United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

## SENATE—*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, a Senator from the State of Florida.

The Reverend Delvin D. Elwell, pastor, First Baptist Church, Hinton, W. Va., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, through whose power men in generations past obtained liberty, we are mindful of the heritage which is ours, not of our deserving but by Thy providence. We are grateful for the privilege of living and serving in this great land and for those democratic principles which have made our Nation great.

We acknowledge that Thou art a sovereign God and that even mighty men and nations must bow before Thee.

Grant, we pray, spiritual wisdom to these public servants so that they may properly determine Thy will and the right action to take as crucial decisions come before them.

Help us to be worthy to stand in this place and with steadfast courage fulfill the tasks which Thy will demands.

We pray in the name of our Lord. Amen.

### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read a communication to the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
*Washington, D.C., April 23, 1970.*

*To the Senate:*

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, a Senator from the State of Florida, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
*President pro tempore.*

Mr. HOLLAND thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 20, 1970, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF THE NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 1968—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 20, 1970, the Secretary of the Senate, on April 21, 1970, received the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I herewith transmit to you the second Annual Report on the administration of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968. This report has been prepared in accordance with Section 14 of the Act, and covers the period of January 1, 1969, through December 31, 1969.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 21, 1970.*

### REPORT ON OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM GRANTEES ANNUAL SALARY REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1969—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 20, 1970, the Secretary of the Senate, on April 21, 1970, received the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to Section 610–1(b) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity has submitted a list of the names of officers or employees whose compensation is subject to the limitation set forth in Section 610–1(a) and who were receiving, at the end of the last fiscal year, salary at a rate of $10,000 or more per year, together with the amount of actual compensation paid to each person and the amount of such compensation paid from funds advanced or granted pursuant to the Act. I am transmitting the report to the Congress herewith.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 21, 1970.*

### DISASTER ASSISTANCE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 20, 1970, the Secretary of the Senate, on April 22, 1970, received the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

The spirit of neighborliness, the readiness to extend a helping hand in time of trouble, is one of the great traditions of this country. In the early years of our history, good neighbors were essential in coping with the hardships of pioneer life. They are equally essential in meeting the challenges of life today.

The spirit of the good neighbor was particularly evident in 1969 when natural disasters struck this country in unprecedented numbers and with unprecedented force. Twenty-nine major disasters and an untold number of smaller disasters were responsible for over 300 deaths and an estimated $2 billion in property damage in the last calendar year. Events such as the California floods and Hurricane Camille with the Virginia floods were exceptionally destructive.

Private voluntary agencies have traditionally played a crucial role during times of disaster. State and local governments are key factors in any successful disaster relief effort. Thus the Federal role is only one part of the overall response of the Nation. But it is a very important part of that response. Under the Federal Disaster Acts of 1950, 1966, and 1969 and their amendments and under provisions in many other statutes, the Federal government works to help individuals through relief and rehabilitation efforts and to assist State and local governments by restoring public facilities essential to community life. In 1969 the Federal government allocated $150 million for assistance from the President's Disaster Relief Fund—the largest sum for any one year in history. Significant additional funds were spent on disaster assistance under other Federal programs. A report on our 1969 experience is being provided to the Congress.

We are confident that the general framework of our present program provides an effective mechanism for channeling Federal disaster assistance to individuals and communities. Rather than depending on a specialized disaster assistance agency, the present system makes maximum use of existing agencies, centrally coordinated by the Office of Emergency Preparedness, to perform tasks in time of emergency which are similar to those which they perform in normal circumstances. Our present arrangements also encourage constructive and cooperative efforts among individuals, local communities, the States and the Federal Government.

At the same time, however, we have learned that a number of improvements are in order within the existing framework. The last Presidential special mes-



AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

sage on the subject of disaster assistance was written 18 years ago. Since that time, this program has grown in a piecemeal and often haphazard manner, involving over 50 separate Congressional enactments and executive actions. This slow development process has created a complex program, one which has a number of gaps and overlaps and needs increased coordination. It is time for new legislation and executive action to make our Federal disaster assistance program more effective and efficient.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

*To extend and to improve the assistance which the Federal Government can provide in time of major disasters, I am asking the Congress to enact the Disaster Assistance Act of 1970.* This legislation contains a number of specific proposals, the most important of which are the following:

REVENUE MAINTENANCE

When a community experiences a major disaster, the physical impact is obvious. What the television camera does not capture, however, is the loss of property tax revenue which occurs when a substantial portion of a community's property tax base is destroyed and its essential services are disrupted.

To ease this difficulty, *I recommend that the Congress enact a property tax revenue maintenance plan.* Under this plan, the Federal government would be authorized to lend money at favorable interest rates to local governments to make up their loss of property tax revenues following a major disaster.

PERMANENT REPAIR

*I am asking the Congress for expanded Federal authority to permanently repair or fully replace essential public facilities damaged by disasters.* This authorization would provide a more effective and practical approach to the replacement of damaged public facilities which are vital to community life. This Administration would give preference to local employees and contractors in repair and rebuilding work.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

*I am also asking the Congress to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, so that the Economic Development Administration would provide staff support, technical advice and financial assistance to those communities affected by major disasters.* Such assistance is vital in recovery efforts, particularly when the community is attempting to begin long-range rebuilding or redevelopment efforts.

DISASTER LOANS

*I am proposing legislation to improve the disaster loan programs of the Small Business Administration and of the Farmers Home Administration.* These loans are among our principal sources of assistance to stricken individuals. The recommended changes would provide for improved refinancing, payment deferral, and forgiveness arrangements and would assure disaster loans to older citizens. My proposed amendment would allow the FHA and SBA to provide faster service and would therefore promote speedier recovery following disasters.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

*I am also recommending that the Congress extend for two years the expanded unemployment compensation provisions of the Disaster Relief Act of 1969.* These provisions make temporary income available as promptly as possible to help individuals who are unemployed as the result of a major disaster. Such assistance to individuals was a new feature in the 1969 Act. Before last year, only those unemployed persons who could qualify for compensation under the normal unemployment insurance programs could receive income protection following a disaster. The two-year extension which I recommend would provide time to fully evaluate the new provisions and to consider appropriate legislation.

HOUSING

Hurricane Camille provided the greatest test of the Federal government's ability to provide temporary housing to victims of a major disaster. We believe we met that test; at the direction of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, the Department of Housing and Urban Development was able to place more than 5,000 mobile homes in the disaster area. We also believe, however, that the language of the law which authorizes such activities is confusing.

Two separate provisions in two different laws are now directed to temporary emergency housing. In order to simplify the legislative provisions that apply to this problem, *I propose that the provisions for temporary housing in PL 81–875 be amended so that they incorporate many of the broad principles of PL 91–79, without sacrificing flexibility.* A clarified version of this law would allow the government to provide temporary housing or other emergency shelter—including leased mobile homes or other readily fabricated dwellings.

DEBRIS REMOVAL

One of the serious problems encountered in Hurricane Camille related to the removal of debris from private property. Current legislation in this area is confusing and difficult to administer. *I am therefore proposing corrective legislation that would simplify and speed debris removal from private property when it is in the public interest.* Again, preference would be given to local employees and contractors.

DISASTER PREVENTION

In March and April 1969 this Administration conducted a massive flood prevention program in the upper Midwest and New England. This program—Operation Foresight—was immensely successful; it prevented widespread human suffering and an estimated $200 million in damages, at a cost of $20 million. The success of this disaster prevention effort suggests that we can do a great deal to avoid or limit the effects of expected disasters. *Accordingly, I am proposing legislation which would extend the Federal government's authority to assist State and local governments in disaster prevention and damage reduction activities.*

PLANNING ASSISTANCE

The Disaster Relief Act of 1969 authorized one-time matching grants to help States formulate better plans for coping with disasters. Almost half of the States have already indicated that they will join us in this effort and we expect that others will soon follow their lead. *I now recommend that the Congress expand this provision of the 1969 law in order to help States review and update these plans on a continuing basis.*

In addition to the major initiatives outlined above, the legislation prepared by the Administration includes a number of other changes designed to extend the scope and improve the effectiveness of Federal assistance.

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

Legislative changes are not the only improvements which are presently required. Our experience indicates that changes in administrative procedures can be equally important in providing a more effective assistance program.

COORDINATION

*To improve coordination of Federal Disaster Assistance efforts, both among Federal agencies and among Federal, State, and local officials, I am establishing a National Council on Federal Disaster Assistance.* The Council will be composed of senior officials from Federal agencies concerned with disaster assistance and will be chaired by the Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness.

To further improve coordination of disaster assistance activities in the field, I have also directed that the Regional Directors of the Office of Emergency Preparedness be included as ad hoc members of the newly formed Federal Regional Councils. This improvement will be supplemented by other actions to improve coordination among all levels of government, including the Office of Emergency Preparedness regional planning conferences with State officials with the first such conference this month on the West Coast.

In addition to improving coordination and developing more comprehensive plans, we need better procedures for continuous communication with State and local governments on such matters as disaster legislation. The Council of State Governments and such organizations as the International City Management Association, the National Association of Counties, the National League of Cities, and the United States Conference of Mayors are assisting us in this effort.

Improvements in disaster assistance also require an improved program of research and evaluation, the results of which are readily available to all who can benefit from them. I have therefore directed the Office of Emergency Preparedness to act as a central clearing house for all Federal research which is related to disasters.

ASSISTANCE TO INDIVIDUALS

An important objective, particularly in large-scale disasters, is that of informing individuals of the assistance which is available and of the places where it can be obtained. To meet this problem, we are expanding our information efforts and keying those efforts to the needs of the individual citizens of the community, particularly those who are poor.

Whenever a disaster occurs, those who

live in the area desperately want to be in touch with their friends and relatives who live elsewhere. Rescue workers also need better communication facilities within such areas. I have therefore asked the Office of Emergency Preparedness to provide better emergency communication services to stricken regions during times of disaster.

Just as we make it easier for individuals to get information, so we should make it easier for them to get assistance. It should not be necessary for individuals to travel from one place to another and then to still another location in order to obtain the help which various agencies of the Federal government are providing. *Accordingly, we are developing plans to provide "one-stop" service to individuals in disaster areas.* Representatives of the principal Federal agencies and of the Red Cross, as well as caseworkers and legal advisors, will all be available at a single assistance center.

DISASTER ASSISTANCE TEAMS

Disaster stricken communities frequently lack trained personnel who can help them make the best possible use of the assistance which is available to them from many sources. To meet this need, I have directed the Office of Emergency Preparedness to form *Federal disaster assistance teams to help local communities coordinate the overall assistance effort.* These teams will be supervised by a Federal Disaster Assistance Coordinator who will act as an on-the-spot representative of the President in any particular disaster area.

DISASTER INSURANCE

Our experience with disasters in 1969 clearly demonstrated the need for expanded insurance coverage for property owners. The national flood insurance sections of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 presently permit Federal insurance assistance in flood-prone areas and we are now implementing that program on an accelerated basis. *I am also directing that a comprehensive study of property insurance coverage for disaster situations be undertaken and that specific recommendations be provided me by the end of this year.* This study should take into account the views of the State insurance authorities, the insurance industry, lending institutions, and the general public.

CIVIL DEFENSE

The disaster assistance activities of State and local governments often are closely related to their civil defense responsibilities. The relationship between the Federal government's disaster assistance and civil defense activities should now be carefully reviewed. Accordingly, I have asked that such a study be carried out and that its recommendations be given to me by December 31, 1970. It is important that any changes in this sensitive area be made only after a careful review, one which gives special attention to the impact of any suggested change upon national security.

As we move into a new decade, one of the nation's major goals is to restore a ravaged environment. But we must also be ready to respond effectively when nature gets out of control and victimizes our citizens.

With the improvements I have recommended to the Congress and those which I am instituting by Executive action, the disaster assistance program of the Federal government will continue to provide outstanding public service in times of crisis. This program manifests the extraordinary humanitarian spirit of our nation. The changes I have proposed would enable it to reflect that spirit even more effectively.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 22, 1970.*

## REPORT ON FEDERAL DISASTER RELIEF ACTIVITY IN CALENDAR YEAR 1969—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 20, 1970, the Secretary of the Senate, on April 22, 1970, received the following message from the President of the United States, which, with accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Public Works:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Natural disasters—in unprecedented numbers and scope—presented a grim challenge to this nation in 1969. The exceptional response to this challenge by the United States government is something in which all Americans can take pride. The story of that response is detailed in the report which I am today transmitting to the Congress.

This report of Federal activities in 1969 under authority of the Federal Disaster Act (Public Law 875, 81st Congress, as amended) is required by Section 8 of that law and has been provided by the Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness. The report also describes activities carried out under authority of the Federal Disaster Act of 1969 (Public Law 79, 91st Congress). The funds which supported these activities are specifically appropriated to the President for the purpose of relieving suffering and repairing damage when disasters strike.

There were 29 major disasters during 1969—the largest number since the program began in 1950. Two of these—the California floods and Hurricane Camille—were exceptionally destructive. The number and extent of major disasters in 1969 required a massive Federal effort; a total of $148,970,000 was allocated from the President's Disaster Fund, the largest amount since the enactment of Public Law 81–875. Despite these increased demands, the Federal response was most prompt and effective and those who participated in it deserve our commendation.

Under the leadership of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, the Administration is developing a stronger and more comprehensive disaster assistance program. An important part of this strengthened program is outlined in my disaster assistance message to the Congress. That message discusses both the legislation which will be submitted—the Disaster Assistance Act of 1970—and the improvements which are being made by executive action. I am confident that our strengthened program will improve cooperation with State and local governments and with private and voluntary organizations. More important, these steps would enable the Federal government to continue to meet its responsibilities to individuals who are victimized by these unhappy events.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 22, 1970.*

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 20, 1970, the Secretary of the Senate received the following messages in writing from the President of the United States, which were referred to the appropriate committees, as follows:

On April 21, 1970:

Sundry nominations; referred to the Committee on Commerce.

On April 22, 1970:

The nomination of Gen. Earle Gilmore Wheeler, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general; referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations received, see the end of Senate proceedings of today.)

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 20, 1970, the Secretary of the Senate on April 21, 1970, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 16311) to authorize a family assistance plan providing basic benefits to low-income families with children, to provide incentives for employment and training to improve the capacity for employment of members of such families, to achieve greater uniformity of treatment of recipients under the Federal-State public assistance programs and to otherwise improve such programs, and for other purposes, which was considered as having been read twice, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session, the following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joseph F. Weis, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be a U.S. district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania;

Howard B. Turrentine, of California, to be a U.S. district judge for the southern district of California;

Warren K. Urbom, of Nebraska, to be a U.S. district judge for the district of Nebraska;

James L. Oakes, of Vermont, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Vermont;

Andrew W. Bogue, of South Dakota, to be U.S. district judge for the district of South Dakota;

Wilbur F. Pell, Jr., of Indiana, to be a U.S. circuit judge, seventh circuit;

A. Roby Hadden, of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Texas;

Robert E. Hauberg, of Mississippi, to be

U.S. attorney for the southern district of Mississippi;

D. Dwayne Keyes, of California, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of California;

Robert L. Meyer, of California, to be U.S. attorney for the central district of California;

John A. Birknes, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be U.S. marshal for the District of Massachusetts;

Anthony T. Greski, of New Jersey, to be U.S. marshal for the district of New Jersey;

William B. Henderson, of Kentucky, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Kentucky; and

Joseph W. Keene, of Louisiana, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Louisiana.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 17, 1970, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 2363. An act to confer United States citizenship posthumously upon L.Cpl. Andre L. Knoppert; and

S. 2595. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with regard to the use of dairy products, and for other purposes.

## THE DRAFT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. HOLLAND) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

The draft has been with us now for many years. It was started as a temporary, emergency measure just before World War II. We have lived with the draft so long, and relied on it through such serious crises, that too many of us now accept it as a normal part of American life.

It is now time to embrace a new approach to meeting our military manpower requirements. I have two basic proposals.

—The first deals with the fundamental way this nation should raise the armed force necessary to defend the lives and the rights of its people, and to fulfill its existing commitmcnts abroad.

—The second deals with reforming the present recruitment system—part volunteer, part drafted—which, in the immediate future, will be needed to maintain our armed strength.

### TO END THE DRAFT

On February 21, I received the report of the Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force, headed by former Defense Secretary Thomas S. Gates. The Commission members concluded unanimously that the interests of the nation will be better served by an all-volunteer force than by a mixed force of volunteers and draftees, and that steps should be taken in this direction.

I have carefully reviewed the report of the Commission and have discussed the subject with many others knowledgeable in this field. The preeminent consideration in any decision I make involving the American Armed Forces must be the security of the United States. I have had to weigh carefully our responsibilities in Vietnam and our overall foreign policy would be affected by ending the draft. I also had to consider the budgetary impact, and the possible effect on our economy.

On the other hand, we have all seen the effect of the draft on our young people, whose lives have been disrupted first by years of uncertainty, and then by the draft itself. We all know the unfairness of the present system, no matter how just we try to make it.

After careful consideration of the factors involved, I support the basic conclusion of the Commission. I agree that we should move now toward ending the draft.

From now on, the objective of this Administration is to reduce draft calls to zero, subject to the overriding considerations of national security.

In proposing that we move toward ending the draft, I must enter three cautions: First, the draft cannot be ended all at once. It must be phased out, so that we can be certain of maintaining our defense strength at every step. Second, existing induction authority expires on July 1, 1971, and I expect that it will be necessary for the next Congress to extend this authority. And third, as we move away from reliance on the draft, we must make provisions to establish a standby draft system that can be used in case of emergency.

To move toward reducing draft calls to zero, we are proceeding with a wide array of actions and proposals:

—This administration proposed, and the Congress has approved, a six percent across-the-board pay increase for Federal employees, retroactive to the first of this year. This raises the pay of members of the Armed Forces by $1.2 billion a year.

—I shall propose an additional 20 percent pay increase for enlisted men with less than two years of service, to be effective January 1, 1971. This action, if approved by the Congress, will raise the annual pay of enlisted men with less than two years of service by $500 million a year, and is a first step in removing the present inequity in pay of men serving their first two years in the Armed Forces. The cost for Fiscal Year 1971 will be $250 million.

—In January 1971 I shall recommend to the Congress, in the Fiscal Year 1972 budget, an additional $2.0 billion for added pay and other benefits—especially for those serving their first two years—to help attract and retain the personnel we need for our Armed Forces.

—I have today directed the Secretary of Defense to give high priority to the expansion of programs designed to increase enlistments and retentions in the services. Further, I have directed that he give me a report every quarter on the progress of this program. Other agencies have been directed to assist in the effort.

—I am also directing the Secretary of Defense to review the policies and practices of the military services to give new emphasis to recognition of the individual needs, aspirations and capabilities of all military personnel.

No one can predict with precision whether or not, or precisely when, we can end conscription. It depends, in part, on the necessity of maintaining required military force levels to meet our commitments in Vietnam and elsewhere. It also depends on the degree to which the combination of military pay increases and enhanced benefits will attract and hold enough volunteers to maintain the forces we need, the attitude of young people toward military service, and the availability of jobs in the labor market.

However, I am confident that, barring any unforeseen developments, this proposed program will achieve our objective.

The starting pay of an enlisted man in our Armed Forces is—taking the latest raise into account—less than $1,500 a year. This is less than half of the minimum wage in the private sector. Of course, we should add to this the value of the food, uniforms and housing that is provided free. But it is hardly comparable to what most young men can earn as civilians. Even with special allowances, some married enlisted men have been forced to go on welfare to support their families.

The low pay illustrates another inequity of the draft. These men, in effect, pay a large hidden tax—the difference between their military pay and what they could earn as civilians. Therefore, on the grounds of equity alone, there is good reason to substantially increase pay.

While we focus on removing inequities in the pay of men serving their first few years in the military, we must not neglect the career servicemen. They are the indispensable core of our Armed Forces. The increasing technological complexity of modern defense, and the constantly changing international situation, make their assignments ever more difficult—and critical. We shall continue to make every effort to ensure that they are fairly treated and justly compensated.

There is another essential element—beyond pay and benefits, beyond the best in training and equipment—that is vital to the high morale of any armed force in a free society. It is the backing, support and confidence of the people and the society the military serves. While government can provide the economic justice our men in arms deserve—moral support and backing can come only from the American people. At few times in our history has it been more needed than today.

The consideration of national security contains no argument against these historic actions; the considerations of freedom and justice argue eloquently in their behalf.

### TO REFORM THE DRAFT

As we move toward our goal of ending the draft in the United States, we must deal with the draft as it now exists. This nation has a right to expect that the responsibility for national defense will be shared equitably and consistently by all segments of our society. Given this basic principle, I believe that there

are important reforms that we must make in our present draft system.

It is my judgment, and that of the National Security Council, that future occupational, agricultural and student deferments are no longer dictated by the national interest. I am issuing today an Executive Order to direct that no future deferments shall be granted on the basis of employment. Very few young men at age 19 are in such critical positions that they cannot be replaced. All those who held occupational deferments before today, as well as any who may be granted such deferments from pending applications filed before today, will be deferred as they were previously.

This same Executive Order will also eliminate all future paternity deferments—except in those cases where a local draft board determines that extreme hardship would result. All those who held paternity deferments before today, as well as any who may be granted deferments from pending applications filed before today, will be deferred as long as they are living with and supporting child dependents.

I am also asking the Congress today to make some changes in the Military Selective Service Act of 1967.

The first would restore to the President discretionary authority on the deferment of students seeking baccalaureate degrees. If the Congress restores this authority, I shall promptly issue a second Executive Order that would bar all undergraduate deferments, except for young men who are undergraduate students prior to today. These young men would continue to be eligible for deferment under present regulations during their undergraduate years. This Executive Order would also end deferments for young men in junior college, and in apprentice and technical training programs, except for those who entered before today. Men participating in such programs before today would continue to be deferred until they complete them.

Should Congress pass the legislation I have requested, those young men who start college or enter apprentice or other technical training today or hereafter, and subsequently receive a notice of induction, will have their entry into service postponed until the end of the academic semester, or for apprentices and trainees, until some appropriate breaking point in their program.

Even if college deferments are phased out, college men who through ROTC or other military programs have chosen to obligate themselves to enter military service at a later date would be permitted to postpone their active duty until completion of their study program.

In each instance, I have spoken of the phasing out—not the elimination—of existing deferments. The sudden elimination of existing deferments would disrupt plans made in good faith by individuals, companies, colleges and local school systems on the basis of those deferments.

My second legislative proposal would establish a direct national call, by lottery sequence numbers each month, to improve the operation of the random selection system. We need to ensure that men throughout the country with the same lottery number have equal liability to induction.

Under the present law, for example, a man with sequence number 185 may be called up by one draft board while a man with a lower number in a different draft board is not called. This can happen because present law does not permit a national call of young men by lottery sequence numbers.

Some local draft boards may not have enough low numbers to fill their assigned quota for the month. As a result, these local boards are forced to call young men with higher numbers. At the same time, other draft boards throughout the country will have more low numbers than necessary to fill their quotas.

I am recommending to the Congress an amendment to suspend this quota requirement while the random selection system is in effect. If the Congress adopts this amendment, I will authorize the Selective Service System to establish a plan under which the draft call each month will be on a national basis, with the same lottery sequence numbers called throughout the country. This will result in a still more equitable draft system.

As long as we need the draft, it is incumbent upon us to make it as fair and equitable as we can. I urge favorable Congressional action on these legislative proposals for draft reform.

CONCLUSION

While I believe that these reforms in our existing draft system are essential, it should be remembered that they are improvements in a system to be used only as long as conscription continues to be necessary.

Ultimately, the preservation of a free society depends upon both the willingness of its beneficiaries to bear the burden of its defense—and the willingness of government to guarantee the freedom of the individual.

With an end to the draft, we will demonstrate to the world the responsiveness of republican government—and our continuing commitment to the maximum freedom for the individual, enshrined in our earliest traditions and founding documents. By upholding the cause of freedom without conscription we will have demonstrated in one more area the superiority of a society based upon belief in the dignity of man over a society based on the supremacy of the State.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 23, 1970.*

## WORLD WEATHER PROGRAM PLAN FOR FISCAL YEAR 1971—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. HOLLAND) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying document, was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with Senate Concurrent Resolution 67 of the 90th Congress, I am forwarding to you the second Annual Plan for United States' Participation in the World Weather Program. This report reviews the progress made during the past year and describes the activities planned by the Federal agencies for the coming fiscal year.

Progress in the World Weather Program has been significant. Of particular import is that, through the United States' effort in space, we have seen the development and testing of an instrument which is capable of measuring globally from a satellite the temperature distribution of our total atmosphere. This represents a giant stride forward. It holds promise of providing data from over the oceans and other remote areas, heretofore unavailable, which are essential for providing weather predictions to our people.

On another front, it is most encouraging to note the progress in international cooperation in this area. Nations have joined hands in moving forward with a program to assist developing countries in improving their meteorological services. And the nations of the world are coming together this month to decide on the next major steps in the research activities of the World Weather Program.

The World Weather Program focuses on the important problem of understanding our global atmosphere. Whether we are attempting to assess the impact of pollutants on the quality of our environment, or trying to improve the accuracy and time range of weather prediction, these activities are vital to the people of the United States—to their safety and to their economic well-being.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 23, 1970.*

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 533. An act for the relief of Barbara Rogerson Marmor;

S. 1177. An act to authorize the documentation of the vessel *West Wind* as a vessel of the United States with coastwise privileges;

S. 1775. An act for the relief of Cora S. Villaruel;

S. 1963. An act for the relief of Wu Hip; and

S. 1968. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit the removal of the Francis Asbury statue, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1519) to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1193) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prevent terminations of oil and gas leases in cases where there is a nominal deficiency in the rental payment, and to authorize him to reinstate under some conditions oil and gas leases terminated by operation of law for failure to pay rental timely, with amendments, in

which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3253) to provide that the Federal office building and U.S. courthouse in Chicago, Ill., shall be named the "Everett McKinley Dirksen Building East" and that the Federal office building to be constructed in Chicago, Ill., shall be named the "Everett McKinley Dirksen Building West" in memory of the late Everett McKinley Dirksen, a Member of Congress of the United States from the State of Illinois from 1933 to 1969, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12605) to amend section 613 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 780. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Merlin division, Rogue River Basin project, Oregon, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4172. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide financial assistance for development and operation costs of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9854. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the East Greenacres unit, Rathdrum Prairie project, Idaho, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15207. An act to provide for a modification of the project for Denison Dam (Lake Texoma), Red River, Tex., and Okla., authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16417. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to broaden the authority of the Secretaries of the military departments to settle certain admiralty claims administratively, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 1069. Joint resolution extending for four years the existing authority for the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune.

## HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 780. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Merlin dvision, Rogue River Basin project, Oregon, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4172. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide financial assistance for development and operation costs of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9854. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the East Greenacres unit, Rathdrum Prairie project, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 15207. An act to provide for a modification of the project for Denison Dam (Lake Texoma), Red River, Tex., and Okla., authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 16417. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to broaden the authority of the Secretaries of the military departments to settle certain admiralty claims administratively, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 1069. Joint resolution extending for 4 years the existing authority for the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

## LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## S. 3743—INTRODUCTION OF THE ADMINISTRATION BILL TO DISCONTINUE THE DISPOSAL OF POLLUTED DREDGE SPOIL IN THE GREAT LAKES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on April 15, the President sent to the Congress of the United States a message dealing with the problem of the disposal of dredged spoil in the Great Lakes, which evidences again his deep interest in the quality of the environment. I am sure his attention to this problem, and the action he has proposed, is welcomed indeed by those who have long been concerned about the consequences of dumping in the Great Lakes, and especially by representatives of the eight States where life is so intimately connected to the Great Lakes.

The President's message has been followed with proposed legislation, and a transmittal letter to the Vice President from the Department of the Army, which have been referred to the Senate Committee on Public Works. As the ranking Republican member of the full committee and of the Subcommittee on Flood Control—Rivers and Harbors, I am very glad to have the privilege today of introducing the administration bill. Joining with me as sponsors of the bill are a number of members from the Great Lakes States and of the Committee on Public Works, including the minority leader, Senator SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, the assistant minority leader, Senator GRIFFIN, of Michigan, who spoke in the Senate on this subject on April 15, and Senator RALPH SMITH, of Illinois, who I know has played an important part in developing this proposal.

The President has properly called attention to the important task of "restoration of these magnificent waters," and his action is a most constructive step in the effort to protect, preserve and restore the Great Lakes. In the terms of his message, the bill we are introducing today would:

Discontinue disposal of polluted dredged materials into the Great Lakes by the Corps of Engineers and private interests as soon as land disposal sites are available.

Require the disposal of polluted dredged spoil in containment areas located at sites established by the Corps of Engineers and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

Require States and other non-Federal interests to provide one-half the cost of constructing containment areas and also provide needed lands and other rights.

Require the Secretary of the Army, after 1 year, to suspend dredging if local interests were not making reasonable progress in attaining disposal sites.

The President has also given attention to the broader problem of dumping in the oceans, which has recently been the subject of increased public attention and, in fact, the subject of hearings on March 5 before the Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Public Works. We are glad that he has directed the Council on Environmental Quality to work with the Departments of the Interior, the Army, other Federal agencies, and State and local governments on a comprehensive study of ocean dumping, to be completed this year.

Mr. President, the problems of dredging to maintain navigation, and of proper disposal of the resulting dredge spoil, have been a concern of the Committee on Public Works, and received a great deal of attention during the last year by the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution—although I would assume that this bill, directed as it is to the authority of the Corps of Engineers, will be considered first by the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors. Senate Report No. 91–351 on S. 7, which has become the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1970—Public Law 91–224—discusses the Committee's approach to the problem at that time on pages 26 and 27, and later at page 30. Specifically, the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1970 includes in subsection 21(d) a provision, similar to a portion of the administration proposal with respect to the Great Lakes, authorizing the Chief of Engineers to permit the use of spoil disposal areas by Federal licencees or permittees, and to make an appropriate charge for such use.

Mr. President, the problems of disposal of dredge spoil, and of ocean dumping, are difficult and do not lend themselves to quick or easy or inexpensive solutions. I think it is recognized that this proposal, welcome as it is, is an interim solution, proposing deposition of the polluted material from 35 Great Lakes harbors in contained areas along the shore during the next 10 years, at a construction cost of $70 million, one-half borne by the Federal Government, and at an estimated operation and maintenance cost of $5 million annually. It is essential that adequate treatment of municipal waste be achieved as rapidly as possible, so that the streams flowing into these harbors no longer deposit the

pollution which now contaminates the sediment which must be dredged in order to maintain navigation. I assume that land disposal sites may be hard to find, and that this practice could not be continued indefinitely. I say this because, while I expect the committee to give prompt consideration to this measure, I recognize that the problems of dredging, of disposal of spoil and of ocean dumping will continue, and our work is only fairly beginning.

Mr. President, the President's message on waste disposal appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 15, 1970, on page 11791. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the fact sheet that accompanied the message, the text of a transmittal letter from the Secretary of the Army, the summary report of the Corps of Engineers on dredging and water quality problems in the Great Lakes, and the text of the administration bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. HOLLAND). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and other material will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Kentucky.

The bill (S. 3743) to provide for construction of contained dredged spoil disposal facilities for the Great Lakes and connecting channels, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. COOPER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3743

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That open water disposal of dredged spoil from authorized Federal navigation projects and all other sources in any of the Great Lakes and their connecting channels shall be discontinued, where such spoil has been dredged from an area which the Secretary of the Interior has determined, after consultation with the governor or governors concerned, to be significantly polluted. Such disposal shall be discontinued as soon as the Secretary of the Army determines that dredged spoil disposal sites are available. The Secretary shall undertake to establish the contained spoil disposal facilities authorized in section 2 of this Act at the earliest practicable date, taking into account the views and recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior as to those areas which, in his judgment, are more urgently in need of such facilities.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain, subject to the provisions of section 3 below, contained spoil disposal facilities of sufficient capacity to meet the requirements of this Act for a period not to exceed ten years. Before establishing each such facility, the Secretary of the Army shall obtain and consider the views and recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the effect of the proposed facility on the quality of the water and land resources involved, and on other environmental values.

SEC. 3. Prior to construction of any such facility, the appropriate non-Federal interest or interests shall agree in writing to (a) furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the facility; (b) contribute to the United States 50 per cent of the construction costs, such amount to be payable either in cash prior to construction, in installments during construction, or in installments, with interest at a rate comparable to that for other interest bearing functions of Federal water resource projects, over a period not to exceed ten years, as determined by the Secretary of the Army; (c) hold and save the United States free from damages due to construction, operation, and maintenance of the facility; and (d) except as provided in Section 5, maintain the facility after completion of its use for disposal purposes in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Army shall suspend or terminate dredging at Federal navigation projects, and shall prohibit dredging by Federal licensees or permittees, if he determines, at any time after one year after the date of enactment of this Act, that non-Federal interests involved have not taken reasonable steps toward meeting the requirements of section 3 of this Act.

SEC. 5. The participating non-Federal interest or interests shall retain title to all lands, easements and rights-of-way furnished by it pursuant to Section 3. A spoil disposal facility owned by a non-Federal interest or interests may be conveyed to another party only after completion of the facility's use for disposal purposes and after the transferee agrees in writing to use or maintain the facility in a manner which the Secretary of the Army, after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, determines to be satisfactory.

SEC. 6. Any spoil disposal facilities constructed under the provisions of this Act shall be made available to Federal licensees or permittees upon payment of an appropriate charge to be fixed by the Secretary of the Army. Fifty per cent of such charge shall be remitted by the Secretary of the Army to the participating non-Federal interest or interests.

SEC. 7. The Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to extend to all navigable waters, connecting channels, tributary streams, and allied waters of the United States, a comprehensive program of research, study and experimentation relating to dredged spoil. This program shall be carried out in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies, and shall include, but not be limited to, investigations on the characteristics of dredged spoil, alternative methods of its disposal, and its effects on receiving waters.

SEC. 8. The provisions of this Act in no way affect other current cost-sharing requirements relating to spoil disposal in the interest of navigation on projects authorized, or proposed for authorization, for construction by the Department of the Army.

SEC. 9. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The material, presented by Mr. COOPER, is as follows:

FACT SHEET—PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON WASTE DISPOSAL

I. PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The Great Lakes Disposal Bill would:

1. Discontinue open water disposal of polluted dredge spoil from authorized Federal navigation projects and all other sources in the Great Lakes and their connecting channels as soon as disposal sites are available. The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Governors, will determine the areas where dredge spoil is polluted.

2. Authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct, operate, and maintain contained disposal facilities for a period not to exceed ten years. Before establishing such facilities, the Secretary of the Army must consider the views of the Secretary of the Interior on the effect of the proposed facility on water quality and other environmental values.

3. Require States or other non-Federal interests to provide needed lands, easements and rights-of-way and one-half the cost of constructing containment areas.

4. Require the Secretary of the Army to suspend or terminate dredging or prohibit dredging by Federal licensees and permittees if he determines, one year after enactment of this Act, that the non-Federal interests have not taken reasonable steps toward providing funds and land, or land rights.

5. Permit Federal licensees or permittees to use the containment areas for disposing dredged spoil by paying a fee equal to the cost of providing the facility. One-half of this fee would be returned to the local interests.

6. Authorize the Corps of Engineers to extend to all navigable and allied waters a program of research, study, and experimentation related to dredge spoil.

II. THE PROPOSED PROGRAM

1. The proposed program is based on a comprehensive study by the Department of the Army on the effects on the Great Lakes of depositing dredge spoil. This study was conducted in cooperation with the Department of the Interior, including thhe Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, other Federal agencies, several universities, and technical consulting companies. An eminent group of consultants interpreted the results of this study by concluding that deposition of polluted dredged spoil in the Great Lakes is "presumptively undesirable," and that in the long run the ecology of the Great Lakes would be affected adversely.

2. The study included an investigation of many alternative methods of spoil disposal including treatment in sewage plants, aeration, burning, and deposition on upland and in contained areas along shore. Of these, the best alternative for an interim period of about 10 years is the deposition of the polluted material in contained areas along the shore.

3. First priority under the program will be given to the 35 most polluted harbors.

4. The construction of facilities in these 35 harbors will cost $70 million: $35 million Federal and $35 million State and local costs. Cost of operation and maintenance will be increased $5 million annually due to the added handling cost of the dredged spoil.

III. THE OCEAN DUMPING PROBLEM

1. A study performed by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare indicates ocean disposal of solid wastes during 1968 as follows:

a. Atlantic Coast—24 million tons.
b. Gulf Coast—16 million tons.
c. Pacific Coast—8 million tons.

2. Attention has recently been directed to the dumping of sewage sludge, cellar dirt, dredged mud and chemicals in the New York Bay area. The results of an intensive study to determine the effects on the ecology of this area will not be completed until early next year. An interim study indicates this dumping has had an adverse effect on bottom marine life in this area, although its impact has not been fully evaluated.

3. Current disposal methods and technology are not adequate to deal with wastes of this volume immediately. There are an ever decreasing number of appropriate sites for land-fill disposal. Current incineration practices are costly and create air pollution problems. There have been jurisdictional problems in transporting wastes to inland sites. Other technologies and alternatives, such as composting, creation of artificial islands, transporting material to fill in strip mines or to create artificial reefs, baling of wastes, and incineration at sea have not been sufficiently developed and tested.

4. A study will be conducted under the direction of the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality to recommend:

Further research needs;

Legislative changes, if necessary;

A comprehensive approach to the problem of ocean dumping, including an evaluation of all the proposed and other alternatives.

---

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
*Washington, D.C. April 14, 1970.*

HON. SPIRO T. AGNEW,
*President of the Senate.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Transmitted herewith for appropriate reference is a copy of the Corps of Engineers report titled "Dredging and Water Quality Problems in the Great Lakes" and a draft of legislation "To provide for construction of contained dredged spoil disposal facilities for the Great Lakes and connecting channels, and for other purposes." The draft bill, which derives from the conclusions and recommendations contained in the report, was described by President Nixon in his message of 15 April to the Congress, as a major step forward in cleaning up the Great Lakes.

It has been known for some time that as a result of inadequate treatment of municipal and industrial wastes and of uncontrolled sources of agricultural and other pollution, the sediments deposited in dredged channels and harbors of the Great Lakes have become polluted to varying degrees. It is the considered judgment of a distinguished Board of Consultants convened to assist in the preparation of the report referred to above, that disposal of heavily polluted dredgings must be considered "presumptively undesirable" because of its long-term adverse effects on the ecology of the Great Lakes.

In view of this judgment, the draft legislation provides that open water disposal of dredged spoil removed from areas which the Secretary of the Interior determines, after consultation with the governor or governors concerned, to be significantly polluted, shall be discontinued when the Secretary of the Army determines that dredged spoil disposal sites are available. It is the initial objective of this legislation to terminate at the earliest practicable date the open lake disposal of dredged spoil from those 35 Great Lakes harbors which the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, in connection with above-mentioned report, identified as the most heavily polluted of the 118 harbors on the Great Lakes.

In furtherance of these objectives, the draft legislation authorizes construction, operation, and maintenance of spoil disposal faciilties by the Secretary of the Army. In establishing spoil disposal facilities, the Secretary of the Army would be directed to obtain and consider the views and recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior. These views and recommendations would concern such matters as location of disposal areas and methods of disposal so as to minimize damages to fish and wildlife habitat and impact on the environment, and would be given great weight in the Department's decision processes.

The bill would require participating non-Federal interests to provide land areas necessary for the facilities, and to maintain the facilities after disposal is completed in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary. Participating non-Federal interests would also pay half the construction cost of the facilities, either in cash at time of construction or in installments, with interest, within ten years. Interest will be at a rate similar to that prescribed for other water resource functions. No facilities will be constructed to meet more than ten years of estimated disposal requirements. This ten-year period is specified in recognition of the development within that period of the facilities necessary to treat at their sources the industrial and municipal wastes which are presently deposited in channels and harbors in the Great Lakes.

The authority for, and the cost-sharing terms of, the spoil disposal facilities provided for in the draft legislation, are intended to be separate from and supplementary to any other cost-sharing requirements relating to disposal areas and diking that have been established for existing navigation projects in the Great Lakes area. The objectives of this proposed legislation are primarily water quality improvement and environmental protection, rather than navigation improvements, and the construction cost-sharing arrangement proposed, accordingly, corresponds roughly to the Federal grant assistance available for waste treatment projects under the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966.

Under the proposal, dredged spoil from non-Federal project sources could be disposed of in the facilities authorized in this legislation upon payment of fees to the United States and the cooperating local interests. The fees, designed to recover a fair share of the costs of installing and maintaining the facilities, would not be charged the cooperating interests should they deposit spoil from their own projects.

It is essential that the non-Federal interests, who are the principal beneficiaries of Federal navigation projects in the Great Lakes area, take timely steps toward furnishing the sites for these disposal areas, providing their share of the construction costs, and otherwise meeting their requirements as set forth in the Act. To assure that construction of these spoil disposal sites will progress as quickly as possible, the bill provides that after one year after enactment, the Secretary of the Army shall suspend or terminate dredging on Federal navigation projects, or prohibit further dredging by Federal licensees or permittees, if he determines that the concerned non-Federal interests have not taken reasonable steps toward meeting their requirements under the Act.

Finally, the legislation would authorize extension to all navigable waters of the research program on dredged spoil that has been conducted for the Great Lakes. A variety of problems in dredged spoil disposal exists in other localities, and it is proposed to seek solution to the most pressing of these in an orderly manner in cooperation with appropriate Federal and State agencies.

Apart from the authorities sought in this draft legislation, the Department of the Army intends to advance the bill's basic objectives in the interim by reducing to absolute minimum the dredging required to maintain navigation in the Great Lakes and their connecting channels, and by taking preliminary steps to identify potential spoil disposal sites for which construction would be authorized by the bill.

The President has directed that, upon enactment of this legislation, the Department of the Army report periodically to the Council on Environmental Quality on the progress being made, or the obstacles being encountered, in achieving the objectives of this proposal.

The ultimate Federal costs for the disposal facilities authorized in this legislation are presently estimated to be $35 million for construction and $50 million for ten years additional hauling and handling.

In view of the high public interest that has developed in the problems of spoil disposal in the Great Lakes, authority to provide contained facilities is urgently needed. Accordingly, favorable and early consideration by the Congress is recommended.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of this legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

There is enclosed the detailed statement of the effects of the legislation on the environment as required by Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

Sincerely,

(Signed) STANLEY R. RESOR,
*Secretary of the Army.*

REPORT OF THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS ON DREDGING AND WATER QUALITY PROBLEMS IN THE GREAT LAKES, SEPTEMBER 1969

1. *Authority.* This report, together with the 12-volume detailed report on Dredging and Water Quality Problems in the Great Lakes, prepared by the Buffalo District Engineer, is in response to a request made by the Bureau of the Budget in connection with its review of the Corps of Engineers-Civil budget estimate for Fiscal Year 1967. At that time it was directed that a study and experimental research program be conducted to determine the need for and efficacy of alternate methods of dredged spoil disposal in the Great Lakes. The report was prepared with the assistance of the Great Lakes Regional Office of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration and has been coordinated with the eight Great Lakes States and the Department of the Interior. Their comments have been included in the detailed report.

2. *Background.* As a result of soil erosion, wastes discharges and littoral drift, sediment loads wash into various authorized harbors and channels of the Great Lakes. Periodically this material is removed by the Coprs of Engineers by dredging to maintain the previously established navigation depths. About 10.8 million cubic yards of material are dredged each year from the harbors by the Corps. Approximately 63% of this volume is from Lake Erie harbors and in the case of this lake the dredging constitutes about 8% of the sediment and dissolved solids reaching Lake Erie. In the other lakes the dredging constitutes a smaller proportion. In all, some 115 harbors must be dredged more or less frequently. Most of the dredged materials are transported by self-propelled hopper dredges and dump-barges, the material being moved from the channels and harbors on the fringes of the lakes to the open lakes.

About a hundred selected deep water disposal areas are located near enough to the harbors to minimize hauling costs, yet far enough away to avoid interference with water intakes, beaches, or other facilities. As population and industrial development have increased along the Lakes, the sediments that must be dredged from the harbors and channels have become increasingly polluted. As a result, most of the sediments dredged at the commercially important harbors have become contaminated by inadequately treated pollutants from municipal, industrial and agricultural sources. The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, various public officials and others have expressed concern over the cumulative adverse effects associated with open Lake disposal of these polluted dredged materials. The standards set for water pollution control by the states and approved by FWPCA, which generally require secondary or comparable treatment by municipal and industrial plants along the Great Lakes, are apparently several years from providing adequate treatment of wastes. Means of controlling pollutants from agricultural sources are not yet prescribed.

3. *Canadian Dredging Operations.* The question of the relationship of the dredging operations at Canadian harbors is also being considered in connection with studies now being conducted by agencies of Canadian Government. Since the average annual volume of materials being dredged and disposed of in open water areas, some 1.7 million cubic yards, is small in comparison with the volumes dredged at United States harbors, they consider that their dredging operations are not a major source of pollution.

4. *Non-Federal Dredging Operations.* In order to use the harbors and channels constructed and maintained by the Corps of Engineers, private industry or port authorities maintain access from slips and docks to the Federal channels. The amount of non-Federal dredging necessary to accomplish such maintenance is about 20% of the Corps volume. Whatever criteria of dredged spoil control

are applied to Corps dredging should be applied to non-Federal dredging associated with the use of the navigation channels.

5. *The Problems.* The basic problems posed by the study were:

a. What is the effect on the Great Lakes environment from open lake disposal? What alternatives to open lake disposal of dredged spoil are available? What are the alternative costs and the effectiveness of such alternatives in removing pollutants from the lakes?

b. Should an interim alternate disposal program, to be used until pollutants are effectively controlled at their sources, be adopted? Are the costs of such an alternate program justified in terms of the resulting improvement in the lake environment?

c. If an alternate disposal program is to be adopted what Federal/non-Federal cost-sharing and cooperation should be recommended to the Congress for authorization?

6. *Conduct of the Study.* In conducting the study requested of the Corps of Engineers, a wide variety of alternate disposal methods and modifications to present dredging techniques were investigated and analyzed. In addition, the technical services of other Government agencies, including FWPCA, as well as a group of recognized consultants, certain universities and specialized private firms were utilized to assure consideration of other fields of interest associated with or affected by the dredging operations. In reviewing available information on the subject, including that produced by the Pilot Study, it must be recognized that there is a scarcity of credible data concerning the physical, chemical and biological characteristics at the harbors and lake disposal environments. The conclusions arrived at by the District Engineer in connection with the study are contained in Section 12 of his report.

7. *Views of States.* The states are of the opinion that alternate methods of disposing of polluted dredged spoil are necessary. Some states consider this to be entirely a Federal responsibility. Other states have indicated a willingness to cooperate in financing in the same manner as for local flood protection projects by furnishing necessary lands. A more detailed statement of the states' views is contained in Section 11 of the detailed report.

8. *View of Department of Interior.* The Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water Quality and Research recently expressed these views with respect to the report.

"Our Great Lakes are a priceless natural resource, and we must push with all possible speed to stop and to counteract the continuing degradation of this resource.

To that end, your draft report has shown beyond the shadow of doubt that diked or other on-land disposal of such dredge spoil is a very effective pollution control measure. It remains for the Corps of Engineers to pursue this far wiser course with all diligence and in full keeping with the spirit of Executive Order 11288. Rest assured that this Department will cooperate with you to the fullest to implement without further delay a maximum program of diked disposal."

The Assistant Secretary also points out that in their analysis of available information there were several instances when they would not arrive at the same opinions and conclusions reached in the report of the District Engineer and that generally the report was unsympathetic with the effect that dredging operations may have on the pollution problem which exists in the Great Lakes.

9. *Discussion.* The data derived from the studies of this Pilot Program indicate that materials dredged from 35 of the Great Lakes harbors contain significant amounts of pollutants mixed in with the relatively benign silts and sands carried by the stream and lake currents. At these harbors serving the large cities and their associated industries about 80% of the total Great Lakes annual dredging is performed. The quantities and types of pollutants vary from harbor to harbor, and within a specific harbor area also. Concerted efforts of sampling and analysis of the effects of open lake disposal of the polluted dredge materials generally failed to detect the impact of such disposal on the lake environment. The difficulty ensues because whatever changes are occurring in the lake environment, they represent the gradual cumulative effects of many varying operations, no one of which can be separately measured, quantified and analyzed at any particular time. Thus the cessation of open lake disposal, which in Lake Erie amounts to moving into the lake about 8% of the solids which reach the lake naturally, cannot be related to any specific improvement in the quality of the lake waters, and as a result no specific improvement in municipal water treatment costs, fish and wildlife, or recreation can be calculated. In some few cases it is possible that open lake disposal will improve the lake bottom conditions where such conditions presently are badly degraded. The District Engineer made extensive and detailed studies on alternate methods of disposal and constructed and used such alternate methods in disposing of up to 25% of the polluted dredged material during the two-year Pilot Program. Accurate data on costs and effectiveness of the cheapest alternative to open lake disposal are provided in the report. Placement of the dredged material in diked disposal areas was proved to be effective for containment of the pollutants and also the least costly alternative. The costs for such diked areas are generally two to five times the present costs of open lake disposal.

The pollutants which are mixed in with the silts and sands to be dredged have a variety of sources. In the highly industrialized large cities, the bulk of the pollutants come from inadequate sewage treatment plants. Additional pollutants come from farm, highway and street runoff. The harbor and channels dredged on a periodic basis provide settling basins for the pollutants. Once a dredge has picked up the material and temporarily removed it from the water, the opportunity obviously exists to place the material elsewhere than in the lake water, and in the process perform a pollution abatement function. This pollution abatement function should be performed for the most part by industrial and municipal sewage treatment plants, standards for which have been set and approved by law. Until such sewage treatment plants become effective the Corps dredging program, if it permanently removed the pollutants from the water, could be credited with partially fulfilling on an interim basis the sewage treatment plant function. Although obviously not a substitute for adequate treatment, the monetary credit that could be attributed to the removal of pollutant solids by dredging based on the percent of solids to be removed by treatment and the costs of treatment, is about $2 to $3 per cubic yard of dredged material where such material contains about 10% pollutants. This does not suggest that dredged material be run through a sewage treatment plant, but only that it be recognized that the dredging program can partially meet water quality standards established by law until such standards are achieved by the required sewage treatment plants yet to be built. On the assumption that a significant reduction in pollution at its source would take place in about 10 years, at which time the bulk of dredged materials could then be moved to the open lakes, estimates show that costs of providing the least costly alternative disposal areas at the 35 harbors presently considered to be polluted would be about $70,000,000 for construction of diked disposal areas with an annual added increase of $5,000,000 for the more expensive handling operation of placing the material within the diked areas during the 10-year period.

The report indicates that lesser programs for only the most polluted harbors could be developed, at lower costs of course. In a sense the lesser programs are a way of expressing the priorities of action which could be implemented dependent on funding available for a diked program. For most of the 35 harbors the added cost for confining the dredged materials in diked disposal areas ranges from about $1 to $5 per cubic yard averaging $1.30 per cubic yard. Thus a diked disposal area program, although not justifiable in terms of the direct tangible benefits accruing to the lake environment, is roughly equivalent in terms of costs or removal of pollutant solids to that of the treatment plants required to meet water quality standards. Construction of the diked disposal area program at all 35 harbors would require about 3 construction seasons, after funds have been made available.

10. *Cost Sharing and Cooperation of non-Federal Agencies.* During the past years the Federal policy concerning the furnishing of lands for disposal areas and the construction of retention areas has varied. At many of the earlier projects disposal areas and dikes, where needed, were a part of the Federal cost. Such requirements were readily available and the cost of such facilities was nominal. During more recent years the provision of lands for disposal areas as well as diking such areas has been included in the requirements of local cooperation prescribed for navigation projects authorized by Congress. Since the navigation system of harbors in the Great Lakes and throughout the country has developed over a period of many years, the requirements of local cooperation vary widely depending on the Federal policy that existed at the time of authorization. Many have no requirements whereas others authorized recently include the requirement that local interest furnish the necessary disposal areas.

The control of pollution is a responsibility of local government in conformance with standards established by the individual states and with approval and assistance of the Federal Government. The above discussion pointed out that significant amounts of pollution exist in the harbor sediments of some 35 of 115 Great Lakes harbors. The criteria for defining the amount of pollution that is significant or insignificant have not been established with any degree of precision. Because the individual states have established the water standards for their waters, it appears that the Corps would be best advised to obtain from the state pollution control agency for each of its harbors a judgment on the degree of pollution of the navigation channel sediments and a recommendation on whether or not such pollution warrants the requirement for a diked disposal area.

The costs of an interim diked disposal program can generally be broken down into: cost of lands and access rights thereto; costs of preparing the site by building dikes and other retaining structures; and costs of moving the dredged material from the dredge to the containment site. To be equitable to both local and Federal taxpayers, a consistent cost sharing policy is desirable. Therefore, general legislation is required to provide consistency. It is evident that the cost and acquisition of lands should be a local responsibility and the increased costs of moving the dredged material to the containment site should be Federal. Recognizing that some benefits, though difficult to evaluate, accrue to the owners of filled-in-land, that much controversy will result as to which lands should be used (which can best be resolved by local government), and that such disposal areas will also be used by non-Federal agencies or industry as well as the Corps, it appears that the cost of the site preparation

phase of the program should be borne in whole or in part by local agencies. Since it is not practicable to be sure of equitability in all cases, proposed for the consideration of the Congress is a 50–50 cost sharing on those portions of the diking required for construction and maintenance of the Federal project.

11. *Conclusions.* Based on the results of the study and the carefully considered opinions of the board of consultants, I conclude that:

a. The accelerated mechanical movement of significantly polluted materials from harbor areas to deep waters of the Great Lakes contributes to a cumulative, long-range degradation of lake water quality. Such degradation cannot be quantified, and in some particular cases may not exist.

b. An opportunity exists in the dredging program to perform a pollution abatement function. Accomplishment of the work would be consistent with established standards of waste treatment requiring the removal of solid wastes from sewage effluents. Although not a substitute for treatment of pollution at its source, the dredging procedures, if they permanently removed pollutant solids, could be credited with partial interim achievement of the required but not yet provided treatment.

c. The cheapest effective method of disposal, as an alternate to open-lake disposal, is the use of diked containment areas near the navigation projects. Lands are difficult to acquire and the alternate disposal procedure increases costs several-fold over open-lake disposal. To provide the alternate areas for all 35 Great Lakes harbors currently considered to be polluted would require an investment of about $70,000,000 for providing retention facilities for a 10-year period of operation. Such an investment should be specifically authorized by Congress, allowing for probable changes in degrees of pollution that will exist at various harbors, and with the understanding that the 10-year program is based on the assumption that effective treatment facilities will change the need for containment of dredged spoil in about 10 years. The 35 harbors can be programmed in order of priority in accordance with available funding. After funds are available about 3 construction seasons of dike construction time would be needed.

d. The state water pollution control agency should be the agency to establish the criteria for determining the significance of channel sediment pollution and make recommendation to the Corps of Engineers on the need for undertaking alternate methods of disposing of dredged materials.

e. Non-Federal agencies should be required to furnish lands for disposal sites, access thereto, and pay 50% of the costs of diking or other means of containment at all harbors of the Great Lakes where pollution conditions warrant. Congressional authority for the imposition of this cost-sharing is required.

f. From the results of the studies completed to date and a review of available literature on the subject, it is obvious that further research and study in this field are necessary and should be continued as a part of the maintenance activities on the navigation projects. These studies are urgently required to evaluate more conclusively the impact of the various disposal procedures on the environment of the Great Lakes.

g. Pending approval and the provision of funds for accomplishment of the program, the disposal of polluted dredge spoils will be confined to such diked areas as presently exist, such areas as may be provided under the authority of the existing projects on the basis of minimizing operation and maintenance costs, and in such additional areas as may be furnished by local interests at their expense.

h. The added cost of dredging operations (exclusive of the construction of containment areas) resulting from the utilization of any alternate disposal procedures should be a Federal cost.

i. All non-polluted material should continue to be disposed of in open waters of the Great Lakes.

j. The long-range solution of resolving the pollution problem as it relates to dredging operations is the control of pollution at its sources. 12. *Recommendations.* In furtherance of the national objective of improving water quality through the prevention, control and abatement of water pollution from Federal Government activities, as directed by Executive Order 11288, I recommend the following actions be taken:

a. That the Secretary of the Army approve this report and forward it to the Bureau of the Budget and to Congress.

b. That legislation be enacted, draft of which is being submitted under separate cover, which will require local interests to furnish lands acceptable to the Chief of Engineers for the disposal sites free of cost to the United States and also to pay 50% of the cost of diking or other means of containment at all harbors of the Great Lakes where pollution conditions warrant, as determined by the state pollution control agency.

F. J. CLARKE,
*Lieutenant General, USA, Chief of Engineers.*

---

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON DREDGING AND WATER QUALITY PROBLEMS IN THE GREAT LAKES

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

This supplemental report is submitted in conformance with Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. The broad purposes of the attached Corps of Engineers report, written prior to the Act, are those of the Act, Section 2.

Using a systematic and interdisciplinary approach the Corps of Engineers, with the assistance of the Department of Interior, a board of eminently qualified consultants, and various Universities, assessed the impact of the construction and maintenance of navigation projects on the environment of the Great Lakes. Although environmental amenities and values are extremely difficult to quantify, the great intangible values of high quality water in the Great Lakes were carefully considered and were significant in the decision making reflected below.

(i) *Impact On Environment.* The Corps of Engineers in dredging authorized harbors and channel projects in the Great Lakes has generally disposed of most of the dredged material in the open waters of the Lakes. The detailed study of these procedures concluded (see attached report) that much of the dredged material is polluted by man's industrial, agricultural and domestic activities and when placed in the lakes could have a long range, cumulative, detrimental effect on lake water quality with ensuing undesirable impacts on the environment. The proposed actions would permanently remove polluted dredged material from the lake waters by disposing of the material in containment areas to reduce or eliminate the undesirable environmental impact of the present Corps of Engineers dredging procedures. The proposed actions would perform a partial pollution abatement function for a period of ten years until such time as pollutants presently reaching lake and harbor waters are expected to be controlled at their sources.

The actions proposed will still impact on the local environment at the proposed contained disposal sites. Site selection in upland areas or along shore or in shallow waters requires careful study to assure that one type of environmental enhancement does not produce another type of degradation. Therefore, disposal site selection, construction, and use will be carefully coordinated by the Secretary of the Army through the Corps of Engineers with non-federal participating agencies and the Department of Interior. By careful site selection, beneficial land fills for commercial, industrial, public, or wildlife uses may be developed. Site selection also must give appropriate emphasis to the least total economic cost in terms of land acquisition, construction of containment structures and the disposal operation.

(ii) *Adverse Environment Effects.* The adverse environmental effects that would result by implementing the proposed procedures of dredged material disposal are minimal. The basic purpose of the proposals is to eliminate the pollutional effects of present methods by adopting procedures that would not create other environmental problems. Careful implementation of the proposed procedures will accomplish this purpose.

(iii) *Alternatives to the proposed actions are:*

(1) Continue to dispose of most dredged material in the open waters of the Great Lakes. This is the least cost procedure for maintaining the harbors and channels to the depths authorized and directed by the Congress. This alternative would accept the detrimental environmental impact of present procedures until pollution sources were controlled and dredged material was no longer significantly polluted.

(2) Discontinue the dredging of the Great Lakes harbors and channels. The harbors and channels would within one or two years fill in to such an extent that severe economic hardship would be created at all large Great Lakes ports and extend throughout this region. As the harbors and channels filled in to natural depths, they would no longer serve as settling areas for polluted materials and such materials would then flow into the lakes.

(3) Remove the pollutants from the dredged material prior to open lake disposal. This alternative was tested as part of the reported study and proved to be much more expensive but not more effective than the proposed action.

It must be recognized that within the procedures proposed many alternatives exist with respect to site selection, dredging methods, and conveyance of dredged material to the disposal site. In each polluted harbor or channel project, the most economical and effective methods must be adopted once the proposed authorities and funds are provided.

(iv) *Short-term versus long-term effects.* The proposed procedures are based on the conclusion that short term economic advantages of open lake disposal are overweighted by the need for the long term protection of the Great Lakes environment.

(v) *Irreversible Commitments.* The proposed actions allow for considerable detailed study and coordination prior to implementation in each case. An irreversible commitment would occur after a site had been put into use for disposal of the dredged materials, quantities of which are as high as 1,000,000 cubic yards per year at major harbors such as Cleveland and Toledo. Once these areas were in use for disposal purposes for the proposed 10 year period, they would be converted into new fills that would take time to consolidate before being available for other beneficial purposes. This emphasizes again the need for careful disposal area site selection in order to meet the purposes of the proposed actions.

*Coordination.* The report on the detailed analyses that accompanies this evaluation of dredging and water quality problems in the Great Lakes, has been coordinated with the eight Great Lakes States and pertinent Federal Agencies. Volume I of the report includes State and Agency comments as a result of this coordination. A series of public meetings at various cities in the Great Lakes area during the Spring of 1969 as well as widely dis-

tributed brochures were used to advise the public on the study conclusions and findings.

Coordination through the International Joint Commission continues with the Canadians with respect to an overall program of pollution abatement in the boundary waters.

## DUMPING IN LAKE MICHIGAN: THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. President, I am pleased to join the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works (Mr. COOPER) and the distinguished assistant minority leader (Mr. GRIFFIN) in the sponsorship of S. 3743, President Nixon's program to prevent the dumping of dredged materials into the Great Lakes. The record of leadership compiled by these respected Senators augurs well for the prompt consideration of the President's program and prompt action on this important legislation.

Mr. President, the dredging of shipping channels in the Great Lakes is an important factor in the maintenance of a healthy, vital, economic climate in my own State of Illinois. The people of Illinois know the value of Great Lakes commerce to the State's economy. Many of their jobs depend on shipping and lake-related industries. Yet they have again and again demanded the cessation of the open-lake dumping of dredged materials—not because they want to see the shipping industry come to a halt in the Great Lakes region, but because they believe that shipping and industry can continue to prosper without continuing to pollute.

The people of Illinois look to their public officers to accomplish the goal of progress without pollution by strict enforcement of antipollution regulations. They expect action, not words, directed toward pollution abatement. They insist upon the creation of programs "with the teeth in them"—and the dollars in them—to do the job. They deserve nothing less.

In my opinion, President Nixon's proposals constitute recognition of the principle that public works projects, no matter how desirable, must not be permitted to pollute and despoil. They further recognize the sound principle that if Government aims to eliminate pollution, it should first guarantee that its own activities do not pollute. These are the very principles to which I pledged myself in a statement on the floor of the Senate on April 15. In that statement, I said:

> From this day on, I shall use my office as Senator to oppose each and every new Federal public works project for the State of Illinois, if plans for those projects do not include an adequate concern for the ecological effects of their execution. In other words, I am serving notice here and now to every State and local government officer, and to every interest group, that Ralph Smith will do his best to see that no more Federal dollars are spent on new public works projects in Illinois unless those projects include completely adequate safeguards to control pollution and other detrimental ecological effects of the projects.

Mr. President, in some ways President Nixon's proposals do not go as far as I have suggested in visits with him and letters to him over recent months. Nevertheless, I am proud to cosponsor the President's bill as a history-making first step. I hope to present some amendments of my own when the bill is considered in committee, but they will supplement, rather than supplant, the President's very meaningful, very worthy, proposals.

## S. 3744—INTRODUCTION OF THE ADMINISTRATION BILL TO EXTEND FOR 1 YEAR THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the Senate received on Monday, April 20, a letter from the Secretary of Commerce transmitting a draft of legislation to extend for 1 year the authorizations for titles I through IV of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

I am very glad to introduce the administration proposal as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, to which it has been referred, together with Senator BAKER, who is the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Economic Development.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal, a statement of purpose and need which accompanied the letter, and the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. HOLLAND). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and other material will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Kentucky.

The bill (S. 3744) to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend the authorizations for titles I through IV through fiscal year 1971, introduced by Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. BAKER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3744

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) section 105 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "June 30, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1971".

(b) Subsection (c) of section 201 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "June 30, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1971".

(c) Section 302 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "per fiscal year for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1970, and June 30, 1971".

(d) Subsection (g) of section 403 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "June 30, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1971".

The material, presented by Mr. COOPER, is as follows:

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
*Washington, D.C., April 17, 1970.*

Hon. SPIRO T. AGNEW,
*President of the Senate,*
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed are four copies of a draft bill "To amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend the authorizations for titles I through IV through fiscal year 1971." together with four copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that enactment of this legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

_____ _____,
(For the Secretary of Commerce).

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED

The proposed bill is to renew and extend authorizations of funds for Titles I through IV of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, through June 30, 1971.

The continuing growth of the national economy is showing an impact on many lagging areas of the Nation, but a large number of areas are still in need of Federal financial aid to combat severe unemployment and low-income problems in fiscal year 1971. These areas are caught in a downward cycle of privation and are unable to build the public facilities essential to attract private industry and stimulate economic growth.

In an effort to help these areas, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 authorizes a grant and loan program for public works and development facilities needed to create a climate conducive to the development and operation of private enterprise. The appropriations authorization for the grant program, contained in Title I, section 105 of the Act, and the appropriations authorization for the loan program, contained in Title II, section 201(c) of the Act, expire June 30, 1970.

An extension of the authorization of funds for this program through June 30, 1971, is sought to enable EDA to continue to fund needed public works and development facilities.

Section 202 of the Act authorizes (1) business development loans for the purchase or development of land and facilities, including machinery and equipment for industrial or commercial usage and (2) working capital guarantees made in connection with projects assisted by such loans. The purpose of this program is to provide a direct stimulus to industrial and commercial development in these lagging areas. The appropriations authorization for this program, contained in Title II, section 201(c) expires on June 30, 1970.

The extension of this authorization is sought through June 30, 1971, to continue the business loan and working capital guarantee program as a means for providing continued assistance to private sector development in these depressed areas.

The technical assistance and research program authorized by Title III of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is an effective means of giving motivation and support to institutions and groups instrumental in fostering the economic development process, as well as providing preliminary feasibility studies and planning assistance to more adequately assure the success of programs and projects. In addition, the research program authorized by Title III enables the Department to formulate and evaluate its policies and to establish long-term goals and priorities. The appropriations authorization for the technical assistance and research program, contained in Title III, section 302, expires June 30, 1970.

An extension of the authorization of funds for this program through June 30, 1971, is sought to enable EDA to continue this much needed economic development support program.

Public works and development facility grants and loans, business loans and working capital guarantees to be provided to economic development centers are authorized in

section 403. An economic development center must have a population not exceeding 250,000 persons and must be geographically and economically related to the economic development district so that it may contribute significantly to the alleviation of poverty in depressed areas. The purpose of this program is to develop new industrial and commercial centers in such areas. The appropriations authorization for this program, contained in Title IV, section 403(g), expires June 30, 1970.

An extension of this appropriations authorization is sought to enable the continuance of this assistance which is essential to rational, effective areawide economic development.

## S. 3745—INTRODUCTION OF THE ADMINISTRATION BILL—DISASTER ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1970

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, yesterday the President sent to the Congress a message on Federal disaster assistance, both outlining administrative actions he has taken, and making legislative proposals. As the Senate did not meet yesterday, the President's message was received by the Senate earlier today.

It is a humane message, building upon our tradition of extending a helping hand to neighbors in time of trouble. His proposals will advance the great and often critical help which timely Federal efforts can give when storm, flood or earthquake strike.

The message recognizes the importance of coordinating Federal efforts, of bringing assistance promptly and effectively to areas hit by disaster—always difficult at a time of confusion and disruption—and of seeing to it that individuals and families and local officials have access to the assistance we intend be available to them in a way that is convenient, equitable, understandable and, hopefully, uncomplicated.

The Senate Committee on Public Works has exercised jurisdiction in this field for many years and, while not all of the provisions of law touching on emergency and disaster assistance have passed through our committee, the basic legislation has been our responsibility. I think it fair to say that the present system of Federal disaster assistance developed largely at the initiative of the Congress, with additions usually following a major occurrence as needs became apparent. I consider it noteworthy, therefore—and as evidence of the President's concern for human values, of the spirit in him of the good neighbor—that we have this special Presidential message directed to improving Federal disaster assistance. It is the first such message in many years and, I believe, the most comprehensive statement by the White House on the subject.

Last fall, following Hurricane Camille, the Senate Committee on Public Works established a Special Subcommittee on Disaster Relief. Its chairman is Senator BAYH, who has made proposals, introduced legislation, conducted hearings, and devoted much effort to this subject for several years. His faithful and persistent work in this area is recognized and, indeed, the subcommittee begins, on Monday, its Washington hearings on this subject following the field hearings earlier this year in Biloxi, Miss., and Roanoke, Va. The administration proposals will, I am sure, make a significant contribution to the committee's work in this field.

Mr. President, as the ranking minority member of the full Committee on Public Works, I am very glad to introduce, with Senator DOLE, the ranking minority member of the Disaster Relief Subcommittee, and with Senator RANDOLPH, chairman of the full committee, together with Senator BAYH, chairman of the Disaster Relief Subcommittee, the bill submitted by the President. I do so today so that it may be printed in time to be available at the committee hearings beginning on Monday. I have no doubt that a number of Senators may wish to become cosponsors of the administration disaster relief bill, and at a later time will ask unanimous consent to add as sponsors those who wish to do so.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the fact sheet which accompanied the President's message, a section-by-section analysis of the administration bill, and the Executive order of April 22, 1970, establishing the National Council on Federal Disaster Assistance.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. HOLLAND). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the material will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Kentucky.

The bill (S. 3745) to amend existing Federal disaster assistance legislation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. COOPER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The material, presented by Mr. COOPER, is as follows:

DISASTER ASSISTANCE LEGISLATION FACT SHEET

1. *Revenue Maintenance.*—The Federal Government would be authorized to lend money at favorable interest rates to local governments to make up their loss of property tax revenues following a major disaster. Such a program would permit continuation of essential public services and thereby enable local governments to respond to public needs with full vitality at the time when such vitality is most needed. The interest rate on such loans would be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury. It would be based on the current average market yield on those outstanding marketable obligations of the United States which have remaining periods to maturity of 10 to 12 years. This level could be reduced by up to 1%.

2. *Permanent Repairs.*—Existing disaster assistance legislation permits only emergency repairs or temporary replacement of damaged essential public facilities. This authorization would allow permanent repairs or full replacement in conformity with existing codes and standards. It would therefore provide an effective and practical approach to the replacement of damaged public facilities which are vital to community life.

3. *Economic Development Assistance.*—The Economic Development Administration would be able to provide staff support, technical advice, and financial assistance to those communities affected by major disasters. These forms of assistance are vital in recovery efforts, particularly when the community is attempting to begin long-range rebuilding or redevelopment efforts.

4. *Disaster Prevention.*—The Office of Emergency Preparedness would be authorized to take preparedness or preparatory action "in circumstances which clearly indicate the imminent occurrence of a major disaster." This arrangement is expected, in some instances, to reduce damage and destruction and to contribute to a more rapid and effective response following a disaster.

5. *Disaster Loans.*—Disaster loans by the Small Business Administration and the Farmers Home Administration are the principal sources of assistance to stricken individuals. Disaster loans under this legislation would have improved refinancing and payment deferral arrangements; forgiveness in major disaster areas would be increased from $1,800 to $2,500 and disaster loans to older citizens would be assured. The interest rate on such loans would be set by the Secretary of the Treasury. It would be based on the current average market yield on U.S. obligations with remaining periods to maturity of 10 to 12 years. This level could be reduced by up to 1%. These changes are expected to allow faster service by FHA and SBA, and promote speedier recovery following disasters.

6. *Unemployment Compensation.*—This provision would extend for two years the provisions of the Disaster Relief Act of 1969, and would make temporary income available as promptly as possible to mitigate the hardships of individuals unemployed as a result of a major disaster. Before 1969, only those unemployed who could qualify for compensation under the normal unemployment insurance program received income protection following a disaster. The two-year extension would provide time to evaluate the new provisions and to pass appropriate legislation.

7. *Housing.*—The provision for temporary housing in PL 81–875 would be amended to incorporate several features of PL 91–79, while retaining the flexibility necessary to provide an adequate response to natural disasters. One such feature would be the authority to charge appropriate rentals taking into consideration the hardship involved and the financial ability to pay.

8. *Debris Removal.*—The Federal Government would be able, when it is in the public interest, to remove debris from private property. State or local governments would be required to arrange authorization for removal of debris from private property and to indemnify the Federal Government against liability claims.

9. *Planning Assistance.*—The Disaster Relief Act of 1969 authorized a one-time grant to States for disaster planning. This legislation would expand that provision of the 1969 law and would permit the use of Federal matching funds for maintaining and updating of States disaster plans.

10. *Miscellaneous.*—The Disaster Relief Act of 1969 (PL 91–79) expires on December 31, 1970. Items 5 through 9 represent extensions or modifications of provisions included in PL 91–79. Two additional authorities contained in PL 91–79, those concerning timber sale contracts and appointment of a Federal coordinating officer, would also be extended by this legislative proposal.

DISASTER ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1970, SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Sec. 1. Provides that the Act may be cited as the "Disaster Relief Act of 1970."

Sec. 2(a). Amends the definition of the term "major disaster" in PL 81–875 to require that Governors certify a need for "Federal disaster assistance" rather than just assistance under PL 81–875. The amendment also deletes a reference to the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia since that Board no longer exists.

Sec. 2(b) and (c). Amends the definition of the term "State" to include the District of Columbia and deletes the reference to the District of Columbia in the definition of "local government."

Sec. 2(d). Revises Section 3(d) of PL 81–

875 to provide that Federal contributions for permanent repair or replacement of essential public facilities of State and local governments shall not exceed the net cost of restoring such facilities to their pre-disaster capacity in conformity with current codes and specifications. This section has been further amended to permit appropriate rental charges for temporary housing taking into consideration the hardship and the financial ability of the occupant to pay.

Sec. 2(e). Revises Section 4 of PL 81–875 to authorize agreements with private relief organizations to distribute needed supplies in disaster areas in accordance with nondiscrimination provisions of Federal law.

Sec. 3. Extends and modifies certain provisions of the Disaster Relief Act of 1969 (PL 91–79).

Sec. 3(a) and (b). Amends the disaster loan authorities of the Small Business Administration and the Farmers Home Administration by (1) standardizing the interest rates on loans and authorizing such loans even though assistance may be available from private sources, (2) making such loans not to exceed the current repair or replacement cost of the disaster loss, in conformity with current codes and specifications, (3) providing, in cases in which refinancing of existing loans is required, that the amount of the refinancing shall not exceed the amount of the physical loss sustained, and (4) in cases of hardship, raising the forgiveness feature of disaster loans from $1800 to $2500 in major disaster areas.

Sec. 3(c). Amends Section 8(c) of PL 91–79 to eliminate the date for completion of State plans and provides that plans developed under this section shall be applicable to local governments as well as individuals.

Sec. 3(d). Further amends Section 8 of PL 91–79 by authorizing matching grants to States up to $25,000 per annum for purposes of improving, maintaining, and updating State disaster assistance plans.

Sec. 3(e). Revises Section 14 of PL 91–79 to make clear that contractors may remove debris from private property in community areas including rural areas. This subsection also provides that State and local governments arrange to provide blanket authorizations for the removal of such debris and that the Government be indemnified against claims arising from such removal.

Sec. 3(f). Repeals Section 15 of PL 91–79 which defines "major disaster" for purposes of the Act as a disaster which occurred after June 30, 1967, and on or before December 31, 1970. However, the repealing amendment provides that project claims resulting from disasters declared prior to the date of enactment of this Act shall be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of PL 91–79.

The Section further provides that Sections 2, 4, 10, and 11 of PL 91–79 shall not be in effect after December 31, 1970. Section 2 provides for a 50 percent Federal contribution for the permanent repair or reconstruction of non-federal aid highways and is not necessary in view of a revised standard or repair for public facilities eligible for assistance under PL 81–875. Section 4 with respect to public land entryman is considered to be a duplication of existing authority and is deleted. Section 10 which provides for temporary housing has been deleted in favor of a modified temporary housing provision in PL 81–875. Section 11 provides for the distribution of food stamps and commodities in areas where low income households would be unable to purchase sufficient quantities of nutritious food. The Department of Agriculture advises that it can undertake this type of program under existing authority and that Section 11 is not necessary. The Section further provides that unemployment compensation benefits authorized by Section 12 of PL 91–79 shall continue in effect only until December 31, 1972. It is expected that a more satisfactory arrangements for providing these benefits will be adopted prior to the 1972 expiration date. All other sections of PL 91–79 would remain in effect.

Sec. 4. Would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to designate areas which have suffered a major disaster to be "redevelopment areas" eligible for grant and loan assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

Sec. 5. Authorizes 15-year Federal loans by prescribed formula to local governments in cases in which disaster damage has resulted in a substantial loss of property tax revenue. Payments on interest and principal may be deferred during the first three years of the term of the loan. This section also provides for the creation of a separate loan fund for the purpose.

Sec. 6. Permits the President to take effective action to avert or lessen the effects of a catastrophe which threatens to become a major disaster. It is not necessary for the President to declare a "major disaster" before assistance can be provided under this section.

Sec. 7. The President would be authorized to assign advisory personnel to the chief executive officer of a State or local government in order to assure full utilization of disaster relief and assistance resources and programs.

Sec. 8. Forbids discrimination on the grounds of race, color, or national origin in Federal disaster assistance programs and authorizes the President to take the necessary action to insure compliance.

Sec. 9. Authorizes the President to utilize the resources of Federal departments and agencies for use in disaster relief, with or without reimbursement, as he deems appropriate. Similar authority was granted by PL 81–875 but not by PL 89–769 or PL 91–79.

Sec. 10. Authorizes the establishment by Federal agencies of advisory groups to assist in carrying out the provisions of law relating to Federal disaster preparedness and assistance and authorizes use of funds for that purpose.

Sec. 11. Adopts for purposes of this Act, PL 89–769, and PL 91–79, the following definitions contained in PL 81–875: "major disaster", "United States", "State", "Governor", "Local government", and "Federal agency." It also authorizes Federal agencies to liberalize contracting and employment practices in accordance with authority now contained in Section 7 of PL 81–875.

Sec. 12. Adopts the language of PL 81–875 providing that authority and funds shall supplement rather than substitute for other authority conferred or funds provided, and adds the limiting language of PL 89–769 prohibiting duplication of assistance for a single loss.

Sec. 13. Authorizes appropriations.

---

EXECUTIVE ORDER—ESTABLISHING THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON FEDERAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE

Whereas the Congress has enacted a number of statutory provisions authorizing Federal assistance to areas devastated by large-scale disasters; and

Whereas the Federal Disaster Act (P.L. 81–875), the Federal Disaster Relief Act of 1966 (P.L. 89–769), and the Disaster Relief Act of 1969 (P.L. 91–79) are, pursuant to delegations of authority by the President, administered by the Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness; and

Whereas the Departments of Defense, the Interior, Commerce, Agriculture, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, and Transportation, and the Small Business Administration and the Office of Economic Opportunity, also administer important disaster assistance programs; and

Whereas a prompt and effective Federal response to a major disaster requires coordinated action by all of the Federal agencies involved; and

Whereas Federal coordination will be served by the establishment of a National Council on Federal Disaster Assistance:

Now, Therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, it is ordered as follows:

Section 1. *Establishment of Council.* (a) There is hereby established the National Council on Federal Disaster Assistance (hereinafter referred to as the "Council") which shall be composed of the Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, who shall be the Chairman of the Council, and policy level representatives of the Departments of Defense, the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, and Transportation, and of the Small Business Administration and the Office of Economic Opportunity, and such other members as the President may from time to time designate.

(b) Representatives of other Federal departments or agencies, officials of State and local governments, and private citizens may be invited by the Chairman to participate in the deliberations of the Council.

Section 2. *Functions of the Council.* The Council shall advise and assist the Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness in:

(a) Insuring that Federal agencies furnish necessary assistance following a large-scale disaster on a priority basis to the Federal Coordinating Officer appointed by the President to operate under the Director, Office of Emergency Preparedness, pursuant to Section 9 of the Disaster Relief Act of 1969;

(b) Developing policies and programs to provide a strong and integrated total Federal disaster assistance effort;

(c) Stimulating cooperation and the sharing of data, views, and information concerning disaster assistance among Federal agencies, State and local governments, and private organizations having disaster assistance responsibilities and interests;

(d) Facilitating cooperation among Federal, State, and local governments with special concern for the maintenance of local initiative and decision making with respect to emergency restoration and rebuilding programs;

(e) Promoting the participation of Federal agencies in providing Federal assistance for rebuilding efforts;

(f) Encouraging research on means of preventing disasters and ameliorating the effects of those that occur;

(g) Reviewing, from time to time, the effectiveness of the Federal disaster assistance programs and suggesting needed changes.

Section 3. *Assistance to the Council.* Consistent with law, the Office of Emergency Preparedness shall provide staff and other assistance to the Council, and Executive departments and agencies shall furnish to the Council such available information as the Council may require in performance of its functions.

Section 4. *Construction.* Nothing in this order shall be construed as subjecting any Federal agency or officer, or any function vested by law in, or assigned pursuant to law to, any Federal agency or officer, to the authority of the Council or of any other agency or officer or as abrogating any such function in any manner.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 22, 1970.*

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, as the ranking Republican member of the special Subcommittee on Disaster Relief of the Senate Public Works Committee, I join others in introducing legislation containing 10 specific proposals recommended by the President to improve the Federal response to major natural disasters.

The subcommittee recently held hearings in Biloxi, Miss., and Roanoke, Va., to evaluate the Federal role in providing assistance to those affected by Hurricane Camille.

We found that Federal agencies moved quickly to provide the assistance available at that time. The Disaster Relief Act of 1969 added new types of assistance which had to be phased and programed into relief efforts. Although by definition a disaster involves losses, confusion, and unusual hardship, deficiences were found in the framework of our Federal effort. This was especially true on the Gulf Coast where the destruction wrought by hurricane Camille was of unbelievable proportions. Yesterday, the President sent to Congress the first presidential message since 1951 recommending legislative proposals to "make our Federal disaster-assistance program more effective and efficient."

The concern demonstrated by President Nixon's message is especially appropriate this week. Over the weekend, tornadoes and violent winds struck parts of the South and Midwest. In Texas, tornadoes cut across a 200-mile area leaving 26 people dead and hundreds injured. Five persons were killed by a tornado which twisted across northwestern Mississippi, Sunday. The tornado injured more than 70 persons and 300 homes were damaged. At the time tornadoes were damaging Texas and Mississippi, floods were threatening Minot, N. Dak., because of heavy snows.

Although there has been a rapid response to these disasters by governmental and private relief agencies, the President's message contained several far-reaching and much-needed legislative proposals, as well as administrative changes that will improve our performance.

FUTURE DISASTERS

Prior to 1966, when the first comprehensive disaster relief act was enacted, disaster laws were largely the result of congressional response to a particular major disaster. Today we realize the need to plan for future disasters.

DISASTER PREVENTION

Part of planning for future disasters is prevention of future disasters. Last year the administration undertook a commendable initiative labeled "operation foresight." Temporary flood control measures were taken in the upper Midwestern States which demonstrated that by an expenditure of $20 million of prevention, it was possible to save $200 million in damages. In California alone, it is estimated that the $0.9 billion spent for flood control projects in that State saved $1.6 billion in public and private damage. It is estimated that because of the absence of engineered flood control works costing $250 million in New Orleans and Plaquemines Parish, 100,000 lives would have been lost and there would have been approximately $2 billion in property damage if Camille had struck 35 miles westward. The extension of the Federal Government's authority to assist State and local governments in disaster prevention and damage reduction will provide direct savings to both the public and private sectors.

STATE PLANNING

In our hearings, it was evident that there was wide variance among the States on the quality of procedures devised for response to natural disasters. As part of an effort to plan for future disasters, the Disaster Relief Act of 1969 authorized one-time matching grants to encourage States to formulate contingency disaster plans. While there has been a substantial response by the States, their plans must be continuously reviewed and updated. The President's request for additional authorization for matching grants recognizes this fact.

REVENUE MAINTENANCE

One of the most severe problems in the areas hit by Camille was the loss of property tax base and widespread destruction of essential services. We heard numerous representatives of city and county governments testify that, unless they received financial assistance from the State or Federal Government, they would be unable to meet fixed obligations and restore public services. In such cases, the State also suffered sales tax and income tax losses and, therefore, had diminished capability to assist local government. The President's proposals for a property tax revenue maintenance plan to provide loans to local governments at favorable interest rates would assist in the provision of necessary funds.

PERMANENT REPAIRS

The rebuilding of a community struck by a natural disaster is often a slow and demanding process. When public facilities have been damaged or destroyed, it is even more difficult.

One of the recurring difficulties in past disaster relief efforts has been the strict interpretation by GAO of the existing law providing for emergency repairs and temporary replacement of damaged public facilities. Such a limited Federal contribution discourages the improvement or replacement of facilities. Rather than building a better bridge, the community finds tiself bound to the old structure, or even worse, due to cost fluctuation. The administration's liberalization of this provision should allow the community not only to rebuild but to improve and upgrade its facilities.

LONG-RANGE RECOVERY

With a disaster, there is also an opportunity to rebuild a better community and provide greater opportunity for all of its citizens. The one agency in our Government that was created to assist in long-range economic planning is the Economic Development Administration. The President has requested legislation to broaden the responsibilities of that agency and make its staff and financial resources available for long-range rebuilding and redevelopment in major disaster areas.

HOUSING

Central to any disaster relief program must be the assistance available to the individual victim of the disaster. The disaster victim is most frequently in severe need of temporary housing. The 1969 act provided for temporary housing which was furnished after Camille to over 5,000 families. Despite these commendable statistics, numerous witnesses appeared before our committee to complain that they were unfairly treated. To improve the administration of temporary housing, the President has recommended clarification of the law. This change will provide flexibility and allow the Government to house disaster victims more efficiently and expeditiously under varying circumstances.

DISASTER LOANS

If the individual is to rebuild his home and business, it must be possible for him to obtain loans at favorable interest rates. The SBA and FHA loan programs have worked as well as any disaster relief assistance. However, there are problems that must be dealt with. The refinancing of disaster loans and the deferral arrangements have been liberalized and the forgiveness has been increased from $1,800 to $2,500. A provision that is particularly important is the guarantee that older citizens are able to obtain a home loan. We found retired people living on a fixed income who after paying off their home mortgage were unable to qualify for a loan to rebuild.

DEBRIS REMOVAL

As the President pointed out, one of the serious problems encountered in hurricane Camille related to the removal of debris from private property. I am told that although it has been over 3 months since our committee was in Mississippi, substantial debris remains on private property or individuals have not been reimbursed for removal. I applaud the President's proposal and anticipate a more expeditious and fair procedure in future disasters.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Although unemployment is initially inevitable in a disaster area, after reconstruction begins there is often a sharp increase in employment. Nevertheless, it is often a time-consuming process for business and industry to resume normal operations, and the individual unemployed because of the disaster must bear an additional burden. While the program has had a signficant impact on such disaster areas as Mississippi, the States must define who is eligible under this program for assistance. For those not covered under unemployment compensation, other programs must be utilized for the maintenance of income during such periods.

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

By the administrative action taken by the President, he recognized the need for substantial changes in programs that would benefit the individual disaster relief victim.

A common complaint was the failure of Government agencies to coordinate their efforts. Hopefully, the National Council on Federal Disaster Assistance, and membership of the OEP on the Federal regional councils, will mean better communications in Federal programs. Close cooperation with State and local governmental organizations should give each a better understanding of the tasks being performed by the other.

To assist the individual in obtaining information at what is usually a very frustrating and discouraging time, President Nixon has established a "one-stop" service. Transportation is often

difficult and all forms of assistance should be available at one location.

The disaster teams created to "help local communities" should be of great assistance. Oftentimes the local government officials and especially the individual citizens are initially not familiar with the intricacies of the disaster law and procedures. A disaster team would be on the spot to help immediately after or during the disaster.

Two important areas were not covered by the President's message. Property insurance coverage is a major problem in various parts of our country. Without that coverage, it is often impossible for an individual or business to rebuild. Because of the broad implications, the President has appointed a task force to study comprehensive property insurance coverage for disaster situations. We hope they can devise an all-risk insurance that will be fair to the insurers as well as the insured.

Of course, no review of disaster legislation is complete without examining the structure of our disaster relief agencies. The question of the relationship of OEP to OCD and their respective roles in natural disaster arose frequently in our hearings. I am hopeful the President will be able to rationalize what appears to be a hodgepodge of agencies with competing constituencies often working at cross purposes. I concur with the decision to postpone reorganization in order to consider the national security implications of such action, but I urge an early decision. The public will not long tolerate a system which encourages such obvious contradictions. The President's message, the legislation and administrative actions will go a long way in bringing order to the chaos of major natural disasters.

Mr. SPARKMAN subsequently said: Mr. President, there is at the desk a message from the President of the United States and also a suggested bill introduced by the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER). That bill is one that overlaps in its various subject matters the jurisdiction of more than one committee.

I have discussed this with the Parliamentarian and with the chairman of the Public Works Committee.

The bill basically belongs to the Public Works Committee. But there are parts of it which belong to the Committee on Banking and Currency. For instance, disaster loans, small business loans and housing.

I have suggested to the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), that the bill be referred to his committee and that it hold hearings on it and decide what it wants to do with it, but before reporting it to the calendar that the whole matter be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency for consideration and recommendation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am responding to the observations of the able Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) with reference to S. 3745, the administration disaster relief legislation introduced by the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER), who is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works. The understanding between the Public Works Committee and the Banking and Currency Committee, as explained by the Senator from Alabama, its chairman, is correct.

Mr. President, pending in the Public Works Committee is S. 3619 disaster relief legislation, which was introduced on March 20, 1970, by the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), a member of the committee and chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Disaster Relief. That measure will be heard and testimony will be taken on April 27, 28, and 29.

It would be my intention to consider the provisions of the administration bill introduced by the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER) at those hearings. I join him in the introduction of that legislation, not that I subscribe, of course, to that measure, or any other measure in detail at its introduction. I believe we can consider that measure along with the measure S. 3619 already introduced by the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), and 26 other Senators. I am also one of the cosponsors of that legislation.

My desire is to facilitate that comity and understanding which has always existed between the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Public Works with reference to disaster relief legislation.

It is important also to say that there may be, after the hearings in our subcommittee on the legislation but before the measure is reported from the Committee on Public Works—in other words, after the markup has occurred—reasons why the Committee on Banking and Currency might ask that a portion of the subject matter be referred to it. I doubt that this will occur, but it could occur. Properly, the Committee on Banking and Currency will want to review the hearings which the Public Works Committee will have held by that time.

I am delighted to know that the Senator from Alabama has arranged for members of his staff to sit in with the Public Works Subcommittee when it hears not only the legislation, S. 3619, but also the bill, S. 3745, introduced this afternoon.

I assure the Senator from Alabama and the members of his committee that there will be every desire, and every determination to work together, as in the past, to bring to this body legislation which has been considered by all members within the committees that have not only an interest but also a jurisdictional problem which must be equated.

Once more, I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his cooperation. Let me say to him that I did not in any way question reference of the bill to the Public Works Committee. I said that is where it basically belongs even though there are three features in it that particularly belong to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE) wants to file a conference report—call up a conference report. He tells me it will take just about 2 minutes. I therefore yield to him for that purpose.

---

## AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE-PASSED WELFARE BILL BY PROGRESSIVE REPUBLICANS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the administration's far-reaching proposal for a basic reform of the welfare system is before us, with the President's backing. It is an historic initiative which holds forth the promise of a national standard of assistance for the poor, of substantial fiscal relief for the States and localities, and a step up in efforts—such as day care and child development that will help to reduce welfare dependency. It deserves our support as far as it goes.

But, as has been said so often, the administration's proposal is only a beginning.

I submit that it is the responsibility of the Senate, now that we have a bill from the other body, to insure the best start than can be realistically obtained in this Congress so that this crucial legislation will establish the basis for an adequate provision for the poor as a basic policy of this Nation.

In order to establish these principles on a firm foundation, I shall seek the support of my Republican colleagues and others for a series of amendments to the welfare bill which I shall introduce next week, and will hope that they will provide a bi-partisan basis for efforts to improve upon the administration's initiative.

I will introduce amendments to:

First. Provide the basis for increases in the $1,600 payment and eligibility standard beginning in calendar year 1973, the second full year of operation, and subsequent years on the basis of the poverty level redefined to more adequately reflect the amount which a poor family actually requires to meet food and nonfood costs.

The President himself has acknowledged that the $1,600 level, even with the addition of food stamps, will not bridge the poverty gap.

In calendar year 1973, the eligibility and payment standard would be raised to an amount equal to 50 percent of the poverty level as then determined. Under my amendment, the poverty level would be determined on the basis of the "low-cost" food plan determined by the Department of Agriculture as the amount needed for a nutritious diet rather than the—as now—inadequate "economy food budget" prescribed for only temporary or emergency use. The application of this new criteria would result in an eligibility and payment standard of $2,400 for a family of four in calendar year 1973. Food stamps would provide additional benefits.

By keying the family assistance eligibility and payment standard to a more realistic poverty index, my amendment would provide the basis for greater coverage of the poor for more adequate cash payments and for increased assumption by the Federal Government of the costs of welfare. States and localities thereby would be free to use

their resources on those efforts in education, health, economic development, manpower and other areas which will seek to reduce welfare dependency.

We must then move from this beginning calendar year 1973 by raising the standard by 10 percent each year, until a standard at the poverty level and a full Federal assumption is reached.

Second. Provide an incentive for all States to raise their levels of supplementation by providing immediately for Federal sharing in State supplemental payments on a variable basis, ranging from 50 percent to 83 percent, depending upon State fiscal capacity, rather than on the 30-percent basis prescribed for all States under the House bill. Under this formula, which is to be used to determine the extent of Federal sharing in medicaid payments, most of the States that have the lowest payments would be provided greater sharing to raise those payments. This amendment will provide additional fiscal relief to the States.

Third. Require a level of supplementation by low-payment States so that in all States poor families would receive a specified additional amount to supplement the basic family assistance payment of $1,600 in the early years of operation of the plan.

Fourth. Exempt mothers with school-age children from the work requirement of the bill. We must give mothers on welfare the respect to which they are entitled. We must rely upon their own desire to provide for their children, upon a constructive incentive system, upon a meaningfully developed manpower and training program, and upon expanded child-care facilities to spell the difference between our new efforts to help the poor and those previous efforts which have, despite requirements similar to those in the House bill, failed to eliminate the rise in welfare dependency. I consider a mandatory work requirement as applied to mothers of school-age children undesirable as a matter of policy, unrealistic in terms of availability of child-care facilities, and unnecessary in light of our experience under existing requirements.

Fifth. Insure that each child receiving child care under the administration's commendable plans also receive the education, health, nutritional, and related services necessary to help such a child achieve his full potential. While the report on the House bill directs that such services be provided and while the administration has indicated its intention to do so, specific language must be included to preclude the possibility that sometime in the future limited Federal resources and increased emphasis on the working needs of the mother may prompt the evolution of a separate and inferior custodial system of child care under the Family Assistance Act.

Sixth. Direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish reporting procedures and annually submit to the Congress a detailed report indicating child-care needs and the extent to which existing facilities are adequate to those needs.

Seventh. Provide allowances for child-care costs to mothers who choose to participate in training.

Eighth. Authorize the provision of child-care services for mothers who wish to accept or continue work on a part-time, as well as a full-time, basis.

Ninth. Direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish a program to provide technical assistance and information to encourage the meaningful involvement of business, industry, and labor in the development of child-care facilities.

Mr. President, in addition to offering these and other amendments I shall support proposals advanced by Senator McGOVERN to provide for joint administration of food stamp and family assistance programs and of Senator RIBICOFF to include individuals and childless couples in the Family Assistance Title if they are not covered in programs for the aged, blind, and disabled.

Mr. President, I am authorized to state that I make these proposals on behalf of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) and myself. We hope to include the names of other Senators as cosponsors by next week.

It is my hope that a number of my Republican colleagues and Senators on the other side of the aisle, who also believe that these amendments contain elements that should be included in this crucial welfare reform, will join with us and that together we can assure that this great, historic legislation will become law before Congress adjourns this year.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to study the amendments. However, I will do so.

I do want to say that I support fully the proposal and intend to give such support as I am able to give to this new initiative of the President to change the welfare plan in the proposal pending in the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to the Senator from Kentucky. I join the Senator from Kentucky in paying tribute to the President for the fine and historic initiative taken in this field.

## S. 3746—INTRODUCTION OF NATIONAL ABORTION ACT

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, back in February I introduced S. 3501, to legalize abortion in the District of Columbia. This bill was designed to take government out of the business of enforcing compulsory pregnancy and place the decision as to termination of an unwanted pregnancy where it rightfully belongs—with the pregnant woman.

When this bill went in, I indicated my hope that legal restrictions of the termination of an unwanted pregnancy would be removed in all the 50 States. At that time, I limited by bill to the District because I had some questions as to the legality of Federal jurisdiction over abortion, an area which has generally been left to the States. Having continued my research on this point, I am now convinced that a sound constitutional basis does exist for the enactment of a Federal statute legalizing abortion.

I am sure you will agree, Mr. President, that one of our most precious and basic constitutional guarantees is the right to privacy. Restrictive abortion laws—because they amount to compulsory pregnancy—blatantly deny a woman's most intimate right, the right to control her own fertility. The bill I introduce today, the National Abortion Act, is designed to guarantee and protect this fundamental constitutional right.

This National Abortion Act would legalize abortion and end compulsory pregnancy nationwide, it is an attempt to bring some order and logic into an area of law which in its confusion, vagueness, and unequal enforcement has, I believe, been cruel and discriminatory in its effects and therefore a serious burden to society.

It seems highly illogical, at this point in time, when there is so much concern over population growth, that the state should still be in the business of enforcing what biologist Garrett Hardin has called compulsory pregnancy. In this session of Congress alone, we have seen the introduction of a sizable number of bills aimed at studying the problems of population growth and at finding solutions to them.

Yet at the same time that we are discussing ways of preventing too many births, we are saying to desperate women who do not want to bear a child, "We shall punish you for your mistake by making you carry that child to term, no matter how careful you were in your efforts to avoid pregnancy, no matter how it will undermine your present family situation, no matter what happens to the unwanted child." I submit there is simply no sense to such a contradictory attitude.

There are those who oppose making it easier to obtain an abortion because they see it as a license to promiscuity. But surveys have shown that the majority of those who seek or have abortions are married women, often pregnant because of the failure of a contraceptive. A survey by Dr. Charles Westoff and Dr. Larry Bumpass revealed that among married women who do not intend to have any more children, one-third admit they have already had one unwanted child and 60 percent have had a failure in timing a pregnancy, less than one-quarter of all U.S. couples who have reached what they consider to be the end of their childbearing can be considered as completely successful so far in planning their fertility. With the failure rate of current contraceptive technology, there would still be several hundred thousand unwanted pregnancies each year among married women using contraceptives.

Furthermore, there are still several million American women who do not have access to family-planning services. We have been guilty in the past of failing to provide adequate medical services to these poor in our midst. Yet if through ignorance or lack of availability of services they become pregnant, we then insist they must become even more deeply mired in poverty by the addition of an unwanted birth.

There is no question but that in our hypocrisy or indifference we have made abortion much more available to the middle class than to the poor. Statistics

available from New York City show that in the early sixties, 93 percent of therapeutic abortions—that is, those done in hospitals—were performed on white patients, 91 percent in private rooms. The ratio of in-hospital abortions to live births in New York City was approximately 1 to 360 for private patients and something like 1 to 10,000 in municipal hospitals. At the same time, the women whose deaths were associated with abortion in New York City in a typical year were 56 percent black, 23 percent Puerto Rican, and 21 percent white.

Congresswoman SHIRLEY CHISHOLM has found the same antiblack, antipoor policies existing in the District. While private hospitals were performing about 300 abortions monthly, D.C. General, the city's only public hospital, permitted only 27 abortions during the entire fiscal year 1969.

The poor, then, to escape compulsory pregnancy are largely forced to seek relief through illegal abortion. It is estimated that there are as many as 1 million illegal abortions a year in this country. Perhaps one-half are done by doctors, the others by those unscrupulous enough to make a profit out of such human misery, or by the woman herself. Deaths from botched procedures have been cut to perhaps 500 to 1,000 a year because of antibiotics, but the consequences of illegal abortions are still the leading cause of pregnancy-related deaths in this country. And there is still a widespread incidence of infection and permanent sterility from such bungling. Furthermore, the statistics do not cover the maiming of the spirit because of the humiliation and terror experienced by those seeking to terminate an unwanted pregnancy.

Our present system has also placed an unfair burden on doctors as they seek to apply their medical skill. Federal District Judge Gerhard Gesell has ruled recently that the provision in the District of Columbia statute which says that abortion may be done for "preservation of the mother's life or health" is unconstitutionally vague. This is typical of the provisions faced by doctors as they seek to abide by their States' legal codes. What is preservation of life—is it a mere matter of breath or is it something broader? Is preservation the same as saving life? Does the threat to life have to be imminent—and how imminent?

As a result of such criteria, vague yet carrying criminal sanctions, most doctors have naturally tended to be highly conservative in their interpretations, and most often the response has been a refusal. It has also been found that abortion policies vary not only from hospital to hospital but also from service to service within the same hospital, and even from doctor to doctor on the same service of the same hospital. How is the patient, particularly the poor patient, to find her path through such intricacies? And why should the doctor be expected to resolve such semantic and legal difficulties?

A doctor should be free, as in other matters involving his professional skill, to treat his patient in the light of his training, his judgment, and his assessment of the needs and total welfare of his patient, without having to arbitrarily refuse the requested treatment or to resort to subterfuges if he feels an abortion would be in her best interests.

There is an accelerating trend in this country toward reform or repeal of the abortion laws on the books, either through challenge in the courts or through the legislative process. California's supreme court last year threw out the State abortion statute and the U.S. Supreme Court refused to hear the appeal; a three-judge Federal panel in Milwaukee has declared Wisconsin's abortion law an unconstitutional violation of the right to privacy as guaranteed by the ninth amendment; and a Michigan district court has struck down that State's abortion law as unconstitutionally vague. Suits challenging the constitutionality of abortion restrictions are pending in several other States. In the legislative arena, Hawaii and New York have made abortion a medical matter between the doctor and his patient; Maryland is presently considering such a standard, and other States are moving toward action. For that reason, some may even question the need for a national policy on this matter, such as I am proposing today.

Experience seems to be demonstrating, however, that mere reform or liberalization does not solve the basic problem. Difficult criteria must still be weighed by doctors and hospitals. And in practice, reform has meant by and large that the poor and minority still have little access to abortion.

Furthermore, when some States act and others do not, when there are varying degrees of liberalization, there is a fear that the States with the most open policy will be beseiged by women from other States seeking abortions. Opponents of a loosening of restrictions hold up the specter of hospitals inundated with such women, literally preventing the hospitals from carrying on its other functions. This National Abortion Act would free States from the fear of this eventuality.

In any discussion on abortion—on the right of a woman to control her own fertility—the most fervent opposition comes in regard to the rights of the fetus. I do not dismiss this question lightly. But in discussions on the rights of the fetus, there is a conspicuous lack of consensus. Some religions oppose any relaxation of restrictions on abortion while a number of others have endorsed the principle of reform. The American Baptist Convention and the Universalist/Unitarian Church have come out for total repeal. Public opinion polls demonstrate that a majority of people, including a majority of Catholics, feel abortion should not be a matter of law.

Under this national act, no woman would be forced or even encouraged to have an abortion against her beliefs. No doctor would have to perform an abortion against his personal moral principles. But those with different religious or moral convictions would no longer be forced into compulsory pregnancies.

Let me bring up another point here—the origin of abortion laws. Contrary to popular belief, the legal structures against abortion are of comparatively recent origin. Until the early 19th century—at common law both in England and the United States—abortion before quickening was not illegal at all. Restrictions against abortion were not imposed until the early 1800's—but not to protect morals or the "soul" of the fetus, but rather because of the great danger of infection in any surgical procedure at the time. Abortions were allowed only where necessary to save the life of the mother—that is, where the risk of infection was outweighed by the risk of carrying that particular pregnancy to term. Today deaths from hospital abortions are virtually nonexistent, but meantime the statutes written to meet the needs of a bygone era have become frozen into our system of law. Mr. President, just look at the irony of this situation. The laws on our books were originally devised to protect women from a serious health hazard. They have now come full circle—under proper conditions, the health hazard is gone. But the laws remain on the books, infringing on millions of women's right to privacy, right to follow their own ethical convictions, right to control their own fertility. The injustice of this situation can no longer be ignored or tolerated.

I submit, Mr. President, that it is timely and right to change these laws. The right to privacy demands no less of us.

So I am introducing this National Abortion Act for your consideration. By it, burdens of guilt and suffering would be lifted from countless women; doctors would be freed to practice their profession in this area according to their best knowledge and skill; the problem of unwanted and unloved children would be eased; a discriminatory practice afflicting the poor could be abolished; the state would be taken out of the business of enforcing compulsory pregnancy and—most importantly—each woman would regain her right to control her own fertility.

The National Abortion Act will, I fervently hope, take abortion out of the realm of inconsistency and emotionalism and into the form of a rational and humane national policy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. HOLLAND). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3746) to authorize abortions in the United States, introduced by Mr. PACKWOOD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

---

## POSTPONEMENT OF HEARINGS ON ARCHES AND CAPITOL REEF BILLS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I have today postponed hearings previously set for May 6 on two bills introduced by Senator FRANK E. MOSS, of Utah, which would reduce the size of the expanded Capitol Reef and Arches National Monuments and elevate both Monuments to national park status—S. 531 and S. 532.

The subcommittee has scheduled hearings on these and two other Utah bills introduced by Senator Moss on May 5

and 6. The great interest evidenced in these bills, and in S. 26, to revise and extend the boundaries of Canyonlands National Park and S. 27, to establish the Glen Canyon Recreation Area in the States of Utah and Arizona, indicate to me that we cannot possibly give all of the bills full consideration in the 2 days we have set aside for them, so we will concentrate on the Canyonlands and Glen Canyon bills, and hope to hear the other two bills at some later date. Departmental reports have already been received on S. 27, and we understand that reports on S. 26 will be received shortly. No departmental reports are in on S. 531 and S. 532.

## SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE PUBLICATION REFLECTS RECENT CHANGES IN STRUCTURE OF AMERICAN BANKING

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Small Business, I am pleased to announce the availability and issuance by the committee of a study on "Recent Changes in Banking Structure in the United States."

This survey was performed by the Federal Reserve System at the committee's request, and updates two previous reports on concentration and banking structure of September 10, 1952, and January 5, 1962.

The past 8 years have witnessed dramatic changes in the way the business of banking is carried out in the United States. For example, holding companies have recorded advances that must be termed as startling in both their speed and extent.

Registered holding companies, which own 25 percent of two or more banks, numbered 41 at the end of 1961, and they held a total of 427 subsidiary banks. By the end of 1969, however, the number of multibank holding companies had increased to 86 and the number of affiliated banks had risen to 724.

Known single-bank holding companies increased in number from 550 in 1965 to 890 at the end of 1969. In that same period, the precentage of U.S. deposits held by one-bank holding companies rose from 4.5 percent to 43 percent.

Together with approximately 14½ percent of bank deposits controlled by registered bank holding companies at the end of 1969, holding company vehicles of one sort or another thus held a predominant share of the money deposited in the U.S. banking system.

SOME DOWNWARD TRENDS IN CONCENTRATION

Other banking trends—some traditional, and others more novel—are also measured in this study. Perhaps most visibly to the public, the number of Americans per banking office—counting branches—declined from 7,500 to 6,200 in the last 8 years. It is likely that this was accompanied by a proportionate increase in convenience for the average person with banking business. The Federal Reserve also found that the number of banks increased by 207 between 1961 and 1968, in contrast to a net decrease of 647 between the years of 1952 and 1960.

In the area of deposits, also, there was a downtrend in this area of concentration during the 1960's, compared to a slight increase during the 1950's.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS REPORT

What is the point of having these studies made by the Small Business Committee?

In my judgment, there are two justifications. The first reason is that banking structure affects the rates of interest and other conditions pursuant to which millions of individual small businessmen in communities across the country may borrow and otherwise obtain capital to meet the terms of competition in their local markets.

We are beginning to receive hard evidence which confirms what has previously been widely sensed:

As banking concentration increases, businesses pay higher interest rates, and as the size of the borrower increases, the effect of concentration on loan rate diminishes—"Bank Structure and Performance" by Professors Guttentag and E. S. Herman, New York Universitiy, 1967.

This means that, as banking concentration increases, smaller firms pay more to borrow than their larger competitors.

The second and larger rationale of these studies is that capital is the lifeblood of our free enterprise system, and the banking mechanism is quite close to being its heart. In large ways and small ways the decisions on how capital shall be allocated, and to whom, become decisive influences on what economic activity will or will not take place; which enterprises will grow, and which will not; which will remain independent, and which will be merged out of existence. This is particularly true at the early stages in the life of a new small firm.

If Congress wishes our system of economic opportunity to survive, it is obliged to understand development in the banking structure.

IMPLICATIONS OF BANK HOLDING COMPANY GROWTH FOR SMALL BUSINESS

There is a current well-publicized example—the phenomenon of one-bank holding companies, which I have mentioned. Their spectacular growth during the 1962–70 period is documented by this report. Their percentage of banking deposits have grown more than tenfold in the last 5 years.

The pace of this development is indicated by the obsolescence of recent estimates of bank holding company size. A study by the House Banking and Currency Committee, published in February 1969, credited one-bank holding companies with about 25% of banking deposits—"Report on the Growth of Unregistered Bank Holding Companies," House Committee on Banking and Currency, committee print.

The 1970 report of the Joint Economic Committee, issued as recently as March 25 of this year, sets their percentage of commercial bank deposits at one-third. However, this Federal Reserve Study submitted to the Small Business Committee establishes that one-bank holding companies now account for at least 43 percent of U.S. deposits.

One-bank holding companies, therefore, control over $180 billion in deposits. Their affiliates are engaging in at least 20 different financial activities and 99 different nonfinancial activities. They are operating across State lines subject only to the most basic legislative mandates of another and simpler era.

What are the implications of these developments for the free enterprise system? We have seen a pause in the expansion of these companies while regulatory legislation is considered by the 91st Congress. It may be noted that the Federal Reserve System has been advocating such legislation for the past 15 years. The Joint Economic Committee has gone so far as to say:

If such an economic pattern should develop in the United States (to its fullest extent) no business of any consequence could continue to compete and remain healthy without associating themselves with one of these giant financial conglomerates—"1970 Joint Economic Committee Report," H. Rept. 91–972, p. 34.

I feel it is certainly time for the Congress to carefully consider, on the basis of the up-to-date information on bank holding company activity, what legislation may now be called for in this field from the small business point of view.

It is thus quite appropriate that the Committee on Banking and Currency has decided to hold hearings on bank holding company legislation beginning on May 12. I hope that the material in our study is helpful to the committee at that time in focusing on the small business implications of this legislation which I have described.

This 1970 report on bank structure contains a wealth of data, much of it assembled for the first time. The committee, and the Congress, are indebted to the Federal Reserve and its staff in preparing this work, and we take pleasure in presenting it to the public. We hope that it will be useful to those who share the concern that banking structure be responsive to the needs of the Nation's 5½ million small businessmen whose fortunes and families are often dependent on banking services because they have less access to more sophisticated means of fulfilling their financial needs.

The study is in the form of a committee print and may be obtained in the committee offices at 424 Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510.

## SENATOR NELSON—GREAT JOB AS ORIGINATOR OF EARTH DAY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, April 22—Earth Day—a day for America to respond to the clarion call to action in meeting a vast environmental crisis threatening our world. Earth Day marks the beginning of an historic venture involving Americans of all ages, philosophies and backgrounds in the crucial fight to protect our environment and our very lives. The tremendous support for Earth Day activities demonstrates that the issue of environmental quality has at last assumed its rightful place in the forefront of our national conscience.

This national environmental educational effort was proposed by my distinguished fellow Senator from Wisconsion, GAYLORD NELSON. More than anyone else, GAYLORD NELSON is responsible for the creation of Earth Day. The very concept of Earth Day sounded like a far-out

idea when he first suggested it, but he developed the idea and made it a smashing success. More than 10,000 high schools and 2,000 colleges are participating in this week's activities. Thousands of sermons all over the country have enthusiastically endorsed Earth Day and its goals.

As national cochairman of the Teach-In Committee for Earth Day, he is presently engaged in a speaking tour across the country to emphasize the enormity of our environmental problems and to propose far-reaching solutions to the crisis. He is scheduled for 17 speeches in cities in every part of our Nation. He will deliver his powerful message of concern for our environment to college students, labor groups, high schools, and State legislatures.

During Earth Week, Senator NELSON launched a series of six speeches at universities across the country with addresses at the teach-ins at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, and Marquette University. His extensive tour will take him to college campuses in Pittsburgh; Madison, N.J.; New Haven, Conn.; College Park, Md.; Bloomington, Ind.; Los Angeles; and Denver.

In addition, he is speaking to the State Legislatures of Pennsylvania and Massachusetts in connection with their environmental educational activities; to the United Auto Workers at their convention in Atlantic City; tc the Iowa Press Association in Des Moines; and to the American Pharmaceutical Association in Washington, D.C.

He is also delivering the keynote address to the students of Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School at their teach-in.

Senator NELSON's tremendous efforts on behalf of Earth Day are the culmination of many years of involvement and achievement in preserving the quality of life. He has long been one of our Nation's leading environmentalists, and has been instrumental in making the people of America aware of the pollution and destruction of their natural heritage. As a progressive Governor of Wisconsin, Senator NELSON initiated many outstanding programs to protect the State's natural resources and environment.

When he became Senator in 1962, GAYLORD NELSON carried with him into the national sphere this pioneering spirit of concern for the quality of life. He introduced the first nationwide detergent bill as his first piece of legislation in his first speech on the floor of the Senate.

My colleague was among the first to grasp the importance of the environment as an issue of national concern. In 1962, he proposed that President Kennedy undertake a nationwide tour devoted to preservation of the environment. The President endorsed NELSON's idea and made the trip in August of 1963.

The Senate record of GAYLORD NELSON is replete with landmark efforts to insure the quality of our environment. His concerted drive to prohibit the unnecessary use of DDT was begun in 1965, and has led to executive and congressional action on pesticides. GAYLORD NELSON has authored and cosponsored much important legislation to guarantee the protection of our beautiful natural lands.

He was the first U.S. Senator to propose legislation to create an ecological research program in the Federal Government, and was an early supporter of establishing the Council on Environmental Quality in the White House.

Senator NELSON's 1970 legislative program for protecting our environment clearly demonstrates the depth of his concern and extent of his commitment. His environmental agenda for the 1970's includes 18 major bills introduced in this Congress, eight of them since January 1970.

The cornerstone of his environmental agenda is a proposed constitutional amendment which would guarantee every person "the inalienable right to a decent environment." GAYLORD NELSON has continued his determined effort to prevent the destruction of fish, wildlife, and man himself by pesticides, and has introduced legislation which will ban eight of the most persistent, toxic varieties.

Other specific legislative proposals this year include controls on detergent pollution, a disposal fee for throw-away packaging, and proposed reductions on automobile fumes. These efforts are extremely worthwhile. I am delighted to be counted as a cosponsor of the Detergent Pollution Control Act that will set national pollution control standards on all detergent ingredients.

His environmental agenda also includes legislation to expand the educational aspect of the battle against environmental destruction and to halt the pollution of the sea from massive oil spills and the dumping of solid wastes into our oceans and the Great Lakes.

He has also proposed creating a transportation for people fund and a community environment service to deal with the critical need for improving the environment of our cities.

We are now moving toward passage of much of GAYLORD NELSON's far-sighted legislation. His ideas are truly ideas whose time has come.

My Wisconsin colleague has been talking about conservation and environmental problems for all of the past decade. But we tend to forget how long it took the rest of our national leadership to catch up with him. As recently as the 1968 election campaign not a single candidate for President or Vice President made a major speech on the environment. It is a measure of Senator NELSON's vision and leadership that our national leaders are only just now recognizing and attempting to cope with an issue that GAYLORD NELSON has been talking about for years.

GAYLORD NELSON's outstanding efforts in the field of environmental protection have pioneered much of the important work accomplished by Congress and the public in this vital area. He has devoted himself with inexhaustible energy to meeting the many interrelated ecological problems threatening this earth. He has been in the forefront of the efforts to guarantee all Americans the most basic of all rights—the very right to life itself, and to emphasize "quality in life instead of mere quantity."

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for an additional 2 minutes on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## DEATH OF WILLIAM T. EVJUE, LAST OF PERSONAL JOURNALIST CRUSADERS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, early this morning William T. Evjue, publisher of the Madison, Wis., Capital Times, died. Mr. Evjue, for whom I worked when I was reporting on the Capital Times, was an extraordinary person.

Bill Evjue was the last of the crusading personal journalists, and what a great one he was. He made the Capital Times a fighting champion of the public interest. No man did more to make and keep Wisconsin State government honest and responsive to public need. He led all the rest in fighting and beating McCarthyism.

Under Bill Evjue, the Capital Times was constantly on the side of the little people who are being pushed around. No paper ever fought harder or better against the idiocy of war and the mindless pollution of our environment.

And, of course, above all Bill Evjue was a very human person. He could be wrong. He could be stubborn. He could blow up with white-hot anger. And he did. But however wrongheaded or stubborn or angry, he was always on the side of the angels. Never could it be said with more truth. He was one of a kind—a very rare one indeed. There will never, ever be another like him.

## POLLUTION OF THE SEAS

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, just a few years ago the scientists told us that we were ruining our world with pollution; but not many of us listened.

We were too concerned with the problems of everyday life to give much more than a passing thought to the shape of our environment. I was certainly no different than anyone else. While in my native city of Charleston, the harbor was polluted by municipal sewage, we shrugged off the eventual consequences. Now, things are different. We listen to those scientists because we are finally beginning to realize what they are saying. And the reason is as close as the nose on your face. Americans have been aroused against pollution because they have begun to see it, smell it, and taste it. It assails their lungs to and from work. It burns their eyes and dirties their clothes. In short, our enjoyment of life has become hampered and dampened by all the dirt around us.

As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Oceanography, I have been privileged—if that is the word to use—to become increasingly aware of the dangers caused by the filth we are dumping into our streams and rivers. My committee is alarmed because much of this dirt

eventually finds its way into the sea. And I am afraid that in our zeal to get rid of the garbage which surrounds us on land, we will go on polluting the sea more and more.

The world we live in is a water world. Fully seven-tenths of the earth's surface is water. In fact, the continents of earth are like large ocean liners on the surface of this huge sea. Left alone, nature can take care of itself. But where man and water come together, the damage begins. The recent Stratton Commission report tells us:

Recent analytical refinements have established beyond doubt that man-made pollution already has affected the entire ocean.

I may emphasize that that is in the past decade. The fact is that the Stratton Commission reported this 2 years ago, long before antipollution became fashionable. And the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development said that "contamination of the ocean has begun" and in many places the ocean's "ecological balance is endangered." The assault on our seas is extremely vicious along the coast, in the estuaries, marshlands, lagoons, natural harbors and beaches. Into these vital areas we are pouring pollution from our chemical factories and heat from electric generating plants. We are throwing garbage and raw sewage into the sea. Add to this the runoff of insecticides, herbicides, fertilizer, silt, fallout from air pollution and deliberate at-sea dumping of waste and you can begin to understand the magnitude of the problem.

The problem we face in the coastal zone of the United States is compounded by population—75 percent of our population lives in the States bordering the seas and the Great Lakes, and by the year 2000, when our population may be over 325,000,000, it is estimated that 90 percent of the population will live in those 30 coastal States.

That population is demanding electricity at a rate that doubles every 10 years.

Thus, on the Chesapeake Bay they may need one atomic generating plant by 1972; two by 1980; four by 1990, and so on.

The coastal zone is seen by power companies as a place to locate, where cooling waters can be obtained.

But can those waters sustain the thermal impacts and the radiation that occur in the cooling process, and still sustain the characteristic biological life of the area?

Or are there beneficial effects that might be available—year-round production of oysters instead of an 8-month growing period in the temperate waters of Long Island Sound?

That growing population and concentration in the coastal zone means that we shall have sharply increased municipal sewage to dispose.

Some of the fish being caught in the New York Bight, and near the Orange County, Calif., sewage outfall have already been shown to have developed cancer, once thought not to be present in fish, and to have developed genetic mutations, such as poorly developed tails, and jaws that would not close properly, thereby affecting their ability to feed.

I mention these facts because I am convinced that the oceans offer us a major challenge in the years ahead. The challenge is not if we will exploit the resources of sea, but how shall we do it. Shall we allow our seas to become polluted as we have our Great Lakes? I hope not. We have seen what decades of indifference have caused us on the dry land.

When Americans tackled the job of exploiting this Nation for its natural resources, there was virtually no concern for protecting the land or water. When we needed lumber, we stripped the forests without any replanting. When we needed coal or steel, we mined with a vengeance, leaving huge and ugly scars upon the face of the land. But we cannot afford to be so callous anymore, especially as we begin to reap the benefits of the sea. We have seen in our feeble efforts so far that we have not attempted to preserve this tender balance of ecology.

Some of our coastal areas have been practically fished out of existence, like those for haddock and menhaden.

We must not allow this to happen. The one, the only concern, is that life itself on this planet does hinge upon how man learns to live with the oceans, and whether he is going to survive at all.

We must continue to explore man's impact on the environment. We must be discerning between those activities that cause degrading of the environment and those that may have beneficial or useful effects. A basic issue in our whole concern is survival—survival not only of man, of the birds, fish and mammals, but also of bacteria and fungi and the other little creatures that are a vital part of the complex ecosystem on which we depend for life.

Pollution of the ocean is long lasting. Rivers may be able to cleanse themselves in time, but pollutants which sink to the bottom of the oceans can remain there for thousands of years, affecting permanently the delicate life cycles of even the smallest organisms. We have already seen the effect of DDT on sea creatures and fish-eating birds.

We have all been shocked by oil spills such as the ones near Santa Barbara and in the Gulf of Mexico. The results of these spills on aquatic life have been very serious. And with the demand for petroleum obviously increasing, accidents of this nature can be expected to continue unless proper safeguards are assured.

We have been talking about big-time pollution, such as oil spills and sewage. But everyone who has been to the beach for a holiday has only to walk along the shore to see little bits and pieces of man-made pollution—beer cans, cigarette filters which defy decomposition, glass, and the ever-present paper products without which, apparently, the modern family could not hope to exist happily.

Our committee has just returned from field hearings on the coastal zone of Virginia. And only last week, President Nixon spoke out against the pollution of the oceans and coastal waters of the United States. Earlier in our hearings, we criticized the Secretary of Interior for failing to move promptly against polluters.

His failure, for example, in the Gulf of Mexico disaster has put him in the position of asking for a 119-count criminal indictment against an oil company.

We do not want suits and indictments.

We want to protect our world. We want the Federal Government, through the Secretary of the Interior, to move promptly.

To move promptly is to move properly. There is evidence that change is sweeping through the halls of the Interior Department.

The United States, as the world's leading industrial nation, is the world's biggest polluter of the oceans. As such, we owe a duty to mankind to provide the leadership in controlling this pollution. Man's future, I believe, will be strongly linked to the seas. Shall we go on spending billions of dollars to explore the Sea of Tranquillity and, at the same time, deny the pennies necessary to discover and preserve the seven seas here on earth?

As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Oceanography, let me emphasize two things. First, in responding to the charge of developing an oceans program for the U.S. Government, our search is not for how many uses, but our primary concern is to protect and preserve from abuses, the seven seas. And, finally, in this new-found zeal of man to rid his habitat of waste and dirt, let us put the Nation on notice that the oceans will not be used as a garbage dump.

---

## CONFLICT OF WHOSE INTEREST?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, last night the executive committee of WETA, Washington's education television station, upheld the firing of newsman William Woestendiek because his wife works for Mrs. Martha Mitchell.

Committee members said Mr. Woestendiek did his job well, but, because of his wife's new job, he had a conflict of interest.

Mr. President, that kind of reasoning is unbelievable in 1970 in the United States of America, where a woman is no longer chattel but her husband's equal, with the right to pursue her own career.

Today, wherever we look, we see women at work in jobs that conceivably could conflict with their husband's, if WETA's line of reasoning is valid—that whatever a wife does affects her husband's perspective and reflects on his professional integrity.

I would like to cite a few cases of this, some of which might have been mentioned before, but all of which are valid.

The executive producer of the Walter Cronkite news is one Les Midgley. Mr. Midgley is the husband of Betty Furness and was her husband during the period she was Lyndon Johnson's outspoken consumer counsel. Should he have been fired from the Walter Cronkite show?

The bigots at WETA have not mentioned it, but one of their own, Walterene

Swanston, is the wife of a member of the staff of the junior Senator from California. Should Mrs. Swanston be fired?

King Features Columnist Marianne Means, during the Johnson administration was married to a member of the White House staff, Emmett Riordan. Nobody ever suggested that King Features should drop Miss Means.

During the 1968 elections, four wives of very prominent newsmen, Mrs. Drew Pearson, Mrs. Eric Severeid, Mrs. David Brinkley, and Mrs. Joseph Alsop were active in the Humphrey-Muskie campaign. Should their husbands have been fired?

Mr. Max Kampelman, board chairman of WETA and moderator of one of WETA's news programs, was an integral part of the Humphrey-Muskie campaign. Should he disqualify himself?

Columnists and Commentators Frank Mankiewicz and Tom Braden both have political backgrounds. Mr. Braden was a Democratic candidate for Lieutenant Governor in California and Mr. Mankiewicz was Robert Kennedy's press secretary. Should they be fired?

Or should the Los Angeles Times fire one of its editors, Mr. Ed Guthman, because he too worked for Robert Kennedy?

Of course, all this is nonsense, and we know it. So do the people at WETA.

What they have really said and what they really mean is clear. It is this: "If you work for WETA, do not let any hint of Republican ties show. It is not politics that is bad; it is only the Republicans."

Mr. President, I resent the implication, I resent the pressures, I resent the blatant dishonesty. And, regardless of party, it should not pass unchallenged. It is not the party that matters; it is the principle.

What is an anti-Republican bias today could be anti-Democrat tomorrow. If any newsman is to be censored and banned for his wife's political ties, then press freedom is truly in trouble.

## THE SO-CALLED POPULATION EXPLOSION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, there has been a great deal said this week about the problem of our environment. Among the phrases we have heard a lot about during the celebration of Earth Day has been "population explosion."

I am sure many of our ills will be blamed on this population explosion and I am equally sure a good portion of what is said will be highly emotional.

There is no question but what we have serious problems involving our environment. Our pollution problems are many and complex. Our industrial society has provided us with the good life—and has left a pretty terrible mess that has to be cleaned up.

But, factually speaking, this is not the fault of the so-called population explosion. As Mr. Ben Wattenberg points out in the April 11 issue of the New Republic, there really is no such thing as the population explosion in the United States—at least, as compared with other nations of the world.

I do not agree with everything Mr. Wattenberg says, particularly some of his political comments, but I do feel his factual and statistical analyses have a great deal of merit.

Mr. Wattenberg notes that in all the rhetoric about environment and population, a set of critical facts are ignored and critical premises in the argument remain largely unchallenged. He states it this way:

The critical facts are that America is not by any standard a crowded country and that the American birth rate has recently been at an all-time low.

The critical premise is that population growth in America is harmful.

Mr. Wattenberg then backs up this statement with some facts which appear worth the attention of my colleagues. He says:

In not stating the facts and in not at least challenging the premises, politicians and planners alike seem to be leaving themselves open to both bad planning and bad politics. This happens by concentrating on what the problem is not, rather than on what the problem is. Let's, then, first look at the facts. The current population of the United States is 205 million. That population is distributed over 3,615,123 square miles of land, for a density of about 55 persons per square mile. In terms of density, this makes the United States one of the most sparsely populated nations in the world. As measured by density, Holland is about 18 times as "crowded" (at 975 persons per square mile), England is 10 times as dense (588 persons per square mile), scenic Switzerland seven times as dense (382), tropical Nigeria three times as dense (174) and even neighboring Mexico beats us out with 60 persons per square mile. The US, by international standards, is not a very "crowded" country.

But density in some cases can be very misleading in trying to judge "crowdedness." The Soviet Union, for example, is less dense than the US (29 per square mile), but has millions of square miles of uninhabitable land, just as does Brazil and Australia, two other nations also less densely populated than the US.

Of course, the US also has large areas of land that are equally uninhabitable: the Rockies, the Western deserts, parts of Alaska and so on.

But while it is of interest to know that America has some land that is uninhabitable, what is of far more importance is that we have in the United States vast unused areas of eminently habitable land, land that in fact was inhabited until very recently. In the last eight years one out of three counties in America actually *lost* population. Four states have lost population: North and South Dakota, West Virginia, and Wyoming; and another two states, Maine and Iowa, gained less than one percent in the eight years. Furthermore, three out of five counties had a net out-migration, that is, more people left the county than came in.

These counties, the net-loss counties and the net-out-migration counties, are the areas in America where the current hoopla about the population sounds a bit hollow. These are the areas, mostly rural and small town, that are trying to attract industry, areas where a smokestack or a traffic jam signifies not pollution but progress, areas that have more open space around them for hunting and fishing than before, and areas where the older people are a little sad because, as they tell you, "the young people don't stay around here anymore."

This human plaint tells us what has been happening demographically in the United States in recent years. It has not been a population explosion, but a population redistribution. And the place people have been redistributing themselves to is a place we call "suburb":

AMERICAN POPULATION BY RESIDENCE

| | Population (percent) | | Increase |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 1950 | 1968 | 1950–68 |
| Residing in central city | 35 | 29 | 6 million. |
| Residing in suburb | 24 | 35 | 32 million (!). |
| Residing in small cities, towns and rural | 41 | 36 | 9 million. |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 47 million. |

In less than two decades the proportion of Americans living in suburbs has gone from less than a quarter to more than a third.

But even the total increase in population—rural, city, and suburb—is misleading. The big gains in population occurred ten and fifteen years ago; today growth is much slower. Thus, in calendar year 1956, the US population grew by 3.1 million, while in calendar year 1968 population went up by 2.0 million—and in a nation with a larger population base.

What has happened, simply, is that the baby-boom has ended. When the GIs came home after World War II, they began begetting large quantities of children, and Americans went on begetting at high rates for about 15 years. The best index of population growth in the US is the fertility rate, that is, the number of babies born per thousands women aged 15–44. In 1940, the fertility rate was 80, just a few points above the 1936 Depression all-time low of 76. Ten years later, in 1950, the baby-boom had begun and the fertility rate had soared to 106, an increase of 32 percent in just ten years. It kept climbing. In 1957, it reached 123, up more than 50 percent in two decades.

But since 1957, the rate has gone steadily down: to 119 in 1960, to 98 in 1965, to 85.7 in 1968, not very much higher now than in Depression times. The estimated fertility rate for 1969 was down slightly to 85.5 and there is no reason now to think it will go up, although, as we shall see, it may sink further.

When measured by another yardstick, the "percent national population growth" (birth plus immigration less deaths), the American population is now growing by about 1.0 per cent per year; just a decade ago it was growing by 1.8 percent per year. That may not sound like much of a difference, .8 percent, but in a nation of 200 million people it means 16 million fewer people over a single decade!

Mr. President, I have called this portion of Mr. Wattenberg's article to the attention of the Senate because I feel it is of great importance. It is important because it casts a clear, bright light into an otherwise pretty murky area of discussion.

It is equally important because it attempts to deal in a cold and logical manner with a problem that has become emotion-charged.

I do not in any way play down the importance of Americans becoming more in tune with nature. I do not challenge for 1 minute the need for Americans to respond to a call for cleanliness in their environment as well as in their persons.

I do not even challenge the idea that some parts of our country, some parts of some of our cities, are becoming overcrowded.

It is essential that we focus full attention on the problems of racial antagonisms, of pollution, of conservation, of our cities and our suburbs, and of developing our future economy so as not to destroy our good life itself.

But I feel this whole subject should be

dealt with on the basis of facts and not emotion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

## THE PRESIDENT SHOULD ACT NOW ON TRUCK STRIKES AND LOCKOUTS

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. President, the national contract under which 450,000 teamsters and thousands of trucking companies across the country had been operating expired March 31. Negotiations between the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and company representatives on new contract provisions continued through April 2, when a tentative agreement between the parties was announced. That agreement provided for a wage increase of $1.10 per hour over 3 years, plus fringe benefits. The Teamsters Union, a party to the tentative agreement, is about to mail ratification ballots to its membership.

Before those ballots could be mailed and tallied, however, certain local teamster unions and certain members struck trucking companies to protest the tentative agreement. Adding fuel to the strike fire, the Illinois Motor Truck Association and two Chicago area locals negotiated a separate agreement that included a wage increase from $1.65 per hour and fringe benefits of 42 cents per hour over a 3-year period. Only 8,000 drivers and a relatively small number of trucking companies were directly affected by that agreement, but drivers in a number of large cities across the Nation began to walk off the job to demand a national agreement in line with the Chicago agreement. Further, the remaining Chicago area trucking associations closed down to demonstrate their unwillingness to follow the first association's lead. More than 32,000 Chicago area drivers were put out of work by the lockout. Since then additional thousands have either struck or been locked out.

The simple truth is, national transportation paralysis is just days away. Strikes and shutdowns have spread across the country, directly affecting the jobs of tens of thousands in the trucking industry, and perhaps hundreds of thousands more in the short-inventory industries that rely on trucked-in supplies. If these work stoppages continue and spread, even over a short time, the paychecks of millions of workers, in and out of trucking, will be imperiled. Even more important, the health and safety of the Nation will certainly be endangered.

Truck transportation is the principal conveyance for foods of every kind, for drugs and medical supplies, for fuels and other essentials. In fact, more than three-quarters of the volume of the Nation's commerce moves by truck at one stage or another.

The crippling effects of trucking work stoppages are already becoming apparent. Housewives are already finding fresh food and vegetables out of stock at supermarkets and grocery stores. Manufacturers are without materials, and suppliers are frustrated in their attempts to deliver goods. Layoffs across a broad spectrum of industries are already in effect. The work stoppages show signs of rapid spreading. The latest Weekly Truck Tonnage Index, reflecting transfers at 400 terminals in 34 metropolitan areas, shows a calamitous decline of more than 40 percent over a single week alone. This afternoon, that index is expected to show further constriction of the Nation's trucking arteries.

Mr. President, I must say that I am more than a little disappointed with the present "hands off" attitude evident in Washington. The President has the tools to use against the spread of strikes and lockouts that compromise national health and safety. The President himself recognized the unique relationship between the transportation industry and national health and safety when he transmitted his Emergency Public Interest Protection Act to the Congress in late February. He said then, "The Nation cannot tolerate protracted work stoppages in its transportation industries." With the outcome of the teamsters' ratification vote at least 2 or 3 weeks away, and wildcat strikes and lockouts spreading, the Nation could be an idle, hungry, and endangered one, even before it knows whether the tentative agreement has been accepted. If that agreement should be rejected, there would be more of the same.

I believe in the collective bargaining process and the right of unions to strike.

I sympathize with the position of the teamsters. I sympathize with the position of the truckers. But I am infinitely more concerned about the stake of the public in this crisis situation—a crisis which may soon be at least as severe as was threatened by the recent possibility of a railroad strike.

Faced with wildcat railroad strikes, the President acted. Faced with wildcat trucking strikes and walkouts, I believe he should again act. I commend the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce for its call to action in this crisis. The time to prevent an emergency is now. The President has the authority to act. I urge him to do so.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Peril U.S. Truck Accord," written by James Strong and published in today's issue of the Chicago Tribune, and an editorial entitled "Truck Strike Strangling Nation," published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of April 17, 1970.

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

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 23, 1970]

PERIL U.S. TRUCK ACCORD

(By James Strong)

(Drivers balk, move to seek a new deal, call conference in Washington.)

Teamster leaders thruout the nation will meet in Washington early next week to scuttle the national freight agreement covering 450,000 truck drivers from New York to California, a top union source disclosed yesterday.

Two key officials from each of 350 teamster locals involved in the national talks will be summoned to the union's international headquarters to repudiate the agreement and urge Frank E. Fitzsimmons, acting president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, to reopen wage talks with the trucking industry.

NEW LOCKOUTS FEARED

The move could trigger nation-wide lockouts by the 12,000 trucking firms involved in the negotiations and, with the current strike-lockout situation in Chicago, force President Nixon to consider invoking national emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley law.

"The national agreement is dead," the teamster official said. "In checking with locals around the country two weeks ago, only two officers told me they could sell the package to their members. They can't now."

PERILED BY PACT HERE

The tentative agreement reached April 9 in Washington between the Teamsters and Trucking Employers Inc. (TEI) set wage hikes for the next three years at $1.10 an hour and $3 in additional fringe benefits. The action touched off wildcat strikes in key trucking centers, except New York.

The entire national agreement was put in jeopardy earlier this month when leaders of eight local teamsters unions and the independent Chicago Truck Drivers union remained adamant in their demands of $1.65 an hour and $10 a week in pensions and health-welfare payments over the next three years.

When negotiations started, both on the local level and in national talks the truck drivers sought $3 an hour pay hikes and $22.50 in fringe benefits in three years.

NO MEETINGS SET HERE

The drivers' union in Chicago, so far, have been unable to force their demands on five of six major trucking associations, but the unions claimed to have signed more than 2,000 firms with 20,000 drivers to contracts dictated by the unions. Firms refusing to sign have locked out drivers or have been struck.

Charles L. Bowen, assistant regional director of the federal mediation service, said no meetings are scheduled in the Chicago dispute, which is being negotiated separately from the national talks, but added that he was hopeful some talks could be arranged.

Many trucks continued to roll in the city yesterday despite the strike-lockout situation but layoffs and economic setbacks were encountered by both large and small businessmen unable to receive materials or deliver finished products.

The association which locked out drivers are the Cartage Exchange of Chicago, Central Motor Freight, Motor Carriers Labor Advisory council, the Northern Illinois and the Indiana Truckers associations. A sixth employers' group, the Illinois Motor Truck Operators association, signed with the unions and were operating.

PROTEST STRIKES CALLED

At least seven members of the teamsters ruling body, the general executive board, have been confronted with wildcat strikes and scattered violence in their home areas in protest to the controversial contract. This includes the Detroit local of Fitzsimmons, who is substituting for the imprisoned James R. Hoffa in the national negotiations.

Ray Schoessling, president of the 200,000-member Chicago Teamsters Joint Council 25, openly broke with Fitzsimmons last week and indorsed the Chicago drivers' demands. Other leaders confronted by disgruntled teamsters included Harold Gibbons in St. Louis, Mo.; William Presser, in Cleveland; Robert Holmes in Detroit, Mich.; and Einar Mohn and Joseph Diviny in California.

In 1967 teamster and independent drivers unions in Chicago led by Louis F. Peick, secretary-treasurer of Teamsters local 705, and Edward Fenner, executive director of the independent drivers refused to go along with the national agreement reached by Fitzsimmons and ratified by a narrow majority.

Their action upset the pact and forced a renegotiation of the entire contract along the pattern set by Peick and Fenner.

50,000 COVERED HERE

Peick and Fenner have remained aloof of the national talks and insist that the local cartage drivers here have entirely different problems, economic goals, and working conditions and their contracts should be negotiated separately.

Nearly 50,000 drivers are covered by contracts involving the eight teamsters locals and independent drivers from Gary to Waukegan and west to Joliet and Elgin.

William Joyce, secretary-treasurer of Teamsters local 710, is negotiating for an additional 10,000 long-distance drivers and 5,000 dock workers employed here.

Chicago is currently faced with a prolonged strike-lockout situation, assuming President Nixon does not act, because of the hesitancy of industry negotiators to discuss issues until some accord is reached on the national level.

---

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Apr. 17, 1970]

TRUCK STRIKE STRANGLING NATION

President Nixon had better not wait much longer to intervene in the truck strikes around the nation, including the Local 600 walkout here, or the nation's economy will be badly hurt.

In the St. Louis area, the Local 600 strike is reported costing about $1,200,000 a day in wages and probably many times this much in sales.

Many big plants in the area are either closing down or laying off large numbers of employes as shortages of all kinds develop.

In the Chicago area where Teamster locals are staging walkouts, many firms are being shut down as well. American Motors Corp. announced an almost complete closing of its operations in Kenosha, Wis., and Brampton, Ontario, because of a parts shortage caused by the truck strikes.

International Harvester Co. and Admiral Corp. also joined the lengthening list of firms that have had to close their doors due to a shortage of vital components.

The President just cannot allow local trucking bosses to close down the country in order to get a wage increase even more inflationary than the one already negotiated by the national Teamster organization.

Things have come to a pretty sad state when the Missouri highway patrol has to guard a convoy of trucks going through St. Louis in the same way frontiersmen guarded wagon trains from the Indians.

And why should any company owning a truck have to put a sign on the back of it saying it is operating "by permission of Local 600"?

Also why should truckers who are on strike get food stamps, subsidized by taxpayers who are being so gravely hurt by the walkout?

The head of Local 600 (Donald Lane, claims he has no contract offer to submit to the 9,500 members of his union. But the fact is, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters national headquarters sent a telegram to Local 600 informing the union that a tentative agreement with the trucking employers had been reached on April 2 and directed its officers to keep its members working.

But Lane and union leaders in other parts of the country want to compel trucking employers to pay more than the $1.10 increase over a three-year period negotiated by their national officers, which by July 1, 1972, would bring a teamster's wage to $5.03 an hour.

In addition to this hefty wage increase, the agreement would increase health and welfare benefits, boost pension payments, up vacation pay and give truckers an added holiday.

The time has come for the President to stop these wildcat truck strikes before they can inflict still more disastrous damage to the nation and put tens of thousands more people out of work.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I take this occasion to commend once again my distinguished colleague from Illinois for pointing out a very serious problem, which has not been given full attention by public officeholders. Again he has demonstrated that his own intimate knowledge of the commercial, business, and consumer aspects of our lives in the State of Illinois and the great Midwest is of invaluable help in his service as a Senator.

His many years as Speaker of the House of Representatives in Springfield and the many years of devoted attention that he has given to problems affecting consumer interests as well as the business interests of management and labor have caused him many times to inject his thinking at a crucial point into the many complicated problems we have faced affecting the economy of the State of Illinois and the well-being of all of its people. I think he has demonstrated this morning his intimate knowledge of some of the great problems we face, in again offering his valuable and invaluable services, I might say, to help break the logjam and help bring about better understanding, and serve the public interest by so doing.

---

## PRESIDENT NIXON'S FORTHRIGHT REPORT ON THE VIETNAM WAR

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, in his address to the Nation Monday night on the war in Vietnam, President Nixon demonstrated once again that the United States is ready to go more than half way in its quest for peace and is willing to take acceptable risks to achieve peace with honor.

It was a confident, reassuring statement which keeps faith with his commitment to end our military participation in Vietnam in an orderly fashion.

Above all else, the President made it clear that his policy in Vietnam is working—and succeeding—despite the lack of cooperation from the other side.

The proof of the success can be measured in objective terms—115,500 troops withdrawn in the first year of his administration and a plan to pull out another 150,000 troops over the next year.

Mr. President, I am sure the American people welcome this encouraging report—as they welcome the President's willingness to take them into his confidence on the issue of the Vietnam war.

This is the fourth time President Nixon has made such a progress report to the Nation; it was optimistic in some respects and frankly disappointing in others, but it was, above all, candid and forthright.

On the question of negotiations and the matter of enemy activity, the President acknowledged realistically, as he has before, some discouraging facts.

But in a third critical area, the training of South Vietnamese to assume the major burden of the war, the President described the progress as greater than expected. Because of this program it has been possible to make a longer range projection of his plan to end our participation. In addition to the planned withdrawal of an additional 150,000 troops, the President was able to say that all American combat forces "can and will" be withdrawn from that part of the world.

Of course, legitimate debate and criticism are always in order on this subject, but I hope the President's latest report will put an end to much of the petty carping and quibbling we have been hearing regarding the President's earnest desire—and intention—to end the war. In what he has undertaken and the way he has undertaken it I am confident the President has the backing of the people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the President's address be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT OF AN UPDATE REPORT ON VIETNAM

Good evening, my fellow Americans.

I have requested this television and radio time to give you a progress report on our plan to bring a just peace to Vietnam.

When I first outlined our program last June, I stated that the rate of American withdrawals from Vietnam would depend on three criteria—progress in the training of the South Vietnamese, progress in the Paris negotiations, and the level of enemy activity.

Tonight I am pleased to report that progress in training and equipping South Vietnamese forces has substantially exceeded our original expectations last June.

Very significant advances have also been made in pacification.

Although we recognize that problems remain, these are encouraging trends.

However, I must report with regret that no progress has taken place on the negotiating front. The enemy still demands that we unilaterally and unconditionally withdraw all American forces, that in the process we overthrow the elected government of South Vietnam and that the United States accept a political settlement that would have the practical consequence of the forcible imposition of a Communist government upon the people of South Vietnam.

That would mean humiliation for the United States. This we cannot and will not accept.

Let me now turn to the third criteria for troop withdrawals—the level of enemy activity. In several areas since December, that level has substantially increased.

In recent months Hanoi has sent thousands more of their soldiers to launch new offensives in neutral Laos in violation of the Geneva Accords of 1962 to which they were signatories.

South of Laos, almost 40,000 Communist troops are now conducting overt aggression against Cambodia, a small neutralist country that the Communists have used for years as a base for attacks upon South Vietnam in violation of the Geneva Accords of 1954 to which they were also signatories.

This follows the consistent pattern of North Vietnamese aggression in Indochina. During the past eight years they have sent tens of thousands of troops into all three countries of the peninsula and across every single common border.

Men and supplies continue to pour down the Ho Chi Minh trail; and in the past two weeks, the Communists have stepped up their attacks upon allied forces in South Vietnam.

However, despite this new enemy activity, there has been an overall decline in enemy force levels in South Vietnam since December.

As the enemy force levels have declined and as the South Vietnamese have assumed more of the burden of battle, American casualties have declined.

I am glad to be able to report tonight that in the first three months of 1970 the number of Americans killed in action dropped to the lowest first quarter level in five years.

In June, a year ago, when we began troop withdrawals, we did so on a "cut and try" basis—with no certainty that the program would be successful. In June we announced withdrawal of 25,000 American troops; in September another 35,000 and then in December 50,000 more. These withdrawals have now been completed and as of April 15, a total of 115,500 men have returned home from Vietnam.

We have now reached a point where we can confidently move from a period of "cut and try" to a longer-range program for the replacement of Americans by South Vietnamese troops.

I am, therefore, tonight announcing plans for the withdrawal of an additional 150,000 American troops to be completed during the spring of next year. This will bring a total reduction of 265,500 men in our Armed Forces in Vietnam below the level that existed when we took office fifteen months ago.

The timing and pace of these new withdrawals within the overall schedule will be determined by our best judgment of the current military and diplomatic situation.

This far-reaching decision was made after consultation with our commanders in the field and it has the approval of the Government of South Vietnam.

Now viewed against the enemy's escalation in Laos and Cambodia, and in view of the stepped-up attacks this month in South Vietnam, this decision clearly involves some risks.

But I again remind the leaders of North Vietnam that while we are taking these risks for peace, they will be taking grave risks should they attempt to use the occasion to jeopardize the security of our remaining forces in Vietnam by increased military action in Vietnam, in Cambodia, or in Laos.

I repeat what I said November 3rd and December 15th. If I conclude increased enemy action jeopardizes our remaining forces in Vietnam, I shall not hesitate to take strong and effective measures to deal with that situation.

My responsibility as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces is for the safety of our men, and I shall meet that responsibility. The decision I have announced tonight to withdraw 150,000 more men over the next year is based entirely on the progress of our Vietnamization program.

There is a better, shorter path to peace—through negotiations. We shall withdraw more than 150,000 over the next year if we make progress on the negotiating front.

Had the other side responded positively at Paris to our offer of May 14 last year, most American and foreign troops would have left South Vietnam by now.

A political settlement is the heart of the matter. That is what the fighting in Indochina has been about for the past 30 years.

We have noted with interest the recent statement by Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Malik concerning a possible new Geneva Conference on Indochina.

We do not yet know the full implications of this statement. It is in the spirit of the letters I wrote on April 7, to signatories of the 1962 Geneva Accords urging consultations and observance of the Accords. We have consistently said we were willing to explore any reasonable path to peace. We are in the process of exploring this one.

But whatever the fate of this particular move we are ready for a settlement fair to everyone.

Let me briefly review for you the principles that govern our view of a just political settlement.

First, our overriding objective is a political solution that reflects the will of the South Vietnamese people and allows them to determine their future without outside interference.

I again reaffirm this Government's acceptance of eventual, total withdrawal of American troops. In turn, we must see the permanent withdrawal of all North Vietnamese troops and be given reasonable assurances they will not return.

Second, a fair political solution should reflect the existing relationship of political forces within South Vietnam. We recognize the complexity of shaping machinery that would fairly apportion political power in South Vietnam. We are flexible; we have offered nothing on a take-it-or-leave-it basis.

And third, we will abide by the outcome of the political process agreed upon. President Thieu and I have repeatedly stated our willingness to accept the free decision of the South Vietnamese people. But we will not agree to the arrogant demand that the elected leaders of the government of Vietnam be overthrown before real negotiations begin.

Let me briefly review the record of our efforts to end the war in Vietnam through negotiations.

We were told repeatedly in the past that our adversaries would negotiate seriously—

If only we stopped the bombing of North Vietnam.

If only we began withdrawing our forces from South Vietnam.

If only we dealt with the National Liberation Front as one of the parties to the negotiations.

If only we would agree in principle to remove all our forces from Vietnam.

We have taken all these steps.

The United States, over a year and a half ago, halted all bombing of North Vietnam. Long ago we agreed to negotiate with the National Liberation Front as one of the parties. We have already withdrawn 115,500 American troops. Tonight I have announced a decision to reduce American force levels by a quarter of a million men from what they were fifteen months ago. We have offered repeatedly to withdraw all of our troops if the North Vietnamese would withdraw theirs. We have taken risks for peace that every fair and objective man can readily recognize.

Still there is no progress at the negotiating table.

It is Hanoi and Hanoi alone, that stands today blocking the path to a just peace for all the peoples of Southeast Asia.

When our astronauts returned safely to earth last Friday, the whole world rejoiced with us. We could have had no more eloquent demonstration of a profound truth—that the greatest force working for peace in the world today is the fact that men and women everywhere regardless of differences in race, religion, nationality, or political philosophy, value the life of a human being. We were as one as we thought of those brave men, their wives, their children, their parents.

The death of a single man in war, whether he is an American, a South Vietnamese, Viet Cong, or a North Vietnamese, is a human tragedy. That is why we want to end this war and achieve a just peace. We call upon our adversaries to join us in working at the conference table toward that goal.

No Presidential statement on Vietnam would be complete without an expression of our concern for the fate of the American prisoners of war.

The callous exploitation of the anxieties and anguish of the parents, the wives and the children of these brave men, as negotiating pawns, is an unforgivable breach of the elementary rules of conduct between civilized nations. We shall continue to make every possible effort to get Hanoi to provide information on the whereabouts of all prisoners; to allow them to communicate with their families; to permit inspection of prisoners of war camps; and to provide for the early release of at least the sick and the wounded.

My fellow Americans, five years ago American combat troops were first sent to Vietnam. The war since that time has been the longest and one of the most costly and difficulty conflicts in our history.

The decision I have announced tonight means that we finally have in sight the just peace we are seeking. We can now say with confidence that pacification is succeeding. We can now say with confidence that the South Vietnamese can develop the capability for their own defense. And we can say with confidence that all American combat forces can and will be withdrawn.

I could not make these statements tonight had it not been for the dedication, bravery and sacrifice of hundreds of thousands of young men who have served in Vietnam. Nor could I have made it had it not been for the perseverence of millions of Americans at home.

When men write the history of this nation they will record that no people in the annals of time made greater sacrifices in a more selfless cause than the American people sacrificed for the right of eighteen million people in a faraway land to avoid the imposition of Communist rule against their will and for the right of these people to determine their own future free of any outside interference.

The enemy has failed to win the war in Vietnam because of three basic errors in their strategy.

They thought they could win a military victory. They have failed to do so.

They thought they could win politically in South Vietnam. They have failed to do so.

They thought they could win politically in the United States. This proved to be their most fatal miscalculation.

In this great free country of ours, we debate—we disagree, sometimes violently, but the mistake the totalitarians make over and over again, is to conclude that debate in a free country is proof of weakness. We are not a weak people. We are a strong people. America has never been defeated in the proud 190-year history of this country, and we shall not be defeated in Vietnam.

Tonight I want to thank the American people for the support which you have given so generously to the cause of a just peace in Vietnam.

It is your steadiness and your stamina that the leaders of North Vietnam are watching tonight. It is these qualities, as much as any proposals, that will bring them to negotiate.

It is America's resolve, as well as America's reasonableness, that will achieve our goal of a just peace in Vietnam and strengthen the foundations of a just and lasting peace in the Pacific and throughout the world.

Thank you and good night.

---

## THE B–1 MANNED BOMBER

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in late May or early June the U.S. Air Force plans to let contracts for engineering development of its next strategic bomber which will be known as the B–1.

The development of this important weapon system has been well planned and studied for some 8 years and the Air Force will enter this program with a high degree of assurance that this aircraft will meet the high performance needed in our deterrent forces.

The development of the B–1 rests on the question of whether or not this country will need a strategic bomber in the late 1970's and beyond. This is a conceptual question and not a technical one. It is directly related to our national strategy.

Mr. President, each Member of the

Congress knows the Nixon administration is embarked on a course which involves substantial changes in our national strategy. This change is taking form slowly but definitely points toward our reliance on viable and highly mobile strike forces which would deter a potential enemy.

To make this strategy sound this Nation must maintain a long-range bomber strike force. Presently we have the B–52 and the FB–111 in this role as the old B–58 has recently been phased out.

The B–1 will replace the B–52 which is not equipped to handle the complex technology needed in the 1970's and 1980's to assure our Nation of a strong strategic bomber deterrent. This proposed bomber will be able to deliver large nuclear and nonnuclear payloads over distances in excess of 6,000 miles and will have a higher and longer standoff capability than the slower and larger B–52.

The design provides for the four-engine B–1 to penetrate the sophisticated defenses postulated for the 1980's, a key factor in the survival of any future long-range bomber. The aircraft will also have a greater prelaunch survivability through wider dispersal than the B–52's which require long, well-equipped airfields as launching bases.

The key to the need for this new bomber may be summed up in one word—deterrence. This point was ably made recently by Lt. Gen. Otto J. Glasser, the Air Force's Deputy Chief of Staff for Research and Development. General Glasser stated:

> The new bomber is to serve as an integral element of the Assured-Destruction capability of the United States. It will be able to flush on warning from dispersed airfields, or through dispersal to survive any undetected attack, and have a high probability of survival during penetration for precise delivery of weapons on preplanned targets.

Mr. President, throughout the entire history of this great Nation we have never had enemy bombs fall on this continent. While we have had to fight on many foreign shores to assure the safety of our people and our land, a point in time has now been reached where potential enemies have the ability to strike and destroy our Nation.

In order to assure our continued deterrence against such a strike we must have a balanced deterrent force. Such a force includes many elements, but chief among them would be a strategic bomber with the capability of the B–1.

In order that Congress and the American people might have the benefit of some of the reasoning behind our need for the B–1, I ask unanimous consent that the April 1970 article by John L. Frisbee, senior editor of the Air Force/Space Digest, entitled "The B–1—Blue Chip in the Deterrent Stack," be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Air Force/Space Digest, April 1970]

THE B–1—BLUE CHIP IN THE DETERRENT STACK

(By John L. Frisbee)

The B–1, USAF's heavy-bomber candidate to replace the B–52, was conceived in 1963 as AMSA (Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft). Ever since, there have been almost continuous attempts to destroy it in embryo.

The B–1 has been attacked on grounds of nonutility, marginal utility, and disutility. Its critics have ranged from Whiz Kids to members of Congress to intellectuals of the campus, the think-tanks, and the mass media. Their analytical methods cover the spectrum from slipstick and computer to gut reaction. Notably—almost uniquely—the opposition has included no military men of renown from any of the services. The B–1 has been more than thrice-blessed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Not even the most dedicated B–1 opponent has questioned the ability of the US aerospace industry, with the technology of the 1970s, to build a better bomber than the B–52, basically a product of the early 1950s. Rather, B–1 critics have questioned the rationale underlying the requirement. Their key question has evolved from, "Will we need *this* bomber ten years hence?" to "Will we need *any* bomber by the end of the decade?"

So far, a majority of legislators have answered "Yes" to both questions, or has at least been unwilling to say "No" to either. And so the B–1 has survived. In mid-May a prime contractor will be selected to produce five prototype and two test models. If all schedules are met, the first true strategic bomber to be developed in this country in nearly two decades will fly in 1974. This says much for the viability of a concept that has been under siege for seven years.

But the B–1's greatest battle is yet to come—the fight for a go-ahead on production. If that battle is won, the new bomber could begin to join SAC's operational forces in 1978. By that time, the newest B–52s—the G and H models—will be from sixteen to eighteen years old. Their maintenance and modification costs, though not precisely predictable, are bound to be extraordinarily high.

The B–52 could, certainly, be kept operational for another ten years—perhaps longer—if we were willing to pay the cost. But how effectively it could penetrate Soviet defenses a decade from now is quite another question.

Visualize the odds against the B–36 (the newest of which would have been sixteen years old in 1970) in penetrating today's Soviet defenses. The performance gap between the B–36 and the B–52H is comparable to that between the B–25H and the B–1. And a weapon system that will not perform creditably *in* war is not a credible deterrent *to* war.

This brings us back to the key question, "Will we need *any* bomber by the end of the 1970s?" It is primarily a conceptual—not a technical—question. The answer will be affected by economic considerations (how soon and how many), but, fundamentally, a decision must be based on need.

The question of need has to be examined in the context of US defense strategy, which is in a state of transition. During most of the past decade, our strategy has been to deter nuclear war by Assured Destruction—the ability of US strategic forces to survive an enemy attack, and in retaliation cause unacceptable damage to the aggressor. A corollary of Assured Destruction has been Damage Limitation, or the capacity to hold down the level of damage an attacker could inflict on this country. Damage Limitation received considerably less attention than Assured Destruction. Until recently, we have not had the technical means to defend against enemy missiles or to construct bomber defenses that promised to stop a high percentage of attacking aircraft.

Assured Destruction was achieved through a combination of land-based missiles, sea-based missiles, and bombers. As the missile forces grew in size and reliability, the bomber was thought by earlier Administrations to contribute less and less to deterrence. Bombers took several hours longer than missiles to reach their targets. The bomber was believed easier to defend against, and to some it appeared needlessly duplicative of the destructive capacity of the missile forces.

Nevertheless, a reduced number of bombers was retained in the deterrent forces as insurance and because of certain characteristics unique to the bomber. It could, for example, be used effectively in a show of force, as in the Cuban missile crisis. It could carry much larger weapons than missiles, and was acknowledged to be useful against very hard targets that could not be destroyed by smaller warheads delivered less accurately by missiles. In this respect it provided a Damage Limitation dividend, as a counterforce system to be employed against hardened enemy missiles that might be held in reserve after an initial attack. The bomber also could be launched on ambiguous warning and recalled if the warning proved to be false. And the continued existence of US bombers forced the USSR to invest heavily in air defense systems, presumably diverting resources that might otherwise be used to build stronger offensive forces. Finally, the bomber force was regarded as a hedge against Soviet technological breakthroughs that might cancel or reduce the value of our missile forces.

All of these reasons for keeping the bomber alive and well were valid. And they will remain valid, along with other bomber contributions to deterrence, which will be noted later.

Nevertheless, many—probably a majority—of those who believe the bomber only marginally useful were convinced that a relatively low level of U.S. Assured Destruction capability (perhaps twenty to twenty-five percent of the Soviet population and industry) was enough to deter nuclear war regardless of how many Americans might die in a Soviet attack on this country. Therefore, they questioned the need for *any* bombers and rejected the requirement for a new bomber to replace the B–52. This rejection has come to a head at a time when the bomber has, in fact, assumed more, rather than less, importance. The reasons relate both to strategy and to conceptual changes caused by technology.

For many months the Nixon Administration has been conducting an exhaustive study of national-security policy and strategy. There have been vague but persistent rumors that the President intended to revive a strategy resembling the "Massive Retaliation" of the Eisenhower-Dulles years, through it was difficult to understand the feasibility of such a strategy in view of the size and sophistication of Soviet strategic forces.

The first comprehensive, but still general statement of the new Administration's defense policy was contained in President Nixon's "State of the World" message to Congress—United States Foreign Policy for the 1970s: A new strategy for peace. Many questions were left unanswered, but the message roughed in a nuclear strategy that is neither Massive Retaliation nor Assured Destruction at a minimum level.

Several passages in the President's message are pertinent to the future makeup of our strategic forces. (*Italics have been added.*)

"The overriding purpose of our strategic posture is political and defensive: to deny other countries the ability to impose their will on the United States *and its allies* under the weight of strategic military superiority. We must assure that all potential aggressors see unacceptable risk in contemplating a nuclear attack *or nuclear blackmail or acts which could escalate to strategic nuclear war*, such as a Soviet attack on Europe.

"For the foreseeable future Europe must be the cornerstone of the structure of a durable peace.

* * *

"Our NATO allies . . . view the U.S. commitment to deter Soviet aggression as being based mainly *on our maintenance of a powerful strategic posture.*

* * *

"The United States will keep all its treaty commitments. We shall provide a shield if a nuclear power threatens the freedom of a nation allied with us, or of a nation whose survival we consider vital to our security and the security of the region [referring to Asia] as a whole.

* * *

"[*And in the section on General-Purpose Forces*]: The prospects for a coordinated two-front attack on our allies by Russia and China are low because of the risks of nuclear war and the improbability of Sino-Soviet cooperation. *In any event, we do not believe that such a coordinated attack should be met by U.S. conventional forces.*"

A U.S. strategic posture adequate to prevent other countries from imposing their will not only on us, but on our allies, must meet two tests if it is to be credible to a potential aggressor. First, it must leave no doubt in his mind that the U.S. would emerge from a nuclear exchange with some relative advantage over the attacker, in a position to defend itself against third nations, and able to recover more rapidly than could the attacker. Second, other nuclear powers must believe it a reasonable possibility that the U.S. would take some form of positive strategic action against them if they were to threaten really vital U.S. external interests. Such a U.S. force should have a stabilizing influence because of its multiple deterrent effect and since it could not be used rationally to initiate unprovoked aggression.

The strategy outlined in the President's message will require relatively large and versatile strategic forces, including a bomber that can retain its effectiveness well into the future. Also, some of the Soviet technological advances that the bomber has helped insure against have actually occurred. Since they threaten principally the effectiveness of U.S. strategic missiles, they have the effect of enhancing the value of the bomber as a deterrent system. For example, the security of our land-based missiles is sensitive to the accuracy and warhead yield of enemy missiles. The unexpectedly rapid expansion of the Soviet missile force—particularly of the very accurate SS–9, which can carry a twenty-megaton warhead or three five-megaton weapons—is a real and present threat to American ICBMs.

The invulnerability of our sea-based missiles is sensitive to enemy antisubmarine warfare. In his Fiscal Year 1971 Posture Statement, Defense Secertary Melvin R. Laird stated that our Polaris submarines are still invulnerable, but that he could not guarantee continued invulnerability beyond the next five to seven years. For that reason, advanced developmental work was proposed on the Underseas Long-Range Missile System (ULMS), which would enable our missile-carrying submarines to operate in a vastly larger ocean area and still hit targets in the USSR or China.

The now-modest Soviet ABM system has an undetermined growth potential, and hence poses a future threat of uncertain proportions to both land-based and sea-based missiles. While ULMS will increase the Soviet problem of *detecting* US missile submarines, the longer flight time of ULMS probably will simplify the Soviet ABM *defense* problem so far as submarine-launched missiles are concerned.

In view of these Soviet counterforce developments, it would be a dangerous risk to allow the bomber element of the US strategic forces to deteriorate through obsolescence.

One of the bomber's greatest values as a deterrent has been given all too little attention. The bomber, in combination with missile forces, creates an almost impossible timing problem for an enemy planning an attack on the US. Put yourself in the shoes of the Soviet tactician considering a first strike to disarm the United States. The situation might look something like this:

Any one of the three US strategic systems, if used independently of the others, can cause an unacceptable level of damage to the USSR. For a surprise attack on the US, I must, therefore, plan it so that his missiles and bombers are reduced in effectiveness to a point where my defenses can handle them. It's particularly important that I get his bombers, since I want to hit only military targets. The bombers, because of their accuracy and high-yield weapons, have by far the best capability to hit my own hardened or mobile military targets in return. If I knock out the US bombers, the American President's options are reduced pretty much to attacking my cities with missiles. It then becomes a war against populations—a hard choice for any President. He may prefer to negotiate with us. How shall I plan my attack?

Now, U.S. officials have said that they will not fire their missiles at my country until one of my warheads has actually exploded over U.S. territory. It's reasonable to assume they mean this. Launching missiles on warning that may be ambiguous—perhaps even false—is simply too risky for them.

I'll use my land-based ICBMs with high-yield warheads against the hardened U.S. land-based missiles. My submarine-launched missiles (SLBMs) are shorter range, less accurate, and have smaller warheads, but they will do very well to destroy his bombers if I can catch them on the ground.

The U.S. Ballistic Missile Early Warning System (BMEWS) gives the Americans about twenty minutes' warning of attack by my ICBMs. Other U.S. warning systems can pick up my SLBMs five to ten minutes before impact on SAC bases.

I'm going to optimize my surprise attack so my ICBMs will *arrive* over the enemy's missile silos at the same time my SLBMs hit his bomber bases. But wait a minute. That won't work. His radars will pick up my ICBMs even before I launch my SLBMs from a few hundred miles off the U.S. coast. He'll flush his bomber force under positive control and, after my missiles have exploded over U.S. territory, he'll give his bombers a go-ahead. And his surviving missiles, too.

Let's try it the other way. I'll optimize my attack against his bombers. I'll have to launch SLBMs and ICBMs for simultaneous *detection* by the U.S. so as to not flush his bombers on warning. But that won't work either. If all goes very well for me, U.S. radars will detect my SLBMs five to seven minutes from the most exposed SAC bases. Simultaneously, his BMEWS radars will see my ICBMs about twenty minutes' flight time away from U.S. missile sites. That leaves the Americans twenty minutes to alert their National Command authority and maybe fifteen minutes after my first SLBM detonates over a SAC base to make a final decision, transmit orders, and launch their ICBMs.

Let's leave the Soviet planner with this dilemma. It will get worse for him when our satellite warning systems are perfected and when the B–1 becomes operational, with its faster reaction time, ability to disperse widely—even to highways if necessary—vastly improved penetration capability, and varied load of standoff and gravity weapons.

Several leading B–1 opponents have suggested that our need for a bomber may be obviated if the US adopts a policy of launching missiles on warning of an attack. That proposition can be put in a different way. If we do not have a bomber with a credible ability to penetrate Soviet defenses, *we would have to* launch missiles on warning, accepting the horrifying possibility, however remote, that the warning might be fallacious. That is a sobering thought.

Another plus for the strategic bomber is its usefulness in limited conventional warfare, as the B–52s have proved in Vietnam. Where heavy, concentrated firepower is needed, there is no substitute for the big bombers. The B–52s have had no fighters to contend with and very little ground-to-air opposition. But equally ideal conditions will not always be present. The B–1's supersonic speed, low-altitude capability, and advanced electronics will allow us to continue to use heavy bombers in a far less permissive conventional-war environment if future contingencies demand it.

But the B–1, a sophisticated and expensive aircraft, can be justified only if it makes a major contribution to the primary task of our strategic forces—deterrence of attack on the US and our allies.

The fundamental question, "Will we need *any* bomber by the end of the 1970s?" has been answered affirmatively by the Nixon Administration. So, it appears, has the next logical question, "Will we need *this* bomber—the B–1?" An economy-minded Administration is not likely to endorse a nearly $2 billion investment in developing and testing the prototype of a system unless it believes that system essential to national security. A reversal by DoD is unlikely unless there should be a gross reduction in the Soviet/Chinese threat, perhaps as a product of the SALT talks. The decisive arena has shifted from DoD (until two years ago strongly anti-B–1) to Congress (until two years ago overwhelmingly pro-B–1).

In his "State of the World" message, President Nixon said:

"Because planning mistakes may not show up for several years, deferral of hard choices is often tempting. But the ultimate penalty may be disastrous. The only responsible course is to face up to our problems and to make decisions in a long-term framework."

There is no decision on weapon systems to which that warning applies more pointedly than to the B–1.

## SECRETARY LAIRD'S ADDRESS ON THE STRATEGIC BALANCE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Honorable Melvin R. Laird, Secretary of Defense, addressed the annual luncheon of the Associated Press on April 20 at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City on the subject of the strategic balance. His remarks concerning our national security are of great significance to the American people and to the Congress.

Mr. President, it was made crystal clear by Secretary Laird that the Soviets have been engaged in a tremendous effort since 1965 to change the strategic balance of power in their favor. On the other hand during this time frame, the United States has maintained an even level of strategic nuclear offensive forces as a deterrence. The United States has taken no action to increase the total of approved strategic offensive delivery vehicles in the past 5 years. My distinguished colleagues, we must concern ourselves with where this Soviet momentum will carry them.

Mr. President, I would like to quote a paragraph from Mr. Laird's speech which clearly reveals the acceleration of the Soviet buildup in nuclear strategic forces. The threat our Nation faces is evident in his remarks.

Mr. Laird said:

Thus, in the space of five years—from 1965 to 1970—the Soviet Union has more than tripled its inventory of strategic offensive nuclear weapon launchers from about 500 to about 1700—which includes some 200

heavy bombers in both totals—and continues the momentum of a vigorous construction program. In that same period, the Soviet Union has virtually quadrupled the total megatonnage in its strategic offensive force. The United States, on the other hand, in the same time period, made no increase in its established level of 1710 strategic nuclear missile launchers and reduced its heavy bomber strength of 780 by over 200. In that same period the United States also reduced its megatonnage by more than 40%.

These are only some of the alarming facts presented in Mr. Laird's appraisal of the Soviet threat. I recommend that my distinguished colleagues review this address and its implications. I am confident that a study of the substance supporting his remarks will indicate that further positive action is necessary for our own security.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address of the Secretary of Defense, which was delivered at the annual luncheon of the Associated Press, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE MELVIN R. LAIRD, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

I was particularly pleased when your President, Paul Miller of Gannett Newspapers, called me on a Saturday morning several months ago to invite me to speak to the Annual Luncheon of the Associated Press on the subject of the strategic balance. I told him that I regarded this forum as particularly appropriate to express my views on the need to make available to the American people additional information regarding national security.

When I assumed office 15 months ago, I immediately established as a top priority goal the restoration of credibility in the Department of Defense. Since then we have attempted to follow President Nixon's stated desire to make more information available to the American people.

The editors of the Associated Press and all members of the communications media in this country have a deep interest in this subject. I pledge to you that we shall continue to devote maximum attention to reducing and hopefully eliminating overclassification in the Department of Defense. And, we will provide all the information we can within the limits of national security, consistent with the safety and legal rights of our citizens.

This open news policy has brought about significant progress in at least five major areas where information was previously withheld from the American people.

1. Previous policy was to restrict public discussion of Prisoners of War matters. Present policy is to foster public discussion and to focus worldwide attention on the plight of our prisoners of war in order to gain humane treatment for them and to obtain their release.

2. Previous policy was to withhold from the public information on chemical warfare and biological research matters. Present policy is to keep the public informed about our new policies in these two areas, the reasons for these new policies, and the steps being taken to implement them.

3. Previous practices on reporting the costs of major weapons systems led to a major credibility problem in the Department of Defense. Our new policy of full disclosure on major weapons costs will help to restore the Department's credibility and will assist us in gaining better control of costs and in developing better management practices.

4. For several years, the American people were denied knowledge about our activities in Laos. Today, the American people are being informed about what we are doing and what we are not doing in Laos.

5. In the past, overuse of classification denied to the American people pertinent information on the nature and scope of the strategic nuclear threat. In my view, there is still too much classification, but we have tried and will continue to make more and more information available on this subject which is so crucial for the future security of our country.

In my remarks today I will attempt to shed more light on the crucial subject of the strategic threat. In particular, I want to discuss with you editors the nature and scope of the growing Soviet threat, recognizing full well that, in Vienna, our negotiators have just begun round two of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, commonly called SALT.

I hope for success at SALT. I want to emphasize that point. I also want to emphasize that our top military leadership hopes for success at SALT. Where the security of the United States is involved, it is this objective—insuring national security—which is most important. A lower cost means to achieve that objective, lower compared to what otherwise may be required—if it can be achieved within tolerable risks—is obviously most desirable to all Americans, civilian and military.

The budget we have recommended to Congress for the next fiscal year demonstrates how deeply the Nixon Administration is committed to progress at SALT. We have called this year's defense budget a transitional budget. It is transitional because in terms of military capability, it is basically a status quo, stand-pat budget. We have postponed basic national security decisions in the strategic field in order to give maximum opportunity for SALT to be successful, and to foster a meaningful beginning for the era of negotiation President Nixon and the American people seek.

The objective of the Nixon Administration is to restore and maintain peace. With regard to SALT, the President's actions and words document this Administration's accent on negotiation rather than confrontation.

In my Defense Report to Congress in February, I expressed concern that the United States, by the mid-1970's, could find itself in a second-rate strategic position with regard to the future security of the Free World.

Today, in keeping with our policy of maximum information, I intend to present additional reasons for this concern.

It is important to discuss the growing strategic threat because it is essential for the American people to understand the complex issues involved, if we are to insure our national security interests through the decade of the 1970's. The American people need to understand the reasons President Nixon is pursuing the course he has recommended in this year's transitional budget.

As Secretary of Defense, I must face the fact that we are taking a risk by postponing hard decisions which the increasing Soviet threat poses for us. I recognize that in the interests of lasting peace, some risks must be taken. But, it is my judgment that as the American people are provided additional information, such as we are discussing here today, they will agree that we are literally at the edge of prudent risks. And the inescapable conclusion will be that if the Soviet strategic offensive buildup continues, the risk to our nation will become too great to sustain without major offsetting actions.

Therefore, what I particularly want to focus on today is the basic asymmetry between what the United States has been doing and what the Soviet Union has been doing in the field of strategic nuclear weapons in recent years.

In a word, for the past five years, the United States has virtually been in neutral gear in the deployment of strategic offensive forces, while the Soviet Union has moved into high gear in both deployment and development of strategic nuclear weapons. In the 1965–67 time period, the United States decided on a level of strategic nuclear forces, including Multiple Independently Targeted Reentry Vehicles (MIRVs), which was deemed adequate to preserve our deterrent posture for the threat of the 1970's which was projected then. No basic change has been made in the force level decisions established in the mid-1960's.

The Soviet Union, by contrast, has engaged in a major effort since 1965 to change the balance of power. The United States then, unlike the situation today, clearly occupied a superior position.

Except for the minimum "hedge" that SAFEGUARD will provide, we have not responded to the Soviet strategic offensive buildup with new deployment programs. We did not respond in past years because the United States deliberately chose to assume that the Soviet buildup at most was aimed at achieving a deterrent posture comparable to that of the United States. We have not responded this year because, as I have said, we fervently hope that SALT can render such a response unnecessary.

As much as we might wish it otherwise, however, we must concentrate our attention on what the Soviet Union is actually doing. In the current situation of a diminishing U.S. deterrent and Soviet momentum, we simply cannot base our plans and programs on what we hope the Soviet Union may do either unilaterally or in SALT. The Soviets have a momentum going both in strategic weapons deployments and in strategic weapons developments. If their strategic posture could be expected to stay at the operationally deployed posture which exists today, I believe we would have a tolerable situation. What must concern us, however, is the momentum the Soviets have established both in deployments and developments and where that momentum may carry them.

Let me explain in more detail the basic problem.

The most crucial aspect of national security is the strategic balance between nations that have competing interests in the world. The strategic balance has a direct effect on relations between the superpowers. It has an indirect effect on other nations both in terms of their own relations with each other and in terms of their relations with the superpowers. As one example, a situation of clear superiority on the part of the Soviet Union would have profound implications for any future political or military confrontation between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. In fact, a clear strategic superiority on the part of the Soviet Union would affect our interests and our obligations throughout the world.

In our continuing debate on defense matters, it has been said many times that the driving force behind the so-called strategic arms race is the "action-reaction" phenomenon. The recent ABM–MIRV discussions in this country illustrate this. The argument is made, for instance, that the deployment of defensive missiles by one side tends to generate increased offensive deployments by the other side.

I certainly agree that one side's actions definitely can influence what the other side does. But just as weapons in themselves are not the cause of wars, neither are a country's actions in weapons deployment—in themselves—the driving force in a so-called arms race. The fundamental driving force in an arms race is what one country perceives as possible objectives of another country's actions.

Let me explain it this way. Our goal is a stable peace. Our strategic policy to achieve that goal is deterrence. As publicly stated, the basic rationale for United States weapons deployment in the strategic field has been and remains deterrence. Our actions of the past several years underscore the fact that deterrence is our fundamental policy and

that we seek no more than a posture of effective deterrence.

Because we in the United States seek a posture of deterrence to protect our interests and those of our allies, we obviously could recognize as legitimate a Soviet desire for a comparable deterrent to protect its interests.

I know that the actions of the Soviet Union in recent years have raised questions in the minds of some of you editors and others about the true objectives they are pursuing.

As I have said many times, I do not believe that it is appropriate for me, as Secre of Defense, to attempt to assess the strategic intentions of another country. However, under my responsibilities, I must be concerned about present and potential strategic capabilities.

You representatives of a free press understand fully the national security price an open society must pay when competing with adversaries who cloak their plans in secrecy and attempt to hide both their objectives and their hardware behind the mantle of a closed society. The whole world knows what we in the United States have and what we plan in the national security field. Meaningful essentials are laid bare in an open forum—in official statements, in Congressional hearings, in the give and take of Congressional and public debate and in the reports of a free and competitive press. I would not have it any other way.

Let me emphasize again my conviction that the American people have a right to know even more than has been available in the past about matters which affect their safety and security. There has been too much classification in this country. In particular, too much has been withheld in the past about what has been going on in the closed societies of the Soviet Union and Communist China.

As we all pray for success in Vienna, let me point out that, in my view, the American people will support an arms limitation agreement only if they are confident they have the relevant facts about the strategic balance.

The facts I am about to present are not taken from external Soviet discussions of their strategic forces. They do not come from press conferences in Moscow, from testimony in the Kremlin, from news stories in Pravda, or from published annual Defense Reports by Marshal Grechko.

Rather, the information I am presenting to you is based on our own observations of what the Soviets are doing—and on our belief that this information and these facts should not be withheld from the American people and should be made available to others in the world.

Let us examine what has happened in the past five years to shift the relationship between U.S. and Soviet strategic forces and to provide an accelerated momentum to the Soviets in the strategic field:

*In 1965,* the Soviet Union had about 220 launchers for the relatively old-fashioned missiles—SS–6's, SS–7's and SS–8's—somewhat similar to our TITAN. We had 54 TITANs in the inventory at that time.

*Today,* these two forces remain essentially the same. So in this category of old-fashioned multimegaton weapons the Soviets had and still maintain a better than 4-1 advantage.

*In 1965,* the Soviet Union had *no* relatively small ICBM launchers comparable to our MINUTEMAN. By 1965, we had 880 MINUTEMAN missiles operational and had established that the total force level for MINUTEMAN would be 1,000 launchers. In the 1965–67 time period, the United States finalized plans to convert a portion of the established MINUTEMAN force to a MIRV MINUTEMAN III configuration.

*Today,* the Soviet Union has over 800 such launchers operational, and a projected force that could exceed 1,000 launchers within the next two years. These launchers include both the SS–11 and SS–13 missiles. Concurrently, flight testing of an improved SS–11 missile continues. Thus, at present construction rates, the Soviets will achieve parity in MINUTEMAN-type launchers within the next two years or so and could move into a substantial lead in this category by the mid–1970's if they continue to deploy these missiles. The previously scheduled U.S. program to MIRV a substantial part of MINUTEMAN continues in progress.

*In 1965,* there were no operational launchers for the large Soviet SS–9 missile which, in its single warhead version, can carry up to 25 megatons.

*Today,* I can report to you that there are some 220 SS–9's operational with at least 60 more under construction. Testing of an SS–9 multiple reentry vehicle—the triplet version—continues. The U.S. has no counterpart to this program involving large missiles. So, in this area, the Soviets have and will maintain a monopoly.

*In 1965,* neither a depressed trajectory ICBM nor a Fractional Orbital Bombardment System existed in either the Soviet or U.S. inventory.

*Today,* the Soviets have tested both configurations and could have an operational version already deployed. The United States has developed nothing comparable to these systems.

*In 1965,* the Soviet Union had about 25 launchers for Submarine Launched Ballistic Missiles (SLBMs) on nuclear submarines, and about 80 more on diesel submarines. Most were designed for surface launch only. The U.S. had 464 SLBM launchers operational on 29 submarines in 1965 and Congress had authorized the last of the 41 nuclear-powered submarines in our POLARIS Force in the previous fiscal year.

*Today,* the Soviets have over 200 operational launchers on nuclear submarines for submerged launch SLMBs and about 70 operational launchers on diesel submarines. In the next two years, the Soviets are expected to have some 400–500 operational launchers on POLARIS-type submarines, and at present construction rates—6–8 submarines a year—could match or exceed the number in the U.S. force by 1974–75. United States POLARIS submarines still number 41 and no increase is projected in current plans. Conversion of 31 of our POLARIS submarines to the MIRVed POSEIDON missile is planned, and eight conversions have already been authorized by Congress.

*In 1965,* there was no development underway of a so-called Undersea Long-Range Missile System (ULMS) in the United States and there appeared to be none in the Soviet Union.

*Today,* the United States is spending relatively small sums in the research and development area on preliminary investigations of such a system. I can also report to you today that the Soviet Union, on the other hand, already is testing a new, long-range missile for possible Naval use.

*In 1965,* the Soviet heavy bomber force consisted of slightly over 200 aircraft, about 50 of which were configured as tankers. The U.S. heavy bomber force strength was about 780 in 1965.

*Today,* the Soviet heavy bomber force is slightly under 200, with about 50 still configured as tankers. U.S. heavy bomber strength has declined to about 550 today.

*In 1965,* we estimated that the Soviet Union had a complex of ABM launchers being constructed around Moscow as well as a number of radars under construction which could provide early warning acquisition and tracking functions for ABM use.

*Today,* we believe that 64 Moscow ABM launchers are operational together with sophisticated early warning radars and tracking capabilities. ABM testing for new and/or improved systems continues. Today, the first two SAFEGUARD sites have been authorized, but will not be operational before 1974–75. This modified deployment schedule is considerably behind the schedule Congress has approved in 1967 for the planned SENTINEL area defense, which called for initial capability in 1972, and nation-wide coverage in 1975.

Thus, in the space of five years—from 1965 to 1970—the Soviet Union has more than tripled its inventory of strategic offensive nuclear weapon launchers from about 500 to about 1700—which includes some 200 heavy bombers in both totals—and continues the momentum of a vigorous construction program. In that same period, the Soviet Union has virtually quadrupled the total megatonnage in its strategic offensive force. The United States, on the other hand, in the same time period, made no increase in its established level of 1710 strategic nuclear missile launchers and reduced its heavy bomber strength of 780 by over 200. In that same period the United States also reduced its megatonnage by more than 40%.

To repeat: The United States has taken no action to increase the total of approved strategic offensive delivery vehicles in the past five years in response to the rapid growth in Soviet strategic delivery vehicles. We have, of course, maintained certain options and other steps have been taken to preserve our deterrent in the face of this increase.

Two programs that have been the subject of intense public discussion are, of course, our MIRV and Safeguard systems.

Let me emphasize that MIRV is needed to preserve our deterrent. Many people do not fully understand why it is necessary for us to continue the previously planned, Congressionally-approved and funded deployment of MIRV systems. The point is made that the current number of strategic nuclear weapons on alert in our force is sufficient for immediate retaliatory use in a crisis. Because MIRVing would more than double the number of deliverable weapons, the conclusion is drawn that this is unnecessary.

This conclusion could be valid, if we assumed that the Polaris, Minuteman, and Bomber forces all would survive a surprise attack and that the Soviet Union would not deploy an extensive ABM system. However, as was pointed out in my Defense Report in February, the rapidly-growing Soviet strategic offensive forces could seriously threaten both the U.S. Minuteman and strategic bomber forces by the mid-1970's.

Assuming we do not take additional actions to offset the expanding threat—and this apparently is what some people urge—I must, as Secretary of Defense, face the disquieting possibility that in the mid-to-late 1970's we would no longer be able to rely on either the Bomber or Minuteman force to survive a surprise attack. In such a situation, we would be left with only the Polaris/Poseidon deterrent force in our strategic arsenal for high confidence retaliatory purposes. This would pose intolerable risks for American security.

Thus, the critical choice in the face of that situation is this:

1. Do we rely on the fraction of the 656 current weapons that will be at sea on our Polaris force if we do not convert to Poseidon and do not defend our land-based strategic forces?

2. Or, do we continue the previously established program to convert 31 Polaris submarines to the long-approved Poseidon MIRV program—which would provide approximately the same number of sea-based retaliatory weapons on alert that we currently have today in the sea-based and land-based retaliatory forces combined, but with much reduced megatonnage?

Pending a successful outcome in the Stra-

tegic Arms Limitation Talks, therefore, prudence dictates that we must continue our approved program to MIRV current forces.

Moreover, as the experience of the past five years demonstrates, it would be dangerous and imprudent to place unquestioned reliance on the invulnerability of any single strategic system for more than five to seven years into the future.

This is why we must also, at the very least, preserve an option to defend a portion of our land-based retaliatory forces. That is a major part of what the proposed minimal addition to the SAFEGUARD Defensive program is designed to do. I will come back to that.

Because we want to give the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks every chance of succeeding, we are deliberately accepting certain risks by postponing hard choices related to strategic offensive weapons. These risks are acceptable only in the context of proceeding with the MIRV deployments that have been programmed and approved for several years and the SAFEGUARD increment we are recommending this year.

A second and equally important reason for MIRV is that it helps preserve our deterrent by increasing confidence in our ability to penetrate Soviet strategic defensive forces which, by the mid-to-late 1970's, also could be quite formidable. In addition to the extensive air defense capabilities they already possess, the Soviets are pursuing a vigorous anti-ballistic missile research and development program designed to improve the present operational system or to develop substantially better second-generation ABM components.

We now have evidence that the Soviet Union is testing an improved long-range ABM missile. They are also expanding their radar surveillance coverage. We cannot rule out the possibility that they have or will give the extensively deployed SA–5 surface-to-air missile system an ABM role. We believe such a role is technically feasible for this system.

With regard to SAFEGUARD, which I mentioned previously, let me say this. In addition to other objectives, the reoriented SAFEGUARD program, initiated last year, is designed to provide protection for our land-based deterrent forces, the MINUTEMAN and Bombers. As you know, the President directed that each phase of the SAFEGUARD deployment is to be reviewed each year to ensure that we are doing as much as necessary but not more than that required by the threat. The increments of SAFEGUARD proposed so far will provide protection for a portion of our land-based deterrent, and permit flexibility with regard to our future course of action.

Without approval by Congress of the Modified Phase II SAFEGUARD protection proposed by the President, we would be forced to recommend going forward this year with other strategic nuclear offensive force programs.

All of my comments so far have, of course, been focused on the more immediate and troublesome threat posed by the Soviet strategic force buildup. The nuclear weapons program of Communist China also concerns us and directly relates to the need for preserving timely SAFEGUARD options as we move toward the mid-1970's. Time does not permit a discussion of this issue and the interrelationship of maintaining adequate strategic offensive and defensive forces to meet both the Soviet and Communist Chinese threats.

Where does all this leave us, and what is President Nixon attempting to do with the decisions he has incorporated in his Fiscal Year 1971 transitional defense budget?

Clearly, this Administration has not accelerated the previously planned deployment of offensive systems during our 15 months in office. On the contrary, we have slowed it down. The only major change we have made has been modification of the previously approved SENTINEL ABM deployment; and that change was a slowdown, not a speedup. We slowed the original deployment plan Congress approved, keyed it to the emerging threat on an annual review basis, and reoriented it to provide more timely protection needed for our land-based deterrent forces.

If the programmed forces established by the last Administration some years ago and approved by Congress were deemed appropriate and necessary for the security of the United States in the 1970's against the then projected threat, I am at a loss to understand how critics can claim that the Nixon Administration has escalated the arms race. The record clearly shows that we have not done so. We have chosen instead to defer major new weapons decisions as long as possible pending developments in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. In continuing the MIRV and ABM programs, we are simply going ahead with programs on which our deterrent policy was formulated by previous Administrations, even before the current momentum of Soviet strategic programs became clear.

With regard to the important talks which have just resumed in Vienna, the President has stated that every U.S. system is negotiable. To those who argue that the U.S. should take specific, and perhaps unilateral, action at the start of these negotiations, I would reply that the place to resolve these issues is at the conference table with the Soviets. Let us try to find out at the conference table the meaning of the Soviet Union's increased weapons deployments and let us conduct these important negotiations with full recognition of these continuing Soviet deployments.

My appraisal today has covered some of the available evidence of the Soviet military buildup. I am not unmindful, how, of possible other directions of Soviet policy that could be relevant to our security. There have been reports that Soviet economic problems may place pressure upon their leadership to devote major attention to internal matters, thus reducing the recent emphasis on a continued military buildup.

As Secretary of Defense, I will continue to hope that the shift in national priorities we have instituted in America will be duplicated in the Soviet Union. But until evidence of that shift is discernible in weapons deployment activities, I have no alternative but to base my actions and recommendations on the evidence available, much of which I have shared with you editors today and, through you, with the American people.

## WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS FROM VIETNAM

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I concur wholeheartedly with the comments of the distinguished assistant minority leader.

In his report to the Nation on Vietnam on April 20, 1970, President Nixon gave the American people some good news.

He said that he will continue the withdrawal from Vietnam of American troops over the next year, and he set the number of additional troops to be withdrawn at 150,000. Under the plan, the total to be withdrawn by the Nixon administration by the spring of 1971 will be 265,000.

He said that he will be able to withdraw American troops at an even faster rate if there is progress in negotiations.

He said that he is ready to negotiate a political settlement fair to all parties.

He said that he is confident all American combat forces can and will be withdrawn.

This is very good news for the American people. For those who have supported the program of Vietnamization, there must be satisfaction that the President will continue that program. For those who have been skeptical of Vietnamization, preferring greater effort in the political field, there must be satisfaction that the President expressed his unequivocal desire for a political settlement. President Nixon said, "A political settlement is the heart of the matter."

I welcome the President's announcement that he will persevere in the withdrawal of American forces, and I welcome his renewed commitment to seeking a negotiated settlement. Both policies must be pursued together if America's involvement in Vietnam is to be brought to an end.

In my judgment, the maximum rate of withdrawal of American forces possible, consistent with the safety and security of remaining American forces, is essential and necessary to assure that the government and people of South Vietnam will assume an ever-increasing share of the burden of their own self-defense. This should also encourage the government of South Vietnam to become increasingly responsive to the very real needs and desires of the South Vietnamese people.

## EARTH DAY

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, yesterday several million Americans paused to celebrate Earth Day.

I hope that this signifies more than just another important, even red letter, day on our national calendar. I hope that the events of yesterday mark the beginning of a dedication on a year-round basis to an idea and an ideal.

I hope that the rhetoric we heard yesterday does not subside into a dim echo but instead becomes a rolling thunder that cannot be stilled and must be heeded.

I do not have any idea of how many people were involved in yesterday's ceremonies and speeches and demonstrations. I do not believe anybody can make more than a rough guess. I do know that the National Education Association estimates some 10 million schoolchildren took part. I know there were hundreds of thousands of people gathered at the Washington Monument and in the streets of our other great cities.

I also know that a great deal of what was said yesterday was almost supercharged with emotional impact. The future of our planet—unless we act with vigor and with purpose—is, indeed, not bright.

But, Mr. President, I do not think the predictions of doom need come to pass. In fact, I do not believe they will.

For one thing, man is that unique being—an animal with the power to think. And with this power to reason comes the power to act in a rational manner when called upon to do so. I do not think man will abandon his rationality and continue to plunge madly into the dark.

Coincident with this power to reason is man's ability to plan. Perhaps it takes a great crisis or the foreshadow of impending disaster to force man to use this

reasoning ability, but when put to the task he has repeatedly over the centuries demonstrated that he can.

Already, Mr. President, there is ample evidence of man's determination to end his war against nature. The Congress has not been idle. Within the limits of possibility over the past few years we have attempted to provide the tools with which damage can be undone and future damage prevented.

And the Nixon administration, too, has demonstrated its capacity to think in terms of the future, and to plan so that we may better be able to meet that future.

I call to mind the President's state of the Union message which devoted itself in large part to be a state of the environment message. This, it will be recalled, was followed up by a long, carefully thought out and logically stated message on the environment itself.

Lest yesterday's speeches be allowed to diminish the facts, I would like to summarize the 37 points which President Nixon made in his speech on the environment:

WATER POLLUTION

1. Authorization of $4 billion to cover the Federal share of $10 billion needed for construction of municipal waste treatment plants. To be allocated at a rate of $1 billion per year over the next four years, with a reassessment in 1973 of further needs for 1973 and subsequent years.

2. Establishment of Environmental Financing Authority to ensure that every municipality can finance its share of treatment plant construction costs.

3. Revision of statutory formula governing allocation of grants for treatment plant construction, to permit construction of plants where need is greatest and where greatest improvements in water quality will result.

4. Requirement that treatment plants be built to prescribed design, operation and maintenance standards, and be operated only by certified operators.

5. Requirement that municipalities impose users fees on industrial users sufficient to meet costs of treating industrial wastes.

6. Requirement of comprehensive river basin plans, to assure that construction of municipal treatment plants is complemented by abatement of all other sources of water pollution.

7. Encouragement of construction of large-scale, regional treatment facilities.

8. Extension of Federal-State water quality standards to include precise effluent standards for all industrial and municipal sources.

9. Provision that violation of established water quality standards is sufficient cause for court action.

10. Revision of Federal enforcement procedures to permit swifter court action against those in violation of water quality standards.

11. Provision that violation of established water quality standards is subject to court-imposed fines of up to $10,000 per day.

12. Authorization for the Secretary of the Interior to seek immediate injunctions where severe water pollution threatens imminent danger to health or irreversible damage to water environment.

13. Extension of Federal pollution control authority to include all navigable waters, both inter- and intrastate, all interstate ground waters, the United States' portion of boundary waters, and waters of the Contiguous Zone.

14. Tripling of Federal operating grants to state pollution agencies—from $10 million now to $30 million in 1975.

AIR POLLUTION

15. Publication of new, more stringent motor vehicle emissions standards for 1973 and 1975.

16. Revision of auto emissions enforcement procedures, to ensure that all new autos are in compliance with Federal standards.

17. Authorization for the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to regulate gasoline composition and additives.

18. Initiation of a research and development program to produce an unconventionally-powered, low-pollution auto within five years.

19. Initiation of testing and evaluation programs to assist private developers of unconventional, low-pollution autos.

20. Establishment of national air quality standards, with the states preparing abatement enforcement plans to meet national standards.

21. Accelerate designation of interstate air quality control regions.

22. Establishment of national emissions standards for pollutants that are extremely hazardous to health and for specified classes of new facilities.

23. Extension of Federal air pollution control authority to both inter- and intrastate situations.

24. Provision that violation of air quality standards and national emissions standards are subject to court-imposed fines of up to $10,000 per day.

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

25. Re-direction of solid waste research toward techniques for re-cycling materials and producing packaging materials that are easily degradable.

26. Council on Environmental Quality to develop bounty payment or similar system to insure prompt scrapping and re-cycling of junk automobiles.

27. Council on Environmental Quality to work with appropriate industry and consumer groups to develop other incentives or regulations for re-cycling or easier disposal of consumer goods.

INDUSTRIAL INVOLVEMENT

28. Establishment of National Industrial Pollution Control Council.

29. Priority treatment for patent applications which could aid in curbing environmental abuses.

PARKS AND RECREATION

30. Full funding of the $327 million available under the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

31. Review of all Federally-owned real estate to identify properties that can be converted to public recreational use, or sold, with proceeds used to acquire additional recreational areas.

32. Relocation of Federal installations that occupy locations that could better be used for other purposes.

33. Provision that the Land and Water Conservation Fund is maintained or increased as a source of funds for purchase of lands in future years.

34. Authorization for the Department of the Interior to convey surplus real property to State and local governments for park and recreational purposes at public benefit discounts of up to 100 percent.

35. Revision of budget accounting procedures to encourage Federal agencies to make more efficient use of their properties.

36. Assistance to State and local governments for making constructive recreational use of idled farmlands.

37. Authorization of long-term contracts with owners of idled farmlands for reforestation and other improvements for public recreational use.

It will be noted that many of these points involve action which the President himself is undertaking, or directing agencies in the Federal Government to take. But many more of these points involve a responsibility which is being placed squarely on the shoulders of Congress. We have demonstrated in the past our ability to shoulder these responsibilities; it is my sincere hope that political considerations will be shunted aside so that we may discharge our duty in this matter once again in the spirit of Earth Day.

I think that above all else the spirit of Earth Day is one of thoughtfulness.

It involves a rededication to the ideal that man is a rational being, capable of improving his life on this planet without destroying the planet in the process.

Earth Day is more than a call to action. It is a call to thoughtful, logical and foresighted action.

Working together, the Nixon administration and this Congress can achieve that goal. Working at odds with each other, I doubt we can.

Mr. President, I had the great privilege yesterday morning of addressing a large, overflow audience of students who assembled at 9 o'clock on the Circle campus at the University of Illinois.

Within the past few days, I also had the honor and privilege of addressing groups of 4-H students in Normal, Bloomington, and students and faculty members and editors of southern Illinois newspapers at their meeting in Carbondale, Ill.

I ask unanimous consent that the address I delivered at the University of Illinois campus be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR PERCY

Today, Earth Day, is a day without precedent. You and I are here because we share something—something precious—and yet we realize that we must take extraordinary and unprecedented measures to preserve that something—our home—the planet earth.

Each of us knows only too well the crisis we are faced with, and each of us knows only too well that the time we have left to deal with this crisis is fast expiring.

Let me state plainly, this is a major crisis we face. Our very existence is in the balance. If we do not meaningfully deal with, and solve, these problems, then we won't have to worry about the other problems that face us.

So today, we are meeting together, and groups like this are meeting all over this nation. We are all concerned about what is being done to our environment, and we must start now to do what is necessary to save ourselves and our world from self-destruction.

From the earliest times, man has believed that he was a contestant in a struggle of domination between himself and nature. He took a land, green and fertile, he took the air, pure and fresh, he took the water, blue and teeming with life, and he decided that he had to "civilize" this wilderness.

He did civilize and tame nature. Man won the contest, and nature was defeated. One of the results of this victory was a new word which we all know, a word we use to describe this civilization of ours. That word is, of course, pollution. It has become such a popular word that it has quite a variety of adjectives preceding it. There is air pollution, water pollution, noise pollution, ther-

mal pollution, solid waste pollution, and even thought pollution.

Air pollution probably concerns us most, because though the air we breathe is most immediately necessary to life, it is also unspeakably filthy. In 1967, 133 million tons of contaminates were spewed into our atmosphere. In 1969, this increased to 142 million tons—more than our annual tonnage of steel produced. More than half of this aerial contamination consists of carbon monoxide, most of it from cars, trucks, and buses with internal combustion engines.

Water pollution has been a problem recognized for many years. Lake Erie is virtually a dead sea, and Lake Michigan could suffer a similar fate. Every river system in America suffers from some degree of pollution. The Cuyahoga River of Ohio, for example, catches fire periodically. Even the oceans are not too big to be immune from dangerous pollution. A recent study discovered a five square mile area of water off the New York shore where no living organisms could be found. Thor Heyerdahl noted that when he sailed in the Kon Tiki 20 years ago, the ocean waters were beautifully pure. However, in his latest trip in the Ra, he found garbage and debris floating in the middle of the ocean.

Solid waste disposal is an ever increasing problem. A year's rubbish from 10,000 persons covers an acre of ground 7 feet deep. Our total solid waste production each year amounts to over 3.5 billion tons—enough to fill the Panama Canal four times over. We are fast approaching the point of smothering in our own garbage. In fact, if the per capita rate stays the same, the total annual production of combustible waste alone will rise from 193 million to 175 million tons by the year 2000, which will be enough to bury all of Washington, D.C. in 30 feet of trash.

Thermal pollution treatens the life of some marine species by adding abnormally high-temperature water, threatening the plant and animal marine life, the purity of our water, the livelihood of fishermen, and ultimately the food source for millions of people the world over.

At this time, there are seven nuclear plants planned for the Lake Michigan shore. I do not believe we should go ahead with these potential polluters until we know for sure what the consequences of their operation will be, and until we are assured that these consequences will not threaten our lake and the life that depends on it.

Noise pollution!—well, if you have ever stopped to actually listen, just listen to the sounds of the city, the horror of noise pollution is evident enough to you. This is not only unpleasant, it is unhealthy. Functional hearing problems are increasing as the pure and simple result of too much noise. Can we still remember what peace and silence sound like?

But these forms of pollution are well known to you.

There is another dimension to pollution, however, that is too often overlooked. I am speaking of the environment of the homes in our cities. When parents discover their children confronted by rats in their homes, as big as cats, they realize they are living with the most devastating, all pervasive, form of pollution that breeds despair.

To many, this form of pollution is the most urgent, but it seems to be getting far too little attention.

A few years ago, it seemed that everyone was anxious to get the rats out of our city's homes. Under public pressure, Congress authorized $20 million to be spent for each of the years 1968 and 1969 for rodent control. When this was done, everyone seemed to focus their attention elsewhere. Some people couldn't, though. The people who still shared their beds and their food and their lives with rats couldn't pretend the problem was solved, for indeed it wasn't. In 1968, the Congress just didn't get around to appropriating the $20 million, and in 1969, only $15 million was appropriated. Of the originally authorized $40 million, only $15 million was ever actually spent.

If the public's attention span is so short that this was allowed to happen without an agonized response, then what can we expect to happen with the other proposals for pollution control? Our sense of values and our sense of morality should be outraged at this lack of total commitment. Pollution is an all encompassing issue that cries out for no less than full, and immediate commitment.

We must consider the problems of rats in the homes as much a problem of pollution as we do the pollution of the air. For they are both forms of pollution, and they both have a common basis for our disgust and ultimate rejection as a part of our lives. What concern can an individual have for clean air, lakes or rivers who lives amidst human debris and filth on every side?

It is not just too bad that a child of a poor family must share his home with rats, it is immoral.

It is not just too bad that our air and water and land are polluted, it is immoral.

This is the basic question here today; this is the point we must realize. Pollution, of our homes, of our cities, of our nation, is basically the inevitable consequence of neglect, and for this neglect to go on unchecked would be immoral.

The heritage that was ours was a land of beauty and wonder. We are the age that has the choice of either destroying it, or preserving it. The choice is ours. In making that choice, we must ask ourselves whether we have the right to deny to our descendants that which was cherished and passed on to us by our forefathers. In any decision we make that affects our environment, we must realize that there is a definite morality which must dictate our actions.

We cannot, we must not, look on pollution as a matter of expediency, or comfort. It is a matter of life and death.

Here, though, is where this issue becomes difficult for each of us. Because this is an issue of morality, there are certain inescapable consequences. We must each realize that we have an individual responsibility. And because of this responsibility, each of us must come to realize that we will have to make a personal commitment, and each of us will have to make significant sacrifices.

Each of us must become our brother's keeper. Littering must be recognized as a sin against humanity. No one must be allowed to mindlessly throw trash or even a cigarette butt—an object so small—on the ground. There are over 400 thousand tons of cigarette butts littering our landscape every year! We must rethink all of our actions in this light, that we have no right to foul our common home.

We must also realize that we are going to have to rethink our standards of luxury and necessity. For instance, our use of electricity ought to be reconsidered.

The utilities fill our needs for electricity. We cannot, on the one hand, condemn utilities for making efforts to provide us with electricity, and then turn around and fill our houses with endless electrical gadgets. We demand from the utilities that they always supply us with enough electricity to run our electric toothbrushes, our electric knives, our electric blankets, our electric can openers, and all the other modern conveniences of our society. But we never stop to consider that because of our excessive electrical demands, the utilities must keep building and operating polluting power plants. The first step to help clean up pollution caused by overworked power companies is to reduce electrical demands that every home makes, and we should begin to seriously consider this fact now.

In the last analysis, it is people who cause pollution. And right now, there are too many people. By the year 2000, the population of the world will have doubled to 7 billion, and in those thirty years, the United States will add another 100 million people, while the population of Chicago will rise to 10 million. It is time now to grapple with the difficult question of family size. This is especially difficult because of the questions of privacy and personal choice involved. However, this will have to be weighed individually against the consideration of the common good. Since scientists tell us that a birthrate of 2 children per family would be necessary to hold the line against further population increases, each couple must ask themselves what sacrifices they are obligated to make, whether after a certain point, adoption might be a logical step rather than adding another birth.

All of the questions I have raised will have to be answered individually. The collective response of the community will determine the extent of success or failure that will be ours.

There is also a responsibility of the business community. It is no less an issue of survival to them. That community will also have to consider the moral questions involved, and will have to balance progress against survival.

In the past, many businesses, along with everyone else, acted without consideration to the environment as did government regulatory agencies. I can find few instances where such agencies even showed superficial concern about the environment. However, business was second only to the scientific community in realizing how seriously our environment was deteriorating, and business began to devote some of its earnings to protecting and developing the environment long before public interest, such as is evident today, ever was imagined. Only far too late in the day has the issue of the environment caught the public's attention as a whole. Now, public opinion is putting added pressures on the business community to safeguard the environment.

I believe that corporations, owned by millions of citizen-stockholders should be vigorously urged to make environmental protection a basic consideration in any corporate decision.

It must be their responsibility to do all they can to insure that the concerns of the environment as well as the concerns of their stockholders should both be given their utmost attention. Those who own stock would like to realize a profit on their investment, but they are also citizens who want to do what they can to save our environment. Consumers want their products at the lowest possible price but also they realize the necessity of including in the product price an allowance for all necessary steps to be taken by a business to preserve our most precious heritage.

Government, too, is responsible to a large extent for pollution. Cities and municipalities have been, and many still are, discharging hundreds of millions of gallons of raw sewage into this nation's waterways every day. The Army Corps of Engineers, Great Lakes Naval Training Station and Fort Sheridan are among the major pollutors of Lake Michigan. I applaud the President for recently adding $200 million to the military budget for pollution control and taking the same amount out of the budget for the ABM.

It is both easy and inaccurate to blame just one section of our community for our environmental problems. Industry, government, and most of all, individual citizens are responsible. If we are to survive, we must realize that each of us, and each segment of our society, must make intense and unprecedented efforts to stop the polluting that each of us creates. We must start now, right now, to clean up this mess, to change our habits of over consuming and mindless littering, to

make this land of ours into a place where, once again, man can glory in the wonder and beauty of nature.

I mentioned before that air pollution, as we all know, is one of the forms of pollution that most concerns us. In the large cities of this nation, estimates as to the amount of air pollution caused by car engines run as high as 80%. Obviously, if we could eliminate automobile discharges as a form of air pollution, a giant step would be taken toward achieving clean, pure, fresh air.

The auto industry has for years been devoting time and money to research and development of a cleaner internal combustion engine and to alternative power sources such as the external combustion engine.

As a matter of fact, the automobile industry currently spends about $150 million annually for research and technology into controlling emission pollution, or about $15 per car per year.

In the area of style and design changes, the auto industry annually spends more than $1 billion annually, which amounts to about $140 per car per year.

In the past, the money that the auto industry spent to investigate how to clean up the air might have been sufficient.

Now, however, we acknowledge that pollution must be stopped and stopped now. With this as a basic supposition, we can then look at priorities. Which is more important, a new car with attractive styling changes, or a new non-polluting engine? In answering this question we must consider the moral implications of our answers.

Admittedly, this is a very difficult decision to make, because not only is the question of pollution on the line, but the economy of this nation is also involved. The problem is a sophisticated one, and demands a sophisticated answer. We must be wary of solutions which are too quick and too easy. However, we must not let the enormity of the problem discourage us from suggesting sincere solutions, for there is no longer any excuse not to begin to do what is necessary, now.

I believe that both the automobile industry and the American public must come to grips with what the problem is, and determine to do what is necessary to solve it. This will require money, and lots of it. An amount of money proportionate to the problem should be committed to research and development of an alternative power source that does not pollute. An obvious example here is the steam engine, or Rankine Cycle Propulsion System which the Senate Commerce Committee stated is "a satisfactory alternative to the present Internal Combustion Engine in terms of performance, and a superior engine in terms of emissions."

If the automobile industry were to switch over to a radical new power system such as this, it is estimated that the cost would be in the neighborhood of $2 billion. This seems a great deal of money, but we should keep in mind that the money spent in one year on style changes is more than a billion dollars a year.

Considering the immense problem we are faced with, we have to come up with some new, bold, different ideas. Perhaps one such idea would be for the automobile industry to consider spending as much money on the development and eventual changeover to a system such as the external combustion engine as they now spend on style changes. This of course would mean very little money available for style changes. Perhaps it might even mean that the auto industry join together and declare a moratorium for several years on all non-essential style changes, and pledge that the money normally used for these purposes be spent on urgent research and development programs. Then we might be a great deal closer to the goal of clean air for our lungs.

Such a step would be radical and unprecedented. It would mean that additional billions would be available for the immense task with which we are faced. It would mean that little or no federal tax money would be needed.

But if the consumer is not willing to sacrifice such luxuries as style changes in cars so that he can breathe clean air, then we are just paying lip service to the problem of pollution.

I believe that it is not too much to ask. To not strike meaningfully at the root of the problem will result in just patchwork attempts to alleviate a spreading cancer. If this is too much to ask, then we may as well all go home, and sit on our hands, and wait for the inevitable end.

The problem of environmental pollution is great and immediate and unprecedented. It is immoral to allow this problem to continue. We must, then, take the great, immediate, and unprecedented steps that the morality of survival demands.

We must each, as individuals, as communities, as corporations, as a nation, make those painful decisions that are required. As individuals, you must ask yourselves the following type of questions: will you make a personal commitment to stop pollution as well as demand it of corporations? Are you willing to ride a bike to the library or to the store instead of driving? Will you cut down on your use of electric appliances? Will you stop littering the ground and demanding a differently styled car each year?

Before we throw trash on the ground, or buy an electrical gadget, or demand a differently styled car every year, we must, in the words of Rene Dubos, give due consideration "to the wind and the stars, to the flowers and the beasts, to smiling and weeping humanity."

## SENATOR MAGNUSON'S PLAN FOR A WORLD ENVIRONMENTAL INSTITUTE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) has been a leader in the struggle for a better environment here in the United States. His low-emission vehicle procurement bill was the first major antipollution measure to be passed by the Senate this year. His National Transportation Act has been the subject of hearings before the Commerce Committee, which he chairs, and promises to provide transportation systems in the future that are compatible with environmental and social needs. He has also established an Environmental Subcommittee on the Commerce Committee, and that subcommittee—chaired by the able Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART)—has held important hearings on pesticide and herbicide use that led directly to restrictions being placed on the most dangerous of these chemicals.

Recently, Senator MAGNUSON has made a dramatic new proposal in the field of environmental quality, a proposal that would enlist the support of all nations in a cooperative effort to deal with international problems of pollution and ecology. He has called for the creation of a World Environmental Institute in a Senate resolution that he plans to introduce shortly. As a cosponsor of that resolution, I hope that all Members of the Senate will become attuned to Senator MAGNUSON's thinking on this matter and will press for early consideration of his proposal.

The World Environmental Institute that Senator MAGNUSON envisions would have two major functions. First, it would serve as an international "clearinghouse" on environmental knowledge and studies; and second, it would serve as a global research center for international environmental problems.

The details of the institute, its need and its justification, are outlined in an excellent speech that Senator MAGNUSON made last week at the International Geoscience Electronics Symposium here in Washington. The Senator won the pledge of the scientists he addressed to help him in his effort to create this institute. This is a tribute both to his commitment and to the essential worthiness of his proposal.

In order to give the Senate the benefit of Senator MAGNUSON's thinking on this matter, and in order to encourage my colleagues to add their names to those of the 30 cosponsors of Senator MAGNUSON's resolution, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Senator MAGNUSON's recent speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WORLD VIEW OF THE ENVIRONMENT

(Remarks of Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON before the second annual International Geoscience Electronics Symposium, Washington, D.C., April 16, 1970)

I am deeply honored by your welcoming me to this International Symposium, and I in turn would like to re-extend the welcome of the United States to those of you who have come here from foreign lands. I know your Symposium will be a success; for you have assembled here a vast amount of talent, experience, and achievement from many nations.

Problems of the environment are an appropriate focal point for this Symposium, not only because the United States is experiencing a period of intense environmental awareness but also—as our visitors can tell us—because the United States has no monopoly on environmental problems or environmental concern. Few, if any, environmental ills are unique to a particular country. With the exception of isolated species of wildlife whose existence is threatened, most environmental problems—like pollution—are common to all industrialized nations, regardless of their size or form of government.

We are all familiar, for example, with the problems of the United States and other Western nations; but it is interesting to note that the Soviet Union is undergoing environmental difficulties similar to our own. Polluants from pulp mills are quicky destroying beautiful Lake Baikal, and a recent accident in a chemical plant is known to have killed millions of fish in an important Soviet river. And while we in the United States are still in the "talking stage" with respect to noise pollution, the Soviets have already taken action: cars and trucks are no longer permitted to drive through Moscow during the hours when most Muscovites are asleep. Perhaps these developments foretell a new contest to replace the arms race and the space race: an "environment race" between the East and the West to see who will have the cleanest air and water and the quietest streets. This would be a healthy and welcome form of competition indeed.

Yet the problems of environmental quality are global in scope and extend far beyond the industrialized nations of the East and West. Rapid population growth and economic development efforts make the environment a problem for the modernizing nations of the

world as well—regardless of their political systems or their foreign policy. The Ganges River in India is more polluted than the Rhine; DDT is spread far more thickly in the tropics than in North America. *Any* nation that hopes to increase its Gross National Product, its per capita consumption, or other indices of economic growth is faced with an inescapable dilemma about the impact of such development on its environment.

With this realization in mind—that environmental problems are rooted in the growth of population and technology, not in ideology—I want to share with you tonight a special hope, a hope that I believe is more than just a dream. It is a hope born of concern for the dozens of modernizing nations for whom environmental quality is a necessarily low priority today but for whom the experience of the industrialized nations could provide valuable assistance in making economic growth and environmental quality compatible. These nations have seen, and desire, the glamorous fruits of industrialization; and most of them have not yet paused to consider questions of ecology that we ignored ourselves for generations. A cooperative international effort could clarify the choices these nations face and could help them avoid the costly mistakes that we made in similar stages of our own development.

But my hope is born of other, more ominous concerns about the international aspects of environmental quality; concern about DDT being found in the fat of Antarctic penguins; concern about the oil globules that now dot the surface of the oceans; concern about the steady build-up of carbon dioxide in the Earth's atmosphere. These findings indicat. that international cooperation on environmental problems would be more than helpful—it may hold that key to survival for all of mankind.

I know that it isn't fashionable today to raise the issue of survival when speaking of the environment. We are told not to be alarmists, not to jeopardize public support for environmental programs by raising unjustified fears. But the rate at which the nations of the world are pumping poisons into the air, the water, and the soil makes survival a very real issue in the long run. No portion of the complex chain-of-life on this planet can die without threatening all other forms of life; the "death" of the oceans, for example, might seal the fate of mankind.

The issue that this raises is stark: no nation can survive while other nations perish; no country can prosper while other countries pollute the ocean and the atmosphere. Ultimately, for man to continue his existence on this planet, international cooperation and understanding will have to prevail. A pragmatic concern for survival will force us to achieve what an idealistic concern for peace and friendship never could: the realization that we are all brothers, destined to perish or prosper together as a species.

Adlai Stevenson, an American who was really a citizen of the world, summed up this realization long ago. He wrote that:

"We all travel together, passengers on a little spaceship, dependent on its vulnerable reserves of air and soil; all committed for our safety to its security and peace; preserved from annihilation only by the care, the work, and the love we give our fragile craft."

Ironically, we had to launch spaceships of our own before we saw what Stevenson had seen: Earth is a spaceship herself, on which every member of the human race travels together through the solar system and the infinite universe. An Apollo astronaut on the lunar surface can block out the vision of our distant planet simply by lifting his thumb. When he looks at Earth, he can see no national boundaries, no capitals, no place names, no armies. All he can see is a tiny, shining ball suspended in the black void of outer space.

Most of us will never stand on the moon. That makes our task even more difficult than the astronauts'. We must learn to see Earth as the astronauts have seen it, yet we must do so without ever leaving the ground. If we can achieve this vision—and we *must* achieve it—we will concentrate less on the issues that divide mankind and more on those matters that emphasize our common problems and our inter-dependence. We will realize that pollution of the Yangtze, the Ghanges, the Rhine, or the Dnieper is no less important to our continued existence than pollution of the Missouri and the Potomac. We will learn that DDT is no less hazardous to us all if it is sprayed on the Indian subcontinent instead of on the United States. And we will see that *all* wastes and poisons from around the world mingle together in our common environment—the air, the water, and the soil—to form a blanket of danger that envelops the guilty and innocent alike.

When we achieve this understanding, we have only two alternatives available: action or despair. To despair is to forget mankind's greatest virtues: his ability to cooperate, his ability to pass knowledge between peoples and between generations, his ability to establish goals for himself and to work until those goals have been met. Even with the aid of these abilities, however, action will not be easy. We will have to overcome centuries of mistrust, generations of conflicting ideologies, and years of suspicion and fear. But we will never be alone: no nation, no government can ignore the issue of survival.

Fortunately, there are many international organizations working today to bring about controls on pollution and harmful substances—the United Nations, NATO, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, to name only a few. These groups are attempting to establish international treaties, inspection procedures, and environmental police powers. Their success—and the success of many similar organizations—is essential to all men.

But these organizations, important as they are, cannot provide one vital function that must be performed: the gathering and dissemination of environmental information to *all* nations of the world. Since each of us has a stake in the environmental quality of other nations, we cannot afford to work only through existing international organizations that include some nations and exclude others. NATO by definition involves only one community of nations; the United Nations excludes the largest country in the world.

In addition, each of the existing organizations on the world environmental front is *political* in nature and is involved in disputes between different nations and blocks of nations. Even though politics will play an important part in environmental treaties and arbitrations, politics must *not* be allowed to interfere with the free flow of information and knowledge between all nations and all people. The world pool of knowledge and talent is a resource that belongs, like the air and water, to all mankind. No nation should be denied access to this pool because of political disputes with other nations. In fact, the solution to international environmental disputes may hinge on the sharing of knowledge and technology by all nations alike. This knowledge includes more than conventional environmental techniques—the technology of mass transportation, housing development, and automobile safety are clearly related.

So tonight, I am proposing for the first time that a *new* international organization be created. This organization, which might be called the World Environmental Institute, would serve as a central information center for all nations of the world. Every nation—regardless of its form of government or its international and domestic policies—could consult the Institute for expert advice on all forms of environmental problems. The Institute would serve both as a research center and as the repository of that worldwide pool of knowledge and talent. Through the use of computers, any country could obtain a thorough guide to the scientists and scientific studies around the world that relate to a particular environmental problem.

Under the auspices of the Institute, a continual exchange of scientists and technological information between the countries of the world would be possible on a non-political basis—not simply on the unilateral scale of today but on a multilateral level never dreamed of before. Task forces could be set up—consultants who would work as a team and on request visit the distant parts of the globe to undertake special projects. A constant flow of specialists between the Institute and other public and private research centers throughout the world would insure a balance in the Institute's personnel and purpose.

The Institute would be an international organization similar in spirit and purpose to the Olympic Games; but, like the Games, it would not heal the political divisions of the world, even with respect to environmental problems. International environmental disputes would continue to rage, with British soot falling on Swedish forests and with an Egyptian dam upsetting the ecology of the Mediterranean. The Institute would not attempt to arbitrate such disputes—that is the function of organizations like the United Nations. But the Institute would attempt to provide as much and as accurate information as possible to all those concerned and to the international organization within which such conflicts will be resolved. The Institute, let me emphasize again, would have no police powers—it would be like a reference book available to any and all nations with environmental difficulties.

It is not my intention to supplant the work of those hundreds of research institutions where scientists are now at work on complex ecological problems. On the contrary, the World Environmental Institute would serve as an index to these men and their work—helping to speed the flow of knowledge between those few who discover and those millions who need. The Institute will be an exchange, a reference center, a "clearing house" on environmental information—not a monolithic super-bureaucracy. It will be founded on a simple ideal: that the stock of knowledge about environment problems ought to be held in common by all men and that all men should have access to such knowledge whenever they desire it.

Surely the time has come for the United States to take the lead and to propose creation of the Institute to the nations of the world. The time has come for us to realize that world leadership and world prestige are based on the power of ideas, not on the power of weapons. And the time has come for knowledge—that most precious of man's many resources—to be liberated from the prisons of nationalism and the shackles of the Cold War.

In the next few days, I will introduce a Senate Resolution designed to accomplish these aims. The Resolution will express the sense of the Senate that the United States should begin now to explore, both formally and informally, the attitudes of leaders around the world with respect to the creation of the World Environmental Institute. The Resolution will further urge that the Institute proposal be placed on the agenda of the World Environment Conference scheduled by the United Nations for Stockholm in 1972 and that nations who are not members of the U.N.—like Red China—be extended specific invitations to participate in that Conference. In addition, I personally stand ready to meet with foreign leaders and scien-

tists in this country and abroad to promote the creation of the Institute.

Perhaps the plan I have laid before you is only a dream; perhaps, despite my hopes, the centuries of nationalism cannot be washed away by all the polluted waters of the world. Perhaps mankind cannot muster the will and the energy to insure his own survival. But as a Nobel Prize-winning novelist once wrote, man is not yet a finished creation: he is a challenge of the spirit. Response to that challenge of the spirit is the measure of man.

Survival is a challenge. Cooperation is a challenge. Peace is a challenge. A world view of the environment is a challenge. We may not meet these challenges, but we must try. For our response to these challenges will determine not only how we are remembered by future generations—it will determine whether or not there will be future generations to remember us at all.

Mr. KENNEDY subsequently said: Mr. President, yesterday, as America observed Earth Day, many proposals were put forth in many parts of the country to help solve the evils that pollution has done to our environment. I think yesterday's observance will bring many Americans to a greater realization that we must act to preserve and improve the environment of this Nation.

And, at this time, as we study the effects of Earth Day, I would also like to call to the attention of the Senate a proposal put forth by the senior Senator from Washington, Senator MAGNUSON. In an address on April 16 before the second annual International Geoscience Electronics Symposium, Senator MAGNUSON made some very constructive proposals on the larger question of international cooperation to prevent pollution. His address deserves the careful consideration of all of us.

I understand that the majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, has introduced this address into the RECORD. I would like to ask as well that the RECORD include a copy of an editorial from the Boston Globe of April 20 which examines and commends Senator MAGNUSON'S proposal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COURAGE ON POLLUTION

Sen. Warren G. Magnuson (D.-Wash.) proposes that the United States take the lead in the establishment of a "World Environmental Institute" to conduct research and store knowledge on a problem that knows no national boundaries.

It is our obligation to support the proposal, which should not, for the most compelling of political and moral reasons, be dismissed as merely another idealistic, do-gooder scheme.

For the United States, because of its not-altogether-blessed status as the world's most prosperous nation, is, in fact, the world's biggest polluter.

It is to a measurable degree the demand for the consumer luxury of air-conditioning that produces New York's Summer brownouts. They take their name more from the color of the sky than from the dimming of the lights in August.

The power plants (Mayor Lindsay is trying to do something about this, as are authorities in Boston) belch sulfurous fumes into the sky in order to manufacture the current to run the machines that clean the air. This cycle is increasingly futile.

Fly over the Bronx-Westchester line some bluebird-April day and look south, where you might expect to see the world's most magnificent city. You can't even see Central Park.

The ocean is dying where New York barges its sludge. Lake Erie is dead, and Michigan salmon are declared inedible. It is, largely, American DDT that is found in the too-fragile shells of osprey eggs that do not hatch and in the livers of polar bears and penguins.

Most tragically, it is petroleum to run the automobiles and the power plants of the United States that threatens the beaches and rocky foreshores of the world.

In his address that announced his proposal to the second International Geoscience Electronics Symposium, Sen. Magnuson stressed the international aspect.

"The world pool of knowledge on environmental problems," he said, "is a resource that belongs, like the air and the water, to all mankind.

"No nation should be denied access to this pool because of political disputes with other nations. Pollution of the Yangtze, the Ganges, the Rhine or the Dnieper is no less important to our continued existence than pollution of the Missouri or the Potomac.

"No nation can survive while other nations perish; no country can prosper while other countries pollute the ocean and the atmosphere. We are all brothers, destined to perish or prosper together as a species."

The senator wants the institute open to all nations, regardless of foreign or domestic policies, and he insists that the institute would be totally non-political.

Pollution, however, is already a political issue because the economic realities of the American consumer society render it political. This country has been accused, and can expect to be accused with increasing frequency and uncomfortable accuracy, of spoiling the earth in its attempt to subdue it and meet the insatiate demands of its citizens' rising economic expectations.

There is no indication that these demands and the technological capacity to meet them are going to disappear in the immediate future. Troreau's bean patch simply does not turn Reuther's auto workers' wives on.

In this sense, the United States and all the industrial societies have a great deal of rethinking to do about the meaning of progress and the purpose of life and the courses they choose to pursue happiness.

In time, the rethinking will be done. Meanwhile, the world needs to know that this country is responsibly aware of the situation it largely has created and is actively in pursuit of means by which the blessings and the consequences of technological advance can be reconciled.

Sen. Magnuson has proposed a way. That it will, inevitably, be subject to politicking, much of it designed to embarrass this country, should not deter conservationists. Ecology is more than an issue to distract people from immediate concerns.

Just as it took courage to admit, as most people now do, that the war in Vietnam was damaging our interests, it will take courage to confess our share in the despoliation of the world. Our sin is apparent from Pitcairn to Portland.

---

## SAFEGUARD—1970

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, an excellent paper on the present range of arguments concerning the Safeguard ABM system has been prepared by George W. Rathjens, Ph. D., and Herbert F. York, Ph. D. Drs. Rathjens and York have long experience within the Government as well as in private life in defense armaments and technology. I believe it is the most succinct synopsis and analysis of the current arguments seeking to justify deployment of the Safeguard ABM.

I ask unanimous consent that the paper be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS ON SAFEGUARD—1970

(By George W. Rathjens and Herbert F. York, April 5, 1970)

SUMMARY

The Administration's case for Safeguard as a defense for Minuteman is far weaker than it was a year ago. The actual technical situation has not changed materially but it is now conceded that if Soviet missile forces grow as projected in intelligence estimates, even the full Phase II of Safeguard would be inadequate to defend our Minuteman force against a pre-emptive attack. The defense would be effective only if the Soviet Union were to tailor its threat to match Safeguard's limited capabilities. Safeguard as a defense of Minuteman now looks so bad on cost effectiveness grounds, even to the Administration, that it can not be defended on its own merits. It is now being rationalized on the grounds that since we need an anti-Chinese defense anyway, the defense of Minuteman can be justified as an addition.

There is no need to go ahead with Minuteman defense at this time. We could safely wait a year to see how the "threat" is developing, and then make decisions, if necessary, to buttress our retaliatory strength. Options other than Safeguard would be less costly, more effective, and, even with a year's delay, available on a shorter time scale than Safeguard. Cancelling Safeguard (and deferral for a year or so of decisions to go ahead with additional offensive forces as well) would be highly desirable both because of dollar savings and because the prospects for a successful SALT outcome would be enhanced.

The arguments that Safeguard is needed to cope with a possible Chinese attack and that it could do so infallibly are both wrong. We can and should rely on deterrence vis-a-vis China (while at the same time trying to bring China into the world community). Safeguard is unlikely to be available by the time the Chinese have their first ICBM's. When it is available, the Chinese are likely to have capabilities for penetrating it. Certainly it would be foolhardy for the United States, in a belief in Safeguard's infallibility, to take actions some years hence that might lead to a Chinese attack.

Any attempt to maintain even a moderately effective defense in the face of an evolving Chinese "threat" is to commit ourselves to a program that will require continuous improvement and massive expansion. The money being asked for this year should be recognized as but the ante in a program that will involve the expenditure of billions each year with no end in sight and no increase in our security.

Not only should there be no expansion of Safeguard, the program should be cancelled forthwith. With Safeguard having been approved last year by a single vote it is clear that the collective view of the Senate was that the case for even Phase I was very marginal. Those Senators who had doubts about the proposal last year, but who voted for it, will find many of their doubts resolved this year in favor of cancellation. The Administration has now gone most of the way in conceding the validity of the opposition's arguments of a year ago. This is apparent from a careful reading of Defense Department statements of this year. It will become more apparent with questioning of Administration witnesses.

(1) DEFENSE OF MINUTEMAN

*The Administration now recognizes that the radars are the Achilles' heel of the Safeguard defense of Minuteman.*

There are two problems with the radars: they are relatively soft targets (perhaps able to withstand 1/10 the blast overpressure that Minuteman missile sites can withstand); and they are very expensive (of the order of $200 million each).

Because they are so soft, weapons with relatively poor yield-accuracy combinations will be able to destroy them. This means that the Soviet SS–11 missiles, of which there are very large numbers, would suffice. Also, if the Soviet Union should develop a MIRV capability for its SS–9 missile, that missile could carry large numbers of warheads of yield adequate to destroy the Safeguard radars. The defense cannot function at all if the Missile Site Radars (MSR's) are destroyed. Therefore, a large fraction of the defensive interceptors must be deployed so they can protect the MSR's. Because the range of the Sprint interceptor missiles is only about 25 miles, interceptors that are deployed so that they can defend the MSR's will be unable to defend many of the Minutemen in any given complex (the complex at Great Falls is about 200 miles across). Interceptors deployed to defend the more remote Minutemen would be unable to protect the MSR's. In addition, controlling the interceptors remote from the radar could be something of a problem.[1]

These problems could be very largely alleviated if it were feasible to employ a number of redundant radars at each Minuteman base. However, the very high cost of the radars makes this unattractive. Opposition witnesses suggested that the system might be greatly improved by developing and utilizing a radar specifically engineered for hard-point defense. However, the Administration brushed aside such suggestions. Thus, Dr. Foster, the Director of Defense Research and Engineering said:

"Each year we have looked for a cheap radar that could defend hard sites, and each year we have tried to think of a way of having a lot of radars that could do the job. And then we have come down on the decision that you really have to have a radar that can cope with all of the kinds of things that the enemy might throw at those hard points that you are trying to defend, and that is not a cheap radar. It is a rather expensive radar.

"This radar, from Raytheon, costs about $40 million.[2] Now you could get a radar for $10 million, but it would not do the kind of things that we think the radar has to do if it is to accomplish this mission." (ref. 3, p. 194)

and Secretary Packard:

"There has been talk about the possibility of using smaller harder radars for the defense of Minuteman. There are some areas where smaller and harder radars might be utilized, but this question has in fact been investigated. It is our conclusion, after looking at all aspects of the matter, that we need the kind of capability that the Missile Site Radar we are recommending here has, and we need the size in order to achieve that capability." (ref. 3, p. 1681–1682)

The Administration is now actively facing up to the fact that an effective defense against a heavy threat cannot be based on the MSR.

Thus this year we have Dr. Foster saying:

"If the Soviet threat to Minuteman should increase beyond levels that could be handled by the Phase II Safeguard multi-purpose defense, we might wish to augment the system by deploying several terminal defense radars in each Minuteman field. For this reason we have budgeted for development of a new radar, smaller and less expensive than the MSR. The new radar, although less capable than the MSR, could be deployed in greater numbers to improve defense survivability." (ref. 4, p. 2)

*The Administration now concedes that Safeguard, including the full Phase II deployment, will be quite inadequate if Soviet forces grow as projected.*

Secretary Laird now says:

"We are now faced with the following possibilities concerning Minuteman:

"(a) That the Soviets do not increase the deployment of the SS–9 and the SS–11, do not develop a MIRV for the SS–9, and do not improve ICBM accuracy. Under these circumstances there is no need for a defense of the Minuteman force.

"(b) That the Soviets stop building ICBM's beyond those now operational or started; they do not develop a MIRV for the SS–9; but they do improve the accuracy of their entire ICBM force. Under these circumstances, the force could constitute a threat to the Minuteman force and Safeguard would be quite effective against that threat.

"(c) That the Soviets deploy a MIRV on the SS–9, improve their ICBM accuracy, and do not stop building ICBM's at this time, but continue building them at their present rate. We would then be faced in the mid-70's with a threat which is much too large to be handled by the level of defense envisioned in the Safeguard system without substantial improvement and modification. (ref. 5, p. 48)

"To be perfectly candid, Mr. Chairman, it must be recognized that the threat could actually turn out to be considerably larger than the Safeguard defense is designed to handle. That is one reason we have decided to pursue several courses which should lead to less expensive options for the solution to this problem than expanding Safeguard to meet the highest threat level." (ref. 5, p. 49)

The contingency suggested in paragraph b of the quotation above implies a less active Soviet program than even the "Low-Force-Low Technology" estimate of the intelligence community. That estimate, according to Secretary Laird, credits the Soviet Union with possibly "hard target multiple RV's as early as mid-1972", and with a "hard target kill capability [that] would be considerable" (ref. 5, p. 104). It is not much of an exaggeration to say that the only circumstance, by the Administration's own admission, under which Safeguard would be effective would be one where the Soviet Union could be induced to tailor its strategic force to match the meager capabilities of Safeguard! Such a Soviet force posture might result if the SALT negotiations were successful, but otherwise seems exceedingly unlikely. Contrast this situation to that of a year ago when the Administration was claiming that Safeguard was needed in case the SALT negotiations failed. Secretary Packard:

"It provides a hedge against failure of arms control. If the Soviets refuse a workable agreement, then this country will be able to move to a protection of its second-strike force, if the Soviets continue to install more effective weapons." (ref. 1, p. 263)

Also contrast this with the Administration contention that Safeguard would be effective against a Soviet missile threat *including* one that involved not only increased accuracy but also MIRV's and increased numbers of SS–9's. Secretary Laird last year:

"The relative effectiveness of Safeguard option 2A in defending our Minuteman force can be measured in terms of the threat I mentioned earlier; namely, the large Soviet SS–9 type missile equipped with three independently targetable 5-megaton warheads with an accuracy of one-quarter of a mile. With a force of 420 of these missiles on launchers and an assumed failure rate of 20 percent, the Soviets could place over the Minuteman fields about 1,000 warheads. Without any ABM defense, it is possible that only about 50 Minutemen would survive. (A mixed force made up of fewer large missiles but including a number of highly accurate small missiles could produce similar results.) With Safeguard Phase I, perhaps two or three times as many Minutemen would survive and with Safeguard option 2A perhaps five or six times as many." (ref. 2, p. 27–28)

and Dr. John Foster:

"We think on the basis of those kinds of calculations that we can on an economic and practical basis, defend the Minuteman field against anything the Soviets will throw at us.[3] (ref. 3, p. 225)

*Because Safeguard is patently an uneconomic approach to defense of Minuteman, the Administration is now rationalizing its deployment as a desirable add-on to a nationwide defense that should be deployed against China anyway.*

Secretary Laird:

"We have further decided to continue deployment of Safeguard because the additional cost needed to defend a portion of Minuteman is small if the full area defense is bought." (ref. 5, p. 49)

Secretary Packard has estimated the costs for Safeguard Phase I to be $4.5 billion and for the modified Phase II (i.e. adding more interceptors and the defense at Whiteman Air Force Base) to be $5.9 billion (ref. 6, p. 16). From Secretary Laird's statement that with Phase I at least 10–20% of the Minutemen would have a heavy defense (ref. 2, p. 46) one might reasonably infer that at most 150 to 225 would be defended by Sprints in the case of Phase I. These figures are obviously *an upper limit* on the number that could be saved no matter what the weight of attack (provided it is of a quality such that it can penetrate the Spartan defenses). Thus, the minimum cost per Minuteman saved will be $20–30 million with the Phase I deployment. Perhaps 50% more Minutemen could be saved *as an upper limit* with the expansion to include Whiteman. In that case the minimum costs would run about $20–25 million per Minuteman. Compare these costs with those for buying additional Minutemen (6 or 7 million each for *super-hard silos* [ref.

---

[1] The problems of the defense of remote Minutemen were not well developed in last year's debate. In March Secretary Laird claimed with reference to Safeguard Phase I, "A heavy cover would be provided to roughly one-third of our Minutemen missile force" (ref. 1, p. 180). The use of the figure 1/3 implied that virtually all of the Minutemen at Grand Forks and Malstrom would be defended. Opposition witnesses pointed out that if the remote missiles were defended the same interceptors could not be used to defend the MSR's. There is an additional problem in that the MSR would be unable to "see" the remote Sprint missiles until they were well above the ground (for those as far as 80 miles away the altitude would be several miles above the horizon). This problem arises because of the earth's curvature and because radars do not work well against targets that are only a degree or two above the horizon.

Presumably in recognition of these problems Mr. Laird changed his position regarding the coverage for Minuteman that could be provided by Safeguard. Thus he said in May "We would have heavier protection for at least 10 to 20% of our Minuteman force". (ref. 2, p. 46)

There is no admission in the record that with this reduction in the number of missiles defended by Sprints there would be a reduction in Safeguard effectiveness.

[2] The cost of an MSR installed with the associated data processing equipment is now estimated at $150–200 million.

[3] Just how practical and economic the presently proposed defense is likely to be can be illustrated by some simple calculations.

2, p. 48] plus perhaps 2 million for missile), or with the cost of additional Polaris boats. (The whole Polaris force cost only about twice the cost of Safeguard Phase I.)

Looked at another way the Soviet problem of overwhelming Safeguard would be simple indeed, particularly if they have MIRV's. The SS–9 should be able to carry a dozen or so warheads of yield adequate, even without accuracy improvement, to destroy the MSR. A few months' production of SS–9's would suffice to exhaust the Phase I defenses and probably less than a year's production would exhaust the modified Phase II defenses.

This rationalization is fantastic particularly considering that there is not now a commitment to the full 12 site program, and there may never be. As will be apparent subsequently, the rationalization for a nationwide Safeguard, i.e. full Phase II, is about as weak as that for defense of Minuteman. If one truly regarded the Chinese rationale as primary, the order of implementation of the Safeguard program would be far different than the Administration plans. The first two sites deployed will provide coverage over only about 7% of the population and will be the least effective of the twelve in defending U.S. population. Two sites deployed for optimum defense of population would provide coverage over an area containing ten times as many people. Grand Forks and Malstrom would be the last sites deployed if we were primarily interested in population defense against China. Considering that, and the fact that there is considerable likelihood that we will never go through with a full Phase II deployment, virtually the full cost of the first two sites, and Whiteman as well, must be charged to defense of Minuteman.

*Secretary Laird now concedes that we could have much greater confidence in the deterrent capability of the Polaris-Poseidon fleet alone than he was prepared to admit a year ago.*

In the Administration's first rationalization of Safeguard they were scarcely willing to admit the deterrent role of Polaris. With criticism and under questioning, they eventually did so. Even then, however, they suggested that Polaris might be vulnerable to Soviet ASW effort to a degree inconsistent with reasonable technical judgment. Following further criticism they now take a more realistic view. The technical situation remains essentially as it was a year ago, but there is considerable difference in Administration statements as the following examples illustrate. Note particularly in 1969 Secretary Laird indicated serious concern after *1972–73*, but that this year he suggests *some* increase in Polaris vulnerability after the mid–1970's. March 30, 1969 Secretary Laird:

"The next question: Is there any reason to believe that our Poseidon force will be vulnerable to preemptive attack during the early 1970's?

"If this particular question is limited to the period through 1972–73, I would say I believe that our force will remain very free from attack. If you go beyond that time period, I would have to question that seriously . . . ." (ref. 3, p. 192)

February 20, 1970 Secretary Laird:

"According to our best current estimates, we believe that our Polaris and Poseidon submarines at sea can be considered virtually invulnerable today. With a highly concentrated effort, the Soviet Navy today might be able to localize and destroy at sea one or two Polaris submarines. But the massive and expensive undertaking that would be required to extend such a capability using any currently known ASW techniques would take time and would certainly be evident.

"However, a combination of technological developments and the decision by the Soviets to undertake a worldwide ASW effort might result in some increased degree of Polaris/Poseidon vulnerability beyond the mid-1970's. I would hope that Polaris would remain invulnerable at least through the 1970's. But, as a defense planner, I would never guarantee the invulnerability of *any* strategic system beyond the reasonably foreseeable future, say 5–7 years." (ref. 5, p. 40)

*The Administration suggests that the alternative to expanding the Safeguard deployment is to decide now to build new offensive systems thereby exacerbating the arms race. The argument is inconsistent with lead time realities.*

We need *not* make decisions at this time to deploy any new offensive systems if Safeguard is held to Phase II or cancelled. The defense at Whiteman Air Force Base will not be operational until 1975 at the earliest (and the other sites probably won't be either). Additional Minutemen could be deployed in considerably less time. This, Secretary Packard concedes:

"We think it (deployment of additional Minutemen) would take three or four years, including all of the administrative lead time)." (ref. 3, p. 1741)

The deployment of additional Minutemen at a time when they may be obsolescent because of MIRV development is hardly very attractive, but neither is spending billions on an ineffective defense of those we have. However, if one insists on increasing the number of Minutemen that would survive a Soviet first strike in the second half of the decade, clearly deploying more is an option that is preferable to defense. It would be considerably cheaper. It would be considerably more effective in increasing the number of surviving Minutemen we would have in the event of an attack against the force. This would be particularly so if they could be superhardened as may well be possible. And, what is most important, *no decision would have to be made now.* We could wait at least a year, and more likely two, while we tried to negotiate an end to the arms race. If at that time the construction of more Minutemen was indicated, we could begin and they would be operational as soon as Safeguard would be.

Realistically, we could also wait a year or so and then build more Poseidon submarines if it appeared necessary. They too would be more cost-effective, and they could probably also be operational by the time Safeguard would be.

Thus, Secretary Laird is being disengenuous when he says:

"In summary, our decision now to proceed with further deployment of Safeguard gives us another year in which to pursue SALT without ourselves exacerbating the arms control environment through actions on offensive systems." (ref. 5, p. 50)

(2) DEFENSE AGAINST CHINA

*Safeguard is unlikely to be operational by the time a "Chinese Threat" develops.*

According to Secretary Laird the Chinese may have an initial operational capability (IOC) with ICBM's by early 1973 though more likely in 1975 or 1976 (ref. 5, p. 109). The last of the twelve Safeguard sites could be installed by the late 1970's (ref. 6, p. 17).[4] Obviously as a defense against China Safeguard won't be much good until completed since if a few large cities are undefended they could be attacked even if the remainder of the defense were operational. If present plans are implemented there would be at least several years during which the Chinese would have an operational ICBM force when the large cities of California and those of the south would be undefended. *The President's statement that Safeguard could provide a "virtually infallible" defense against China (ref. 7) is technically unrealistic and dangerous.*

A single Chinese weapon of the yield they have already tested, 3 megatons, and which is suitable for their ICBM's (ref. 4, p. 4) could inflict well over a million fatalities if delivered on a large American city and a force of 25, even if only 40% reliable could inflict 11–12 million fatalities (ref. 5, p. 43). A defense might well reduce the number of Chinese weapons that could be delivered but it is totally unrealistic to expect none to get through, and it is quite likely that several will. There are a number of reasons for this: the radars might be blacked out, the Chinese might concentrate their attack against one or two areas, they might use penetration aids that would be highly effective, and the defense might just fail catastrophically.

The President's statement is a dangerous one in four respects:

(1) It was claimed that the anti-Chinese defense was needed so that we could credibly deter China from aggressive behavior vis-a-vis its neighbors. The clear implication is that with Safeguard in place the United States might take actions that it could not prudently take in the absence of defense. This suggests that millions of American lives might be lost if a future president, in an unwarranted belief in Safeguard's "infallibility", should take actions which might trigger a Chinese nuclear attack against us.

(2) The statement suggests an aggressive approach to dealing with China, not consistent with the Administration's otherwise constructive moves in this area.

(3) The statement, like the whole Safeguard proposal, will cause a reduction in confidence of the American public and the world in the U.S. Government as the incredibility of the argument becomes apparent.

(4) The statement suggests that the President is being dangerously isolated from responsible technical opinion on questions that seriously affect the security of the nation.

*The Administration's attempt to buttress its case for an anti-Chinese defense by arguing that deterrence may not work vis-a-vis China is unconvincing.*

Secretary Laird has argued (ref. 5, p. 43–45) that deterring China may not be feasible because such a large fraction of Chinese population is rural and because we must have enough weapons after war with China to deter the Soviet Union.

It is true that only a small percentage of Chinese population is in large cities but most of the industry and the technical and political leadership is concentrated there. A modest number of weapons delivered against the large cities would, therefore, probably destroy the government if not a large percentage of the people. But even aside from that, rural China is very vulnerable and this the Secretary has not recognized. Some ⅔ of China's population is concentrated in only about ⅛ of its area. Considering that, China would be very vulnerable to a fall-out attack. This will be especially so since outside the cities fall-out shelter potentialities are likely to be poor and stockpiles of food and medical supplies inadequate. A few hundred B–52's if loaded with high yield, surface burst weapons could probably destroy both China's urban *and* rural population. Thus, we can deter China without compromising in any way our missile capabilities. Moreover, considering China's poor air defenses virtually all our bombers would probably survive a single attack or even several round trips against China. Thus, our bomber capabilities vis-a-vis the USSR would be reduced only slightly should we ever execute a strike against China designed to destroy her totally.

*The Administration's claim that the Chinese are unlikely to develop effective penetration aids by the time Safeguard is fully deployed or soon thereafter (ref. 6, p. 9) is unrealistic.*

[4] Last year Secretary Laird suggested that the full Safeguard deployment could be completed by mid-1976 (ref. 2, p. 28, 85). Secretary Packard more cautiously suggested 1977 (ref. 1, p. 295).

Secretary Packard argues that the Chinese lack complex range instrumentation and skilled technical people that would be required to design and test penetration aids in which they could have confidence (op. cit.). In making the argument he totally misses the point that it is *we* who must have confidence that Chinese penetration aids will *not work* if we are to behave as if our defenses were "infallible"—not China that must have confidence that they will work. The Chinese could not attack the United States whether they had effective penetration aids or not without inviting the total destruction of China. Thus, the only rational purpose that a Chinese ICBM capability can serve vis-a-vis the U.S. is as a deterrent to us. For that purpose it is *our* view of Chinese penetration aid effectiveness that will be relevant. We cannot be sure they will not work.

In denigrating Chinese penetration aid potentialities Secretary Packard is probably wrong on technical grounds as well. He cites the fact that it has taken us ten years to develop high-confidence penetration aids, and uses this to buttress his argument that "Safeguard Phase II is expected to have a capability more than adequate to cope with the Chinese threat in the late 1970's" (ref. 5, p. 9). In so arguing, he completely misreads the history of technological emulation, and that is that once a new device or technology has been developed somewhere in the world others can repeat the development at much less cost and in a much shorter time than the original pioneers. There are countless examples of this but perhaps few that are as relevant and dramatic as the development of thermonuclear weapons. The intervals between a first nuclear explosion and a first themonuclear explosion were 7.3 and 2.7 years for the United States and China respectively. Belief that the Chinese cannot develop high quality penetration aids in a much shorter time than it has taken us is wishful thinking. If they test their first ICBM in, say, 1974, we must expect them, by the time Safeguard is fully deployed, to have penetration aids as effective as those we now have; and against such penetration aids the Safeguard area defense would be ineffective.

While the weapons enthusiasts may have schemes in mind for upgrading Safeguard so that it would be effective against an evolving Chinese capability, there is no realistic basis for Secretary Packard's contention that we could do so without a general thickening of the system (ref. 6, p. 10). The best hope of providing a reasonably effective defense against a late 1970 Chinese capability, and *it would not be "infallible"* would be to begin building *now* a defense very much like the kinds we have considered for defense of population and industry against the Soviet Union, i.e. terminal type defenses for all large American cities, and a nationwide fallout shelter program. A realistic anti-Chinese defense implies an unending program requiring the expenditure of probably five to ten times the amounts projected for Safeguard and it implies a defense to which the Soviet Union would probably react by further expanding its strategic offensive forces.

(3) DEFENSE OF BOMBERS

*With the erosion of its Minuteman and anti-Chinese rationales for Safeguard, the Administration is likely to play up the defense of bombers, but it has yet to explain why such a defense is necessary.*

Leaving aside entirely the extreme unlikelihood of the Soviet Union being able to destroy the Polaris force simultaneously with an attack against our ICBM's and bombers, the Administration still has not explained how the Soviet Union could confidently attack the latter two forces. If an attack were designed so that Soviet missiles would impact simultaneously on both our missile and bomber bases, we would have 15 to 30 minutes warning of the launch of Soviet ICBM's before impact. If the bombers are in a reasonable alert status a very large fraction should be air borne before the arrival of either Soviet ICBM's or SLBM's over the bomber bases. On the other hand, the Soviet Union could hardly defer launching its ICBM's against our Minuteman bases in an attempt to deliver a surprise SLBM attack against the bombers. Were they to do so, they would have to expect that the bulk of the Minuteman force would be launched between the time they destroyed our bombers and the time their ICBM's would arrive over our Minuteman bases.

*Even if fully implemented Safeguard Phase II will provide very little defense for bombers against a Soviet SLBM attack.*

While there has been little if any discussion of a possible MIRV program for Soviet SLBM's, it would be surprising if such a program did not develop if other MIRV programs continue. If the Soviet SLBM's use either MIRV's or high quality penetration aids, the Safeguard area defenses may be quite inadequate. Those air bases not defended by Sprints will have very little protection. The Administration has indeed proposed terminal defenses at the bomber bases (ref. 2, p. 78). Yet, MSR's and Sprints will be located near at most ¼ of the main operating bomber bases (ref. 3, p. 1749) that are near enough to our coasts to make a surprise SLBM attack feasible. To provide even a moderately effective defense for bombers would require increasing greatly the planned numbers of MRS's and Sprints.

(4) DEFENSE AGAINST ACCIDENTS

*The Administration still argues that Safeguard would be useful in coping with the arrival over the U.S. of one or a few accidentally launched missiles. Yet, it does not explain how the command and control problem would be solved.*

If Safeguard is to be effective in dealing with accidents, it must be usable at all times. This almost certainly implies delegation to launch down to very low command echelons including possibly even to the computers. Administration spokesmen continue to be obscure about this point, presumably either because they do not want to upset the public or because they have not yet decided on the command and control philosophy that will prevail.

(5) COSTS AND SCHEDULES

*Not surprisingly Safeguard costs have escalated and the deployment schedules have slipped during the last year.*

Last year it was claimed that the full Safeguard Phase II (including RDT & E but excluding AEC costs and annual operating costs) would be $9.1 billion (ref. 2, p. 29). Ten months later the corresponding figure is $10.7 billion (ref. 6, p. 17), an increase of over 17%.[4] And the program has slipped somewhere between 6 months and 10 months during the last year. (Secretary Laird admits to six or seven months slippage [ref. 8, p. 8] but Secretary Packard admits to 8 to 10 months [ref. 6, p. 6].)

The latter's explanations regarding slippage and increases in costs are interesting. He attributes 3 months' slippage to delay in getting Congressional approval for the Safeguard last year, but asserts that the remainder is "deliberate, to allow a more economical and less compressed construction schedule (5 to 7 months)" (ref. 6, p. 6). Curiously, later on Secretary Packard attributes 6% of the 17% increase in costs to the stretch-out of deployment (ref. 6, p. 18). (Of the remaining 11%, 4% he claims is due to inflation and 7% to design changes and more detailed estimates.)

We stretch out programs so that they will be more economical, but they cost more because we stretch them out!

(6) SAFEGUARD—SOVIET REACTIONS AND SALT

*Now that expansion beyond Phase I is contemplated, the Administration's contention that Safeguard is unlikely to lead to an expansion in Soviet Strategic capabilities is even less convincing this year than it was last year.*

If we are to have a defense that will be significantly effective in coping with an evolving Chinese ICBM force, the defense too must evolve. Unless that is contemplated there would be no sense whatever in starting on an anti-Chinese defense program. Yet, if we do try to build a defense that will be effective a decade hence, it will almost necessarily have to be a "thick" one, and deployment of large numbers of MSR or similar type radars will have to begin soon. With such moves, the Soviet Union is likely to further expand its offenses to offset its *extrapolations* of what that deployment may portend in the way of a large-scale nationwide ABM system. That would certainly be the American reaction were we to see a similar deployment in the Soviet Union.

A similar reaction is likely to follow a serious effort to defend bomber bases. A number are near enough to larger cities so that MSR's used for defense of the base could also be used to defend a city, and in some cases the bases and cities are so close to each other that the same Spirit interceptors could be used to defend both. If we don't put in MSR's and Sprints near the bases we won't have much of a defense. If we do, the Soviet Union is likely to perceive a need to expand its offenses to offset the implied city defense capability.

Defense of Washington will almost certainly lead to whatever Soviet targeting they feel is required, and if need be to increases in overall force levels, just as the Soviet defenses of Moscow have resulted in heavier American targeting of that city.

The Administration has argued that a full-scale Safeguard will be less likely to stimulate a Soviet response than Sentinel would have been because the radars will be more remote from large cities. However, if the map prepared by the Administration is even approximately correct MSR's will be deployed within 50 or 100 miles of a number of large American cities: Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Dallas, Kansas City, Detroit, Washington, Baltimore, and Boston. Sprints 50 miles from such cities could not defend them. However, the Sprints can be added relatively quickly if the radars are available and close enough to control them. Again, a Soviet reaction is likely. We may believe we have deployed the radars too far from cities to be useful for terminal defense, but will they? Would we discount MSR's 50 or 100 miles from large Soviet cities? Not likely.

*The argument that we need Safeguard so that we will have a strong hand in the SALT negotiations is far weaker this year than last.*

It is now admitted that Safeguard cannot cope with the kind of Soviet threat that is to be expected if the SALT talks fail, and it is rationalized on economic grounds as an add-on to a nationwide anti-Chinese defense. Under the circumstances, neither the anti-Chinese part of Safeguard nor the Minuteman defense is a very impressive card in the SALT negotiations. The former is hardly negotiable with the Russians; and the latter is so ineffective that it is hardly likely to impress the Soviet Union as something which they should pay a price to have us forego.

REFERENCES

(1) Strategic and Foreign Policy Implications of ABM Systems, Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organization and Disarmament Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, Ninety-first Congress, First Session, March 6, 11, 13, 21, 26, and 28, 1969.

[4] If costs continue to rise at this rate we will be at the $25–$40 billion level by the time the full Phase II deployment could be implemented.

(2) Safeguard Antiballistic Missile System, Hearings before Subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Ninety-first Congress, First Session, May 22, 1969.

(3) Authorization for Military Procurement, Research and Development, Fiscal Year 1970, and Reserve Strength. Hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate, Ninety-first Congress, First Session, March 19, 20, 25, 26, 27; April 1, 2, 3, 15, 16, 17, 22, 23, 29, 30; May 13, 14, 15; June 3, 4, 1969.

(4) Statement by Dr. John Foster, Director, Defense Research and Engineering, on FY 71 Modified Phase II Safeguard Program, 24 February 1970.

(5) Statement of Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird before a Joint Session of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations on the Fiscal Year 1971 Defense Program and Budget, February 20, 1970.

(6) Statement of Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard to Committee on Armed Services, United States House of Representatives, March 9, 1970.

(7) President Nixon's News Conference of January 30, 1970.

(8) Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird's News Conference of February 24, 1970.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations for the U.S. circuit court, the U.S. district court, U.S. attorneys, and U.S. marshals. I do so with the understanding that they were reported unanimously by the committee earlier today, and they have been cleared on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## U.S. CIRCUIT COURT

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Wilbur F. Pell, Jr., of Indiana, to be a U.S. circuit judge, seventh circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

## U.S. DISTRICT COURT

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations to the U.S. district court.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

## U.S. ATTORNEYS

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of U.S. attorneys.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

## U.S. MARSHALS

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of U.S. marshals.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

## NAMING OF FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING AND U.S. COURTHOUSE IN CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 3253.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3253) to provide that the Federal Office Building and U.S. Courthouse in Chicago, Ill., shall be named the "Everett McKinley Dirksen Building East" and that the Federal office building to be constructed in Chicago, Ill., shall be named the "Everett McKinley Dirksen Building West" in memory of the late Everett McKinley Dirksen, a Member of Congress of the United States from the State of Illinois from 1933 to 1969, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Federal Office Building and United States Courthouse at 219 South Dearborn Street in Chicago, Illinois, shall be renamed the "Everett McKinley Dirksen Building" in memory of the late Everett McKinley Dirksen, a distinguished Member of the United States House of Representatives from the State of Illinois from 1933 to 1949 and of the United States Senate from 1950 to 1969. Any reference to the Federal Office Building and United States Courthouse at 219 South Dearborn Street in Chicago, Illinois, in any law, regulation, document, record, map, or other paper of the United States shall be deemed a reference to such building as the "Everett McKinley Dirksen Building".

And amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide that the Federal Office Building and U.S. Courthouse in Chicago, Ill., shall be named the 'Everett McKinley Dirksen Building'."

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House with an amendment which I send to the desk on behalf of myself and Senators HRUSKA, MANSFIELD, SCOTT, MUNDT, BURDICK, and CURTIS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG). The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK read as follows:

SEC. 2. Upon a determination that a local educational agency lacks the fiscal capacity to provide an adequate free public education for children of persons who live and work on Federal property, and if such children constitute not less than 25 percent of the total enrollment, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall from sums already available make emergency payments for the current school year to such local educational agency as may be necessary to provide a free public education for such children: *Provided*, That the total of such payments shall not exceed $2,500,000 and shall not exceed the average per-pupil cost to such agency for all children eligible to receive a free public education from such agency, less Federal and State payments to such agency for free public education.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, this amendment has been cleared by the leadership, the distinguished Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) our majority leader is also a cosponsor of it and has a deep interest in its provisions. Also, the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT), is a cosponsor.

The amendment has the approval of the Subcommittee on Appropriations on Education, chaired by the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), and the ranking Republican, the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON).

It also has the approval of the chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee handling the bill, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), and the ranking member, the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER).

The amendment has been discussed with the leadership in the House—that is, the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee and the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the House Public Works Committee. We are assured of their full cooperation and consideration.

Mr. President, the amendment which we are offering would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide 100 percent funding for fiscal 1970 for the education of so-called 3–A children under Public Law 874, the aid to impacted areas program.

This amendment is designed to assist only those school districts which face a critical fiscal situation of an emergency nature.

It authorizes the expenditure of not to exceed $2.5 million out of existing appropriations for this purpose.

I am assured by Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, James F. Kelly, that this emergency expenditure would either come out of carryover funds or funds appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for other purposes but not already obligated.

It thus would have no effect on other school districts currently receiving assistance under Public Law 874.

At this time we are aware of two specific school districts—one in Nebraska

and one in North Dakota—which would benefit from this amendment.

Officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimate, however, that it would not include more than 10 school districts, the balance of which have not yet been identified.

The amendment authorizes an expenditure out of existing appropriations of not more than $2.5 million for this purpose.

The $2.5 million figure is an outside estimate and it would not be necessary to spend this full amount unless all the school districts Department of Health, Education, and Welfare officials estimate might be involved are identified.

No one can possibly question the obligation of the Federal Government to provide full entitlement for the education of so-called 3–A children of military families.

The 3–A category only includes children whose parents live or work on Federal property.

The military bases or installations on which these families reside are tax exempt.

Neither the States nor local subdivisions, including school districts, realize any tax revenue from these bases.

There is no property tax, real or personal; they pay no sales taxes on purchases made on the bases through facilities such as commissaries, post exchanges, base exchanges, gasoline stations, liquor stores, or the like.

The military personnel which are assigned to these bases have no choice with respect to their assignment.

They serve at these bases for specified, limited tours of duty.

In many cases the father is either just returning from Vietnam or Southeast Asia or will soon be sent there.

Because of the nature of these assignments, the Federal Government does provide Government housing on the bases for a large number of its personnel.

Certainly providing for the education of the children of the families of military personnel should be of the highest priority.

I have two such bases in my State—the Grand Forks Air Force Base, located near Grand Forks, N. Dak., and the Minot Air Force Base, located near Minot, N. Dak.

In both instances, the public school systems of the cities operate the schools on the bases.

One school district in particular—the Grand Forks school district—faces a very critical financial situation.

In fact, on March 10, 1970, the board of education for the Grand Forks public school district informed the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that with the resumption of classes after the Easter recess the school district could not accept nonresident students—this specifically included Air Force dependents—unless they paid nonresident tuition for the balance of the year.

Much as the Grand Forks school district regretted having to do this, they simply could no longer afford providing quality education to these military dependents for less than 100 percent entitlement under Public Law 874.

Subsequently, an injunction against the school district was sought by a group of parents of these children.

The injunction remains in effect, and under it the Grand Forks public school district is continuing to educate these children. The injunction, however, may only be of a temporary nature.

Mr. President, providing 100 percent entitlement for 3–A children does not represent a windfall to the school district.

This is merely a tax replacement payment for the cost to the school district for providing education for these children.

These school districts can no longer afford to continue providing quality education for these children at a considerable financial loss to them.

No one denies that the financing of this education is a responsibility of the Federal Government.

If the public school districts are no longer able to absorb these costs and, as I have indicated, this has already become the situation in at least one district in my State, the alternative would be for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to operate such schools.

This would include elementary, junior high, and high schools on the various bases.

This can be done under section 6 of Public Law 874.

Should it become necessary for the public school districts to discontinue educating these children, thus requiring the Government to undertake their education, I think we should all be aware of where the funds for such a program would come from and what the cost would be.

Mr. President, the funds to operate Government schools under section 6 would come off the top of moneys appropriated for Public Law 874 before any other allocations are made.

Section 6 school operations have first claim to the full extent they are needed on any Public Law 874 funds appropriated.

As to the cost of such a program, school administrators inform me that it is their estimate that it would cost the Federal Government twice as much to operate these schools under section 6 as it now costs the local school districts to provide education to these very same children.

To put it simply—if a school district is now entitled to $2 million per year as full entitlement for 3–A children, the section 6 approach would cost the Federal Government $4 million annually.

Further, Mr. President, such a school system would not—in the opinion of Department of Defense officials, Health, Education, and Welfare officials, and local school officials—provide as good an education as is presently being provided by the local school districts.

As I have indicated, Mr. President, our amendment would only authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to make payments representing full entitlement for fiscal 1970 for those school districts which face a fiscal crisis—or catastrophe.

The payments made under this authorization would be over and above funds they are receiving now—but not to exceed full entitlement.

Further, the amendment does not increase appropriations for this purpose.

It merely authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to spend not more than $2.5 million to meet these critical problems. It would continue the high quality education being provided by local school districts and make it unnecessary for the Federal Government to take over and operate the schools.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, as a cosponsor I rise in support of the amendment.

I would like to add a few words to what my colleague has said about the amendment. The amendment has two essential parts. It applies to the public education of children of parents who live and work on Federal property, and if such children constitute not less than 25 percent of the total enrollment, the triggering portion of the amendment is set into effect.

When that is found by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, he then shall have the authority to make sums available as emergency payments for the current school year to such local education agency as may be necessary to provide a free public education for such children.

This is most necessary at this time in the State of North Dakota, particularly in Grand Forks, where we have the Grand Forks Air Base.

There is a virtual emergency existing at this moment. The school districts are facing a financial crisis, and even the good relations which have existed between the personnel of the base and the people of the city of Grand Forks, have been affected by an amount of friction which has already occurred.

This legislation is a must. I again say that I strongly support this amendment and I hope that the Senate approves it at this time.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, as one of the cosponsors and as a strong supporter of the Young amendment, I rise in support thereof.

The Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) has made a splendid presentation of the situation which exists, and the serious and grave consequences which will result unless emergency action is promptly taken. This amendment seeks to provide emergency relief for the current school year to several school districts eligible to receive funds under Public Law 874.

The disbursements currently able to be made under this act for the 1969–70 school year are grossly inadequate in certain districts: the amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1970 do not enable them to continue in operation for the balance of the current school year.

Two of the school districts involved are:

First. Grand Forks, N. Dak., where it was necessary to resort to a Federal court order to force the schools to remain open.

Second. Bellevue, Nebr., adjacent to

Offutt Air Force Base, where great difficulty is being encountered in keeping the schools open.

Earlier this week, 164 teachers out of a total of 450 were notified by the Bellevue school board that contracts would not be renewed. In addition, 97 teachers have submitted resignations due to uncertainties of funding. There are possibly six or eight additional school districts which are similarly affected.

The school board, the school officials and the people of Bellevue have struggled valiantly, with patience and restraint, to find some reasonable solution to the crisis. They have now reached "the end of the road." There are no other avenues of relief for this current school year, except that provided in the proposed amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, a table showing pertinent statistics relating to the Bellevue school district and the funds available for its operation.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Data on Bellevue schools*

| | |
|---|---|
| Average Daily Attendance, Bellevue school district | 10,197 |
| "A" students (those with parents living and working on Federal installations) (43 percent of total) | 4,356 |
| "B" students (those with parents working on Federal installations) (35 percent of total) | 3,617 |
| Students with parents not working for Federal Government (22 percent of total) | 2,224 |
| 1970 entitlement under existing law: | |
| "A" students | $2,076,256 |
| "B" students | 861,201 |
| Total entitlement | 2,937,457 |
| Available under 1970 appropriations | 2,261,841 |
| Deficiency for entitlement | −675,616 |
| Total school budget for the 1960–70 school year | 6,385,776 |
| Estimated maximum amount available to Bellevue under the proposed amendment | 474,000 |

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is clear that quick action is needed to relieve the crisis for the balance of this school year. The pending amendment will supply it. While this will not be a permanent solution to the problem, it will ease the immediate situation. Additional measures will need to be enacted to provide for the coming school year of 1970–71.

The amendment contains adequate limitations to assure that only the most severely affected districts will be recipients of these emergency payments. The payments would come from sums already available, so that new appropriations would not be required.

The amendment applies only to those heavily impacted districts where at least 25 percent of the total enrollment of the school are children of persons who live and work on Federal property. The total of payments authorized to be made under this amendment is limited to $2½ million. The amendment will not affect the disbursement of funds to other federally impacted school districts under Public Law 874.

I urge approval of the amendment because the circumstances are serious. In fact, consequences would be dire, indeed, without it. There is a grave responsibility on the Congress to take this action. The alternative is to disrupt the school year's work and credit for over 10,000 pupils in the Bellevue school system, and some 11,600 pupils in the Grand Forks, N. Dak., district. In several other school districts as well, the consequences would be exceedingly serious.

It would be unconscionable to allow this to happen, especially, since this approach would not impair or reduce any other disbursements already provided under the program. Furthermore, a relatively small amount is involved.

Mr. President, a canvass has been made of the leadership on this side of the Capitol as well as in the other body. A careful canvass has been made of the committee chairmen and others interested in the pending bill, as well as in the subject matter of this amendment. We have been assured that they are all sympathetic with the objectives of this amendment. We have been assured that they will do their very best to bring about prompt approval of this amendment.

It is my hope that this result will follow. It is my further hope that the amendment will be promptly approved and that the bill as amended will be processed as expeditiously as possible.

The matter has been thoroughly discussed with the officials of the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Assistant Secretary-Comptroller of the Department, Mr. James F. Kelly, along with other high ranking officials have been consulted, and cooperated fully in the preparation of this amendment. They have also indicated their full support and approval thereof.

This is very gratifying. The situation is a complex one because of the pending legislation on the impact aid program itself for the school year ahead. Also, the hearings are now in progress on the appropriations bill for the coming school year. Every effort will be made to resolve the situation as quickly and as effectively as the parliamentary situation and the rules and the practices of the Congress can be complied with.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments with the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendments were agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I had to leave the Chamber at the time the amendment dealing with the situation for military families in Bellevue, Nebr., and Grand Forks, N. Dak., was considered.

As one of the sponsors of the amendment, which was unanimously adopted by the Senate, I want to say that I am pleased that this body faced up to its responsibility; that these military families, who have been living under great difficulties, now stand a fairly good chance—if the House concurs—to have corrected an inequity which has been detrimental not only to the family unit but also to the military service as a whole.

So I am very happy, as one of the cosponsors of the resolution, to join in the remarks made by the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) and the distinguished junior Senator from the same State (Mr. BURDICK), the distinguished Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA) and others, and to express my thanks to the Senate for considering this legislation and passing it so expeditiously. I would also express the hope that the House will do the same.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## NINETY-EIGHTH ANNUAL ARBOR DAY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in the tremendous outpouring of public response and cooperation on Earth Day yesterday, another venerable observance of equal importance may have been overlooked by some who are interested in conserving the Nation's great natural heritage.

The observance of which I speak is the 98th annual Arbor Day. While Arbor Day is observed in every State in the Union and in many foreign countries, it is a most important celebration to Nebraska because Nebraska is the State in which it originated.

Nebraska statute has established Arbor Day on April 22 and decreed it a legal holiday. It is celebrated no less vigorously in Florida and West Virginia, which have two Arbor Days each year, and in Utah.

Whether Arbor Day is officially observed on April 22, or on other dates as it may be in other States, I think it is important to remind this body that millions of people do observe this occasion every year.

It is also important to point out that in an age when we are increasingly concerned about the dissipation of our natural resources, we would do well as a Nation to reemphasize the basic values which motivated J. Sterling Morton to establish the first Arbor Day in 1872 in Nebraska.

Mr. Morton, newspaper publisher, horticulturist, and public servant, conceived the idea of Arbor Day in Nebraska City, Nebr., where he had moved from Michigan. Disturbed by Nebraska's miles of treeless plains, he inspired fellow Nebraskans to devote one day each spring to mass tree-planting.

Within 16 years after his mass tree-planting day had become an official State observance, more than 600 million trees had been planted and 100,000 acres of forest had been created on the once-barren Nebraska prairies.

The idea of Arbor Day spread quickly and within a few years, more than 35 States conducted their own observance. Today, every State observes the holiday, and in addition it is commemorated in England, Canada, Australia, British West Indies, South Africa, New Zealand, France, Mexico, Norway, Russia, Japan, and China.

J. Sterling Morton went on to serve his State as secretary of the Nebraska Territory and president of the State board of agriculture, and his Nation as Secretary of Agriculture under President Grover Cleveland. But, with all his excellent contributions to his State and Nation, he is best remembered for the conservation instincts which he instilled into a Nation of abundance in its early years.

Nebraska City, Nebr., the home of Arbor Day, is planning a massive celebration May 1–3 for this year's observance. Among the many events scheduled will be a tree planting by the National Guard in memory of the late Ray Thurman, a former Guard company commander. A similar planting at the VFW Home will honor each veteran killed in a war.

It will be my honor to attend the Nebraska City celebration, along with many other State officials and dignitaries from all over the State.

I am pleased to report, Mr. President, that the Senate Judiciary Committee today has reported to the floor House Joint Resolution 251, which authorizes the President to proclaim the last Friday of April each year as National Arbor Day. I urge the Senate to approve this resolution, enabling the President to elevate this important Arbor Day function to the national status which it so well deserves.

We, in Nebraska, are proud of Arbor Day and we observe it vigorously. Several other States follow suit. But, too often, the observances have fallen into a status of a formality which cannot be ignored but is not actively observed.

We are now in a period in this Nation when we are more and more concerned that our resources will be drained off and lost to future generations. I commend to those who are so concerned, the example of J. Sterling Morton. If more of us would take his positive approach to solving our resource problems, we might soon discover that we were indeed beginning to solve them.

Two fine newspapers, the New York Times and the Lincoln, Nebr., Sunday Journal & Star, last weekend took note of the importance of Arbor Day. I ask unanimous consent to have the articles printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Journal and Star, Apr. 19, 1970]

J. STERLING MORTON'S IDEA AN ECOLOGICAL STEP—ARBOR DAY ROOTS DEEP IN STATE

(By Opal Y. Palmer)

Arbor Day is observed around the world by millions each year.

To many J. Sterling Morton's Arbor Lodge is synonymous with the concept. Today the lodge is a state park with its own arboretum, the family stables, a formal garden and a 2,000-tree pine grove planted by Morton in 1892.

This park contains a three-room cabin grown into a 52-room mansion on the site of his original squatter's claim.

. . . When the noted agriculturist brought his bride, Caroline Joy, from Michigan to Nebraska in 1855 their destination was a 160-acre claim in the Nebraska Territory near the brawling river bluffs town of Nebraska City.

Morton's land was fertile but practically treeless although many trees grew on the river bluffs. After building an L-shaped house, he began planting trees. His site was probably the first in any prairie state to be landscaped. He set shade trees, planted an orchard and later landscaped with vines, shrubs and flower beds.

J. Sterling Morton emphasized tree planting through oratory, journalism and politics. He spoke on the subject at the First Territorial Fair in 1859 and at the dedication of the University of Nebraska in 1871. He used his pen in a tree campaign in the Nebraska City News.

After Nebraska statehood in 1867, Morton encouraged farmers—through publications and personal contact—to plant orchards. He employed political influence to get trees planted in honor of notables visiting the state.

At the 1872 annual meeting of the Nebraska Board of Agriculture of which he was a member, Morton presented a resolution that April 10 be set aside for tree planting and that it be called Arbor Day.

The resolution was adopted. But in 1885 the state legislature made Arbor Day a legal holiday and set the official date on April 22, J. Sterling Morton's birthday.

Other states followed Nebraska's example. It was almost as though an old Indian legend were in operation, where one tree whispered the message to another. For today, every state except Alaska observes a tree-planting day.

Nebraska's act inspired Illinois to proclaim an Arbor Day in 1888.

When the white man arrived, half of the area which is now Illinois was wooded. Early settlers permitted forests to burn unchecked and ravaged trees for industry. Conservationists seized on Morton's Arbor Day idea in an attempt to repair the damage with systematic planting.

C. A. Hammond, secretary of the Illinois State Horticultural Society, encouraged citizens in a public statement to plant "one or more specimens of all our native trees" in a public park for every town and village. He recommended special trees for Arbor Day planting "for school and church yards, along roadsides, and in cemeteries."

As is true with many good causes, there was some dissension. Citizens objected to roadside plantings on the grounds that the shade would prevent the rapid drying up of mud after rains.

Jabez Webster of Centralia, Illinois, welcomed Arbor Day because: "In our great country, in the scramble for the almighty dollar, we have almost lost sight of the beautiful in nature."

The 1,200-acre Morton Arboretum is situated at Lisle, Ill., west of Chicago. The aboretum, which contains about 4,800 species and varieties of plants and trees, is open to the public year round.

MORTON AG SECRETARY

Other countries have adopted the Arbor Day practice. By 1961, a tree-planting day had been set aside in England, Canada, Australia, British West Indies, South Africa, New Zealand, France, Mexico, Norway, Russia, Japan and China.

Morton was defeated for governor three times. However he served his state in many official capacities and was secretary of agriculture under president Grover Cleveland beginning in 1893.

Joy Morton, J. Sterling Morton's son, deeded sixty-five of the original acres to the state in 1923 as a memorial.

Thousands of nature lovers stop each year at Arbor Lodge to delight in the blossoms and pattern gardens, the heritage of a pioneer generation.

---

[From the New York Times, Apr. 19, 1970]

WHAT BECAME OF ARBOR DAY?

(By Richard Reinhardt)

Two great holidays of American origin outshine all others in their freedom from chauvinism, sectarianism and commercial exploitation.

One is Thanksgiving, a feast of brotherhood and gratitude based upon a long and honorable historic tradition. The other is a neglected, ridiculed, almost forgotten festival called Arbor Day, which celebrates human kinship with the living earth. Of all our major anniversaries, Arbor Day is the least known and least respected, although it probably is the most significant of all holidays in an era of destructive technology, irretrievable waste and the dark stain of poisons in the air and water.

Unlike the general run of civic and religious celebrations, Arbor Day was the deliberate creation of one man, a Nebraska newspaper publisher named Julius Sterling Morton. It was Morton's happy notion, inspired by ancient European and Middle Eastern folkways, to devote a day each spring to mass treeplanting. During his long career as a horticulturist, editorial writer and politician, he succeeded in spreading this idea to several dozen states and a handful of foreign countries.

Morton first gave evidence of his zeal for forestry in 1854, when he moved from his boyhood home in Michigan to the treeless prairies of Nebraska. Taking squatter's rights on 160 acres of naked loam on the west bank of the Missouri River, he built a four-room house for his young wife and almost immediately began planting slips and seeds. Within a few years he had surrounded the cottage with a jungle of shade trees, shrubbery and vines and was using the columns of his Nebraska City News to urge his neighbors to get busy with their own landscaping projects.

With his friend, Robert W. Furnas, who had started a large orchard in nearby Brownville, Morton toured eastern Nebraska to encourage farmers to plant fruit trees. It was largely to the credit of these two men that the area became an important fruit-growing region.

But Morton's enthusiasm for vegetation went far beyond uses of commercial agriculture. He saw by treeplanting as a communal function with social and educational values. He hounded churches, schools and clubs to undertake planting projects, and he came up with the suggestion that Nebraska towns should set out young trees to commemorate such notable events as the visit of a distinguished guest, the dedication of a public building, or the anniversary of a respected leader.

For four years—1858 to 1861—as secretary of the Nebraska Territory, and later as president of the State Board of Agriculture, Morton had frequent occasion to promulgate

both his simple, Jeffersonian faith in the nobility of small farmers and his love of trees. He seldom passed up an opportunity to state the case:

"If every farmer in Nebraska will plant out and cultivate an orchard and a flower garden, together with a few forest trees, this will become mentally and morally the best agricultural state in the Union."

This message with its calm faith in the ultimate virtue of hugging close to the earth was balm to the homesteaders of that raw territory, where nature was harsh, tillage was difficult and failure was common. When Morton published a resolution in 1872, calling on this courageous fellowship of farmers to conduct a state-wide day of tree-planting in early April, the Nebraskans responded by planting something over a million trees.

Two years later Morton's friend, Robert Furnas, who had been elected Governor of the state, proclaimed April 8 the official Arbor Day. With this authoritative blessing, the holiday blossomed into Nebraska's favorite public event. Over the next 16 years, the people of the state planted more than 600 million trees and created 100,000 acres of forest on the once-open plains. The Nebraska legislature in 1885 made Arbor Day a legal holiday, setting it on the date of Sterling Morton's birthday, April 22.

Arbor Day spread with marvelous speed. Kansas, Tennessee, Minnesota and Ohio quickly adopted the idea. By 1890, 35 states had established some kind of Arbor Day, each one picking a date that was appropriate to the local climate.

Few states kept Arbor Day with as much enthusiasm as did Nebraska, but few dared to ignore the occasion. Then as now, the word "conservation" was a shibboleth. The United States rapidly was changing from a rural nation of small farmers into an urban nation of factory workers, and this sentimental rural, earth-centered ceremony seemed to provide a link with the past and a promise for the future. Cynical legislators saw this harmless holiday as a sop for the worriers who were already complaining about disappearing forests and lost wilderness. Arbor Day? Why not? How much easier it would be to plant a few new trees once a year than to forbid the wanton cutting of virgin timber.

What has happened to Arbor Day? On paper it is flourishing. Every state in the union gives it some form of official sanction. two states (Nebraska and Utah) make it a legal holiday, and two other states (Florida and West Virginia) celebrate it twice a year. Elementary school classes everywhere set out arborvitae trees along the parking strip. Ladies clubs adorn the facades of telephone exchanges and state and Federal tree nurseries ship out millions of seedlings to be planted in windbreaks, woodlots and erosion barriers.

But these demonstrations of amateur agriculture do not add up to a great national sentiment for the stewardship of the earth. They are only ludicrous parodies of a pioneer ritual that was intended to seal a yearly covenant with nature and to inculcate in young and old a reverance for the earth and a sense of personal responsibility for its perpetual renewal.

The spirit is gone dormant. Arbor Day is a sham. It goes on, year after year, but it no longer seems important.

Part of the trouble is that Arbor Day began in a struggling, frontier society that has disappeared. Once the buffalo grass had been plowed under and "village adornment societies" had done their work of planting cotton woods and elms on the residential streets of the Great American Desert, Arbor Day lost its compelling urgency.

Then, too, America has become an urban nation. Our tastes are more sophisticated. Family picnics at the country fairgrounds no longer amuse us. On holidays we drive 300 to 400 miles to go watersking. Arbor Day smacks of the rural past. It reminds us of lukewarm lemonade, speeches on the courthouse steps, Main Street, outhouses, dialect jokes and other crudities we have outgrown.

The saddest reason for the decline of Arbor Day is that many Americans have lost their easy confidence in the positivist principles that guided Sterling Morton and thousands of tree-planting committees since his time. Recent history has given ample evidence that the good, the true and the beautiful do not inevitably triumph. The faith of a Nebraska editor in the ultimate progress of civilization through the promulgation of shade trees and flower gardens now seems blissfully naive. We have learned that trees grow in slums and in concentration camps and on battlefields. How can we pretend that planting trees will guarantee a general improvement in the moral quality of mankind?

The questions is why do we bother to keep Arbor Day on the calendar? In its present form, it is a mockery of the very principles it espouses. It would be worth keeping only if it could be revived and reestablished as a national day of homage to the earth. If that should happen, Arbor Day could become the most important holiday in the year.

There are reasons to think this observance would be welcomed by most Americans. The harshness of frontier life has, in a sense, returned to this richly favored continent. In the midst of luxuriant technological development, we find ourselves looking forward into a wasteland as dark and dry as any that confronted a starving immigrant on the Great Plains. Once again, we are confronted by the frailty and finite limits of the natural environment.

It would do us spiritual and practical good to have a day in which to demonstrate that we are not helpless to save ourselves from this crisis, to show that, as a nation, we are capable of owing as well as reaping, of healing as well as hurting, of creating as well as destroying. Arbor Day would be a pledge to our children that we will not let the world go to waste; that there will, indeed, be blue skies, greenery and clear water, and that trees will endure.

To serve this object, Arbor Day must become a legal, national holiday. Past efforts to accomplish this have failed, but it is time to make the effort again. Even if it is impossible to find a date to suit all climates, a date could be chosen that will satisfy a majority of states. April 22, Morton's birthday, might well be as suitable as any.

When a date has been chosen, Arbor Day could be called each year by Presidential proclamation, as is Thanksgiving. The President could appoint a national committee to advise him on programs of environmental concern that can be undertaken as Arbor Day projects. The committee could coordinate state and local projects so that the impact of Arbor Day would be immediate, conspicuous and exemplary.

Above all, the pattern of Arbor Day activities must change to suit the mood and manners of today. This holiday is too important to be laid out and embalmed in a 19th-century costume. Arbor Day needs a fresh array of ceremonial symbols, an infusion of new ideas.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## PRESIDENT NIXON MAKES MAJOR CONTRIBUTION TO STRATEGIC RESTRAINT

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, the beginning of the strategic arms limitation talks is an event of utmost importance. The success of these vital negotiations will depend on the willingness of both the Soviet Union and the United States to accept certain mutual restraints in the interest of their common security. It is important for both Americans and Soviets to develop greater appreciation of each other's purposes. And in our quest for joint limitations on strategic arms, we need to couple a heightened sense of urgency with a sober understanding that there is still time to ward off a new spiral in the nuclear competition.

The Soviet Union, speaking through a historic Pravda article of March 7, struck precisely this balance.

Despite the difficulties—

Wrote Pravda—

it is obvious that there is still time and there are still possibilities for reaching an understandng which all states await and by which they will gain . . . If both sides intend to hold honest talks without striving to obtain any unilateral military advantages and if the negotiations proceed from the need to insure equal security for both sides . . . , then one can count on achieving agreed solutions.

Much the same tone was sounded by the Soviet Party leader, Mr. Brezhnev, on the eve of the Vienna talks:

If the U.S. government really wants a strategic arms limitation treaty, . . . prospects for the negotiations may be viewed positively. The Soviet Union in any case, will do all within its power to see that these talks prove useful.

These observations are a constructive prelude to the substantive discussions now getting underway.

All of us know the deep suspicion with which each country has come to view the other. Just as Americans have been apprehensive about the Soviet Union's true purposes, so the Soviet Union has been prone to doubt America's genuine interest in arms control.

It is essential that Moscow understand that the United States is indeed dedicated to agreed and verifiable arms limitations which will serve the interests of both our peoples. By now I hope the Soviet negotiators in Vienna are already reporting to their Government the obvious fact that the United States has prepared for these negotiations in the most comprehensive and serious manner. The intensive work and evident good will of the American delegation will, I trust, have impressed itself upon Deputy Foreign Minister Semenov and his colleagues.

In this connection the United States has undertaken a major act of strategic restraint which should be emphasized. It is an act grounded on President Nixon's admirable and decisive commitment to mutual deterrence as the fundamental

rationale for American strategic forces. Over a year ago, the President set forth his awareness that, in today's world, mutual security depends on mutual deterrence. He made clear that neither the Soviet Union nor the United States could safely attempt to deny the other the capacity to retaliate. Any such effort would be futile, since both countries will take whatever action is required to maintain a confident second-strike capability. Thus, programs which seem to jeopardize either side's retaliatory forces are guaranteed to stimulate compensating changes or increases in those forces.

On this central insight President Nixon has based his search for mutual arms control. It required the reorientation of America's planned ABM program toward a principal focus on defense of the U.S. deterrent forces, recognizing that no defense of American cities was feasible against the size and character of nuclear attack which the Soviet Union can mount. Whatever our views of the proposed Safeguard deployment, we should not lose sight of this important shift in the program.

Of still greater significance has been an unpublicized change in the plans for the U.S. MIRV program. Those of us who have worked for many months to support a mutual ban on MIRV testing and deployment have stressed the hazard that such systems pose for mutual deterrence. We have stressed that such weapons could ultimately destabilize the balance of power by posing an intolerable threat to hardened missile sites. At the same time, however, it has been stressed that the first generation U.S. MIRV systems are too inaccurate and too low yield to pose a threat to hard targets.

To perfect highly precise MIRV systems with adequate yield to destroy hardened missile silos would require a concentrated development program over a period of several years and costing tens of millions of dollars. Unfortunately, from the very beginning, discussions of the U.S. MIRV program have been ambiguous. While primary attention has been given to the function of ABM penetration for retaliatory purposes, there have been frequent allusions to possible applications of MIRV against hard targets. Preliminary studies of such applications were in fact begun some years ago, before President Nixon explicitly defined American strategic policy as one of mutual deterrence.

These studies account for much of the anxiety over MIRV deployment. For example, on January 16, 1968, the Department of Defense publicly indicated that—

> Each new MIRV missile warhead will be far more accurate than any previous or existing warheads. They will be far better suited for destruction of hardened enemy missiles than any existing warhead.

As recently as last October 7, the Air Force Chief of Staff, Gen. John Ryan, alluded to such advanced MIRV systems in testimony before the House Appropriations Committee:

> We have a program we are pushing to increase the yield of our warheads and decrease the circular error probable so that we have what we call a hard target killer which we do not have in the inventory at the present time.

It is wholly understandable that such statements would alarm those responsible for the protection of Soviet strategic forces. It is also quite clear that such programs would be incompatible with the judicious strategic policy adopted by President Nixon. It is for that reason essential to make absolutely clear a far-reaching commitment which the President has now undertaken.

In the course of numerous exchanges which the President and I have had on the dangerous implications of MIRV technology, Mr. Nixon has indicated his specific decision not to pursue the program to which General Ryan referred.

In a letter of December 29, 1969, the President reiterated his basic commitment to maintain our deterrent, but not to engage in programs which threaten any nation with a first strike. The President indicated:

> There is no current U.S. program to develop a so-called hard-target MIRV capability. The particular program to which General Ryan referred did not receive Department of Defense approval for funding in the forthcoming Defense budget.

I cannot exaggerate the importance of the President's decision to abandon the proposed program to perfect a hard-target MIRV capability. The scope of this commitment to avoid destabilizing technology is underscored by the parallel decision not to press forward with a program to improve the guidance and accuracy of the Poseidon missile system.

Mr. President, certainly these measures of restraint do not mean that we should proceed with the planned deployment of less accurate MIRV systems in the coming years. In my opinion, such weapons are not yet required and will not be until there is a substantial expansion of Soviet ABM capabilities. Much to be preferred would be a joint arrangement in SALT by which both countries refrain from proliferating ABM systems and introducing multiple-target capabilities into their offensive missile forces. We must continue to seek a ban on MIRV testing and deployment.

But I believe it is of critical importance that the United States is exercising restraint on advanced development of even more dangerous MIRV weapons. It is another indication of Mr. Nixon's earnest desire to find a mutually acceptable basis for stabilizing the strategic balance and for enhancing the security of both our nations.

My purpose in making these comments today is to highlight a hopeful and forward-looking action by the American Government. In the initial days of the SALT discussions in Vienna, this signal contribution to mutual security should be reassuring to the Soviet Union. The Soviet leaders can be confident that their forces are not in imminent danger from the relatively crude American MIRV systems which are being developed. They should also find assurance in the knowledge that any specific development program to produce a true hard-target capability in the U.S. MIRV systems would take years and would be highly visible through the elaborate test programs required, not to mention the congressional and public reviews which such a proposal would arouse. I do not believe that, on present evidence, the Congress would authorize such a dangerous and unwarranted development.

By the same token, this act of restraint is an invitation to the Soviet Union. The United States is profoundly concerned about potential hard-target applications of the Soviet SS–9 missiles, which already are deployed in substantial numbers. It would be most conducive to progress in the SALT negotiations if the Soviets were equally prepared to provide credible assurances that the SS–9 and other Soviet weapons were not being refined for possible use against U.S. missile sites. I remain convinced that the most promising approach to such mutual guarantees would be an end to MIRV testing and a prompt suspension of further deployments of offensive and defensive missiles on both sides, as the Senate recommended in its overwhelming approval of Senate Resolution 211 2 weeks ago.

Surely the Soviet Union must share our perception that security can only suffer from a continued arms race. And surely a comparable Soviet willingness to undertake concrete acts of restraint would be the most hopeful augury for rapid progress in Vienna.

---

## COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. HOLLAND) laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF THE TREASURY BY THE PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

A letter from the President, Panama Canal Company, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for reimbursement of the Treasury by the Panama Canal Company for the annuity paid to the Republic of Panama (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO REVISE THE PROMOTION SYSTEM FOR CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend titles 10 and 32, United States Code, to revise the promotion system for certain officers of the Reserve components of the Army (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROPOSED FACILITIES PROJECTS FOR AIR NATIONAL GUARD AND AIR FORCE RESERVE

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Housing), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve subsequent to 30 June 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report relating to funds obligated in the chemical warfare and biological research program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1967

A letter from the Director, National Headquarters, Selective Service System, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to provide authority for the President to phase out undergraduate student defer-

ments, and to modify the method of allocating quotas and calls (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO FURTHER THE REDUCTION OF DRAFT CALLS IN THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 37, United States Code, to further the reduction of draft calls in the armed forces of the United States by increasing the pay rates of certain enlisted members of the uniformed services (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS PROGRAM EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES

A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of Federal contributions program equipment and facilities for the quarter ended March 31, 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF ARMY CONTRACTS FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AWARDED WITHOUT FORMAL ADVERTISEMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of Department of Army contracts for military construction awarded without formal advertisement for the period July 1 through December 31, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF U.S. SOLDIERS' HOME

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the U.S. Soldiers' Home for fiscal year 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING DIRECT LOANS TO VETERANS FOR SPECIALLY ADAPTED HOUSING

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1811 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Veterans' Administration to make direct loans to any veteran who is determined to be eligible for assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing under chapter 21 of title 38, United States Code (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO INCREASE TAX ON MOTOR VEHICLE FUELS SOLD IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the assistant to the Commissioner, Executive office, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a tax on motor vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROPOSED SMALL BUSINESS TAXATION ACT OF 1970

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to ease the tax burdens of small businesses, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the need to improve military supply systems in the Far East, Department of Defense, dated April 21, 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on further improvement needed in the management of magnetic tapes by Goddard Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, dated April 22, 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR THE PROTECTION OF PUBLIC LANDS FROM FIRES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts for the protection of public lands from fires, in advance of appropriations therefor, and to twice renew such contracts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Mr. Howe Fook Tang from a report relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on September 1, 1969; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WILLIAM B. RICHARDSON v. DAVID M. KENNEDY

A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, the fact that a citizen taxpayer has instituted an action in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania, challenging the constitutionality of Public Law 90-206, under which the rate of payment of compensation to Members of Congress has been determined; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PROSPECTUS TO AMEND CERTAIN PUBLIC BUILDING PROJECTS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a prospectus which contains proposed amendments to 15 authorized public buildings projects (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON REVISED ESTIMATE OF COST OF COMPLETING THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a revised estimate of the cost of completing the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways prepared for the purpose of apportioning Interstate System funds authorized for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1972, June 30, 1973, and June 30, 1974 (with an accompanying report ); to the Committee on Public Works.

PROPOSED DISASTER ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1970

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Preparedness, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend existing Federal disaster assistance legislation, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

## PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. HOLLAND):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"H. CON. RES. 1057

"A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide that Federal statutory and other regulations over small meat slaughterers shall not be such as would preclude their continuing in the operation of their business; and directing distribution

"Whereas, recent federal legislation has threatened the continued existence of many small meat slaughtering businesses across the State of Oklahoma; and

"Whereas, such legislation by exempting from antemortem and postmortem examinations for each animal only those custom slaughtering businesses which do not sell or buy carcasses or meat food products places an undue burden on such businesses; and

"Whereas, many custom slaughtering businesses must, in order to stay in business, operate the logical auxiliary business, that of a meat market; and

"Whereas, such legislation could be interpreted to require such additional facilities or modification of existing facilities of the small slaughtering businesses as would not be economically feasible for such businesses; and

"Whereas, the small slaughtering businesses of this state perform a vital and important service to many of the citizens of this state; and

"Whereas, such businesses have many differences from the larger companies such as not requiring minimum orders and serving rural Oklahoma with limited capital which justify legislaton concerning such businesses to take their particular circumstances into account so that they may continue to serve the people of this state.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 2nd session of the 32nd Oklahoma Legislature, the Senate concurring therein:

"Section .. That the Congress of the United States be and hereby respectfully is urged to maintain federal statutes and regulations over small meat slaughtering businesses and is urged to avoid those which, without permitting alternative measures capable of adequately protecting the consumer, would be so harsh as to preclude continued operation of such businesses.

"SECTION 2. That duly authenticated copies hereof be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States and to each member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress.

"Adopted by the House of Representatives the 5th day of March, 1970.

"REX PRIVETT,
*"Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

"Adopted by the Senate the 15th day of April, 1970.

"TOM PAYNE,
*"Acting President of the Senate."*

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"H. CON. RES. 11

("Requesting action to increase the Federal milk subsidy for Hawaii under the National School Lunch Act for schools and other related program)

"Whereas, it is the declared policy of Congress to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children and encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other foods, by assisting the States, through grants-in-aid and other means, in providing an adequate supply of foods and other facilities for the establishment, maintenance, operation and expansion of nonprofit school-lunch programs; and

"Whereas, the National School Lunch Act and the Special Milk Program for schools and children's centers under the United States Department of Agriculture operate in cooperation with State and local educational agencies to provide a cash reimbursement to provide wholesome milk based on tested nutritional research at a low cost to children between the ages of five and seventeen inclusive in public or nonprofit private schools of high-school grade or under, settlement houses, homes for children, and summer camps; and

"Whereas, this Federal assistance enables

educational agencies to lower the price of milk to children, and areas of severe need, can cover the entire cost of milk served; and

"Whereas, a 1967 study on the cost of milk production in Hawaii reveals that, in comparison to California, the cost to produce 100 pounds of milk is 67 percent higher, feed costs are 56 percent higher, labor costs are 57 percent higher, roughage costs per ton are 96 percent higher, and the cost of concentrates per ton is 44 percent higher; and

"Whereas, the retail price of fresh milk per one-half gallon in Hawaii has increased from 64.6 cents in 1968 to 65.3 cents in 1969, both prices being 10 or more cents above the national retail price average for one-half gallon of fresh milk; and

"Whereas, the increased price of milk has had a significant effect on sales in Hawaii under both the National School Lunch and Special Milk Programs where the daily milk consumption in gallons has not correspondingly increased with increased school enrollments and in fact caused a drastic drop in the daily consumption of milk in the Special Milk Program from 1,708 gallons during the 1966–1967 school year to 986 gallons the following year; and

"Whereas, although Hawaii has been receiving a subsidy reimbursement of 4 cents per one-half pint of milk under both the National School Lunch Program and Special Milk Program, it is clearly evident that Hawaii is in a unique isolated situation from sources of supply that our milk prices are directly affected by high freight and feed costs as well as a recognized 15 percent higher cost of living; now, therefore,

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Fifth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1970, that the President of the United States, the Vice-President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, United States Senator Hiram L. Fong, United States Senator Daniel K. Inouye, United States Representative Spark M. Matsunaga, United States Representative Patsy T. Mink, and Mr. Clifford M. Hardin, Secretary of Agriculture, be, and hereby are, requested to promulgate any necessary administrative policies or enact any necessary legislation in order to increase the federal milk subsidy under the National School Lunch Program and Special Milk Program of the United States Department of Agriculture for Hawaii from 4 cents per one-half pint of fresh milk to 6 cents per one-half pint of fresh milk; and

"Be it further resolved that duly certified copies of this Resolution be transmitted to Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States; to Spiro T. Agnew, Vice-President of the United States; to John W. McCormack, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives; to each member of Hawaii's delegation to the United States Congress; and to Mr. Clifford M. Hardin, Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture."

Resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

"Resolutions memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress to control the importation of men's wearing apparel and textile goods from foreign countries employing cheap labor

*"Whereas,* The importation of unlimited quantities of men's wearing apparel and textile goods from countries employing cheap labor constitutes a serious economic threat to the apparel and textile industry of the Commonwealth, an industry vital to the state's economy; and

*"Whereas,* A sensible and equitable policy should be adopted and strictly adhered to by the federal government in order to protect and promote the standard of living of thousands of American wage earners whose livelihood is directly or indirectly affected by governmental directives regarding unrestricted quantities of imported apparel and textile goods and materials; now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved,* That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the President of the United States and the Congress to take any action that may be necessary to protect the men's apparel and textile industry of the Commonwealth by invoking reasonable and equitable controls on the importation of men's apparel and textiles from countries employing cheap labor; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State Secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Senate, adopted, March 30, 1970.

"NORMAN L. PIDGEON,
*"Clerk.*

"Attest:

"JOHN F. X. DAVOREN,
*"Secretary of the Commonwealth."*

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"S. RES. NO. 149

"Resolution requesting the President and Congress to adopt a policy which would bring the war in Vietnam to an end immediately

"Whereas, the war in Vietnam inflicts great harm on the people of America and the people of Vietnam each day it is permitted to continue; and

"Whereas, the greatest threat to our country today comes not from abroad but from the neglect of our problems at home; and

"Whereas, each day of war costs more lives plus money and energy which should be expended to help solve our growing problems of youth, poverty, racism, crime, health, education, environmental pollution, and housing; now, therefore

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the Fifth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1970, that the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States be requested to adopt a policy calling for (1) an immediate ceasefire in Vietnam to end the killing, (2) the setting of a target date for the withdrawal of all American troops in 1970, (3) further strenuous efforts to negotiate a political settlement, (4) the withdrawal of all support from the Saigon government if it hampers or sabotages peaceful negotiations, and (5) all possible use of the facilities and services of the United Nations to guarantee peace in Southeast Asia; and

"Be it further resolved that certified copies of this Resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate Pro Tempore, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, Senator Hiram L. Fong, Senator Daniel K. Inouye, Representative Spark M. Matsunaga and Representative Patsy T. Mink.

"We hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was this day adopted by the Senate of the Fifth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1970.

"DAVID C. MCCLUNG,
*"President of the Senate.*
"SUILU HIRAI,
*"Clerk of the Senate."*

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"H. CON. RES. NO. 1039

"A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to refer to the States for ratification a proposed amendment to the United States Constitution providing for the merit selection and retention of all Federal judges; and directing distribution

"Whereas, the Constitution of the United States provides that the judges of courts of the United States shall be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall hold their offices during good behavior; and

"Whereas, the basic purpose underlying this system of appointments is to insure the independence and integrity of the judiciary; and

"Whereas, an independent judiciary not only is essential in maintaining the validity of the principle of separation of powers but also is vitally important in preserving and protecting the freedoms, privileges and rights of individuals as established and ordained by the Constitution; and

"Whereas, the separation of powers principle was conceived as a protection against dangerous concentrations of governmental power and tempered by the "checks and balances" device to give each of the three separate branches of government certain powers with respect to the others, serving thus to promote balance or unity of operation in the Federal government and preventing either stalemate or arrogations of power; and

"Whereas, abuses of the judicial power or misfeasances and malfeasances of judicial office can be reached only through the impeachment process, which seldom has been invoked in respect to the Federal judiciary because of its cumbersome nature; and

"Whereas, the maintenance of an independent judiciary is not indispensably related to a system of virtual lifetime appointments, since this objective has been secured equally or even more effectively through merit systems of judicial selection and retention developed and successfully utilized in various states of the Union; and

"Whereas, in such systems retention is determined by the electorate at periodic intervals in noncompetitive, nonpartisan elections, with merit and competence being the guiding criteria throughout the entire process of selection and retention; and

"Whereas, the institution of such a system of merit selection and retention of the Federal judiciary would enhance the independence of the judiciary by making partisan considerations of even less consequence in judicial selection and retention; and

"Whereas, while preserving presidential appointments and senatorial confirmations of the Federal judiciary, this proposed system would, by subjecting these officers and their records to periodic examination by the electorate, be a progressive move toward further democratization of the American governmental process and assure in fact that ours is a government of laws and not of men.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 2nd session of the 32nd Oklahoma Legislature, the Senate concurring therein:

"Section 1. That the Congress of the United States be and hereby respectfully is urged to adopt and submit to the several states for their ratification an amendment to the United States Constitution providing for the selection and retention of Federal judges on a merit basis, following systems utilized successfully in several states of the Union whereby such Federal judges, after appointment by the President and confirmation by the Senate, would submit themselves to the electorate of their districts at periodic noncompetitive, nonpartisan elections for the purpose of determining their continuance in office.

"Section 2. That duly authenticated copies hereof be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States, to each member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress and to the presiding officers of the legislative bodies in the several states.

"Adopted by the House of Representatives the 15th day of April 1970.

"REX PRINETT,
*"Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

"Adopted by the Senate the 9th day of April 1970.

"FINIS SMITH,
*"President pro tempore of the Senate."*

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; ordered to lie on the table:

"RESOLUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to take certain action in remembrance of the Katyn Forest Massacre

*"Whereas,* This year marks the thirtieth anniversary of the Katyn Forest Massacre—the Soviets' cold-blooded murder of 15,000 POW Polish officers captured in the communist rape of Poland in September, 1939; and

*"Whereas,* Mass graves of these officers were discovered near Katyn, USSR; and

*"Whereas,* Citizens of Polish origin and descent have greatly contributed to the progress of the United States in time of war and in peace, are loyal, industrious and law-abiding and have distinguished themselves in the field of public service in our states and our nation and have served and lost their lives in the defense of our country; therefore be it

*"Resolved,* That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to remember this Katyn Forest Massacre by enacting legislation providing for the erection of a monument, the issuance of a postage stamp and an exhibition of Katyn documents in the possession of the United States; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of Representatives, adopted, March 31, 1970.

"WALLACE C. MILLS,
*"Clerk.*

"Attest:

"JOHN F. X. DAVOREN,
*"Secretary of the Commonwealth."*

A resolution adopted by the Federal Bar Association, Colorado chapter, of Aurora, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide special incentives and continuation pay for military lawyers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the town of Brookline, Mass., praying for an end to the war in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of Orville L. Cain, of Grass Valley, Calif., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for an increase in pay to all postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the city of Youngstown, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to a proper redistribution of income to the municipalities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment:

S. 3435. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the completion of the carvings on Stone Mountain, Ga., depicting heroes of the Confederacy (Rept. No. 91–768).

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for Mr. TOWER), from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

H.R. 13959. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the many contributions to the founding and early development of the State of Texas and the city of San Antonio by Jose Antonio Navarro (Rept. No. 91–769).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 1706. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights in and under lands in Pike County, Ga. (Rept. No. 91–770); and

H.R. 13106. An act to extend for 4 years the period of time during which certain requirements shall continue to apply with respect to applications for a license for an activity which may affect the resources of the Hudson Riverway, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–771).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 93. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to consider a petition for reinstatement of certain oil and gas leases (Rept. No. 91–774);

S. 417. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in New Mexico to the Cuba Independent Schools and to the village of Cuba (Rept. No. 91–775); and

S. 2323. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to consider a petition for reinstatement of an oil and gas lease (Wyoming 079626) (Rept. No. 91–776).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 3222. A bill to designate certain lands in the Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge in Oklahoma as wilderness (Rept. No. 91–772); and

H.R. 11372. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the partition or sale of inherited interests in allotted lands in the Tulalip Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1956 (70 Stat. 290) (Rept. No. 91–773).

By Mr. BELLMON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 887. A bill to further extend the period of restrictions on lands of the Quapaw Indians, Oklahoma, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–793);

S. 3153. A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the Interior and the Smithsonian Institution to expend certain sums, in cooperation with the territory of Guam, the territory of American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, other U.S. territories in the Pacific Ocean, and the State of Hawaii, for the conservation of their protective and productive coral reefs (Rept. No. 91–795); and

H.R. 4145. An act to provide for disposition of estates of intestate members of the Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, and Seminole Nations of Oklahoma dying without heirs (Rept. No. 91–794).

By Mr. BELLMON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1498. A bill to provide for the conveyance of so-called scattered tracts in Oklahoma, acquired under the act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1967) (Rept. No. 91–796).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 58. A bill providing for the addition of the Freeman School to the Homestead National Monument of America in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–777);

S. 2253. A bill to amend the act of August 7, 1961, providing for the establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore (Rept. No. 91–779);

S. 3279. A bill to extend the boundaries of the Toiyabe National Forest in Nevada, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–780); and

H.R. 14896. An act to amend the act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 915, establishing a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and other purposes (Rept. No. 91–781).

By Mr. METCALF, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 3007. A bill to authorize the transfer of the Brown unit of the Fort Belknap Indian irrigation project on the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, Mont., to the landowners within the unit (Rept. No. 91–782).

By Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1751. A bill to declare that certain federally owned land is held by the United States in trust for the Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians (Rept. No. 91–786).

By Mr. FANNIN, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

H.R. 4869. An act to further the economic advancement and general welfare of the Hopi Indian Tribe of the State of Arizona (Rept. No. 91–788).

By Mr. HANSEN, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 434. A bill to reauthorize the Riverton extension unit, Missouri River Basin project, to include therein the entire Riverton Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–789).

By Mr. TALMADGE, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 10912. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to liberalize the conditions under which the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is required to effect recoupment from disability compensation otherwise payable to certain disabled veterans (Rept. No. 91–783).

By Mr. TALMADGE, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

S. 3348. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of compensation for disabled veterans, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–784); and

H.R. 10106. An act to revise the definition of a "child" for purposes of veterans' benefits provided by title 38, United States Code, to recognize an adopted child as a dependent from the date of issuance of an interlocutory decree (Rept. No. 91–785).

By Mr. HRUSKA, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.J. Res. 251. A joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April 1970 as "National Arbor Day" (Rept. No. 91–778).

By Mr. HRUSKA, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1461. A bill to amend section 3006A of title 18, United States Code, relating to representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States (Rept. No. 91–790).

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I wish to report S. 1461, as amended, which has the purpose of improving and expanding the operation of the Criminal Justice Act of 1964.

The purpose of the 1964 act was to make more effective the constitutional right to counsel in Federal criminal cases by providing compensated counsel and other defense services to those who cannot afford to obtain their own. The act has been in effect for nearly 5 years, and the experience gained demonstrated its

great success as well as the need for both its expansion and improvement. S. 1461 meets this need.

Mr. President, S. 1461 is a milestone in the efforts of the Congress, the bench and the bar to bring the Federal law enforcement system closer to the ideal of assuring every citizen the full benefits of the sixth amendment.

I will have additional comments on this bill when it is considered on the Senate floor.

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 369. Resolution to print as a Senate document the report of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, entitled "The Cost of Clean Air" (Rept. No. 91–797);

S. Res. 370. Resolution to print as a Senate document a report from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, entitled "Progress in the Prevention and Control of Air Pollution" (Rept. No. 91–798);

S. Res. 371. Resolution to print as a Senate document a report from the Secretary of Transportation entitled "Territorial Highway Study—Guam, American Samoa, Virgin Islands" (Rept. No. 91–801);

S. Res. 372. Resolution to print as a Senate document the report of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, entitled "National Emission Standards Study" (Rept. No. 91–802);

S. Res. 384. Resolution to authorize additional expenditures for the Committee on the Judiciary;

S. Res. 390. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print entitled "The Soviet Approach to Negotiation: Selected Writings" (Rept. No. 91–800); and

S. Res. 391. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print entitled "Peking's Approach to Negotiation: Selected Writings" (Rept. No. 91–799).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 389. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the 1969 report of the Special Committee on Aging (Rept. No. 91–791).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Res. 376. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to study research activities conducted to ascertain the causes and develop cures to eliminate cancer (Rept. No. 91–792).

## APPOINTMENT OF JAMES EDWIN WEBB AS CITIZEN REGENT OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 91–787)

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original joint resolution (S.J. Res. 193) to provide for the appointment of James Edwin Webb as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and submitted a report thereon, which report was ordered to be printed and the joint resolution was placed on the calendar.

## BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. DOLE, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. PERCY, Mr. SAXBE, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMITH of Illinois, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 3743. A bill to provide for construction of contained dredged spoil disposal facilities for the Great Lakes and connecting channels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(The remarks of Mr. COOPER when he introduced the bill appear earlier in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. BAKER):

S. 3744. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend the authorizations for titles I through IV through fiscal year 1971; to the Committee on Public Works.

(The remarks of Mr. COOPER when he introduced the bill appear earlier in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. DOLE, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. BAYH):

S. 3745. A bill to amend existing Federal disaster assistance legislation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(The remarks of Mr. COOPER when he introduced the bill appear earlier in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. PACKWOOD:

S. 3746. A bill to authorize abortions in the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(The remarks of Mr. PACKWOOD when he introduced the bill appear earlier in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 3747. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Code to increase the jurisdictional amount for the administration of small estates, to increase the family allowance, to provide simplified procedures for the settlement of estates, and to eliminate provisions which discriminate against women in administering estates;

S. 3748. A bill to provide for the removal of snow and ice from the paved sidewalks of the District of Columbia; and

S. 3749. A bill relating to crime in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 3750. A bill to modify the boundaries of the Santa Fe, Cibola, and Carson National Forests in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COOK:

S. 3751. A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act of 1966 to provide that daylight saving time be used from Memorial Day to Labor Day; to the Committee on Commerce.

(The remarks of Mr. COOK when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. PEARSON:

S. 3752. A bill to amend the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act to require the disclosure by retail distributors of unit retail prices of consumer commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(The remarks of Mr. PEARSON when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 3753. A bill to provide improved benefits to postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MONDALE (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY and Mr. NELSON):

S. 3754. A bill to designate the Kettle River, in the State of Minnesota, as a component of the national wild and scenic rivers system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(The remarks of Mr. MONDALE when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. FONG:

S. 3755. A bill to authorize housing loans under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to lessees of nonfarmland in rural areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 3756. A bill for the relief of Setsuko Kurihara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. FONG when he introduced S. 3755 appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. SAXBE (for himself, Mr. COOK, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. BAYH, and Mr. PERCY):

S. 3757. A bill to amend the act requiring evidence of certain financial responsibility and establishing minimum standards for certain passenger vessels in order to exempt certain vessels operating on inland rivers; to the Committee on Commerce.

(The remarks of Mr. SAXBE when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. GOODELL (for himself and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 3758. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require the heads of the respective executive agencies to provide the Congress with advance notice of certain planned organizational and other changes or actions which would affect Federal civilian employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(The remarks of Mr. GOODELL when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia (for himself and Mr. SPONG):

S. 3759. A bill to remove the present $1 million limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Navy from settling and paying the claim of the Chesapeake Bay Bridge and Tunnel District arising out of collision of the U.S.S. *Yancey* with the bridge-tunnel span; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. BYRD of Virginia when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina:

S.J. Res. 193. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of James Edwin Webb as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; placed on the calendar.

(See reference to the above joint resolution when reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

## S. 3751—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE UNIFORM TIME ACT OF 1966

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, the 89th Congress enacted the Federal Uniform Time Act of 1966. The legislation divided the United States into eight standard time zones. It further provided that on the last Sunday in April the time is advanced 1 hour until the last Sunday in October. In effect, Congress has given us 6 months of daylight saving time.

The issue of uniform time and daylight saving time has been debated many times in the past. I have no quarrel with the general principle of a uniform time in this commercial and industrial era. However, there are equally important needs in this country which must also be considered.

For example, my own State of Kentucky is geographically located at the far western end of the eastern time zone. Further compounding this problem, a

portion of Kentucky quite logically belongs in the central time zone. This situation causes peculiar hardships and difficulties, especially during the months of May and October.

In both suburban and rural sections of Kentucky, our young children have to walk on dangerous streets and highways to catch school buses in the early darkness of the fall months. There is no reason to expose them to this hazard the entire school year.

The forgotten man in our country, the farmer, also suffers under the hardships of these black mornings. Many a farmers has wryly stated that "chickens and cows don't observe daylight saving time." Unfortunately, the farmer has to start working when the needs of his livestock and crops require it—rather than by the artificial time on his clock.

Mr. President, I do not propose a repeal of the Federal Uniform Time Act because it does have some merit. What I propose is to amend the 1966 act so that daylight saving time prevails only in that period from Memorial Day to Labor Day. My bill would not repeal uniform time, but merely make it more sensible. It would reduce daylight saving time from the present 6 months to little more than 3 months. It would protect our school children who must now travel the highways during the dark, fall mornings. If passed, it would also provide the farmer an additional 3 months to farm according to nature.

Mr. President, on December 16, 1969, the distinguished Congressman from Kentucky's Fifth Congressional District, the Honorable TIM LEE CARTER, introduced H.R. 15276 in the House. Because of both the need for such change in the law and the favorable reception it received, I am offering it for consideration in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3750) to amend the Uniform Time Act of 1966 to provide that daylight saving time be used from Memorial Day to Labor Day, introduced by Mr. COOK, was received, read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

## S. 3752—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE FAIR PACKAGING AND LABELING ACT

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act of 1966, often referred to as the Truth in Packaging Act, really has not worked. It was enacted into law to reduce confusion in the marketplace. Its stated purpose was to facilitate value comparisons for the average consumer. Yet, proliferation in package sizes and diverting promotional practices from coupons to "cents off" arrangements to "giant economy" sizes, have made the consumer's task of finding the best buy for his money an unnecessary difficult exercise.

The bill I am introducing today would provide for direct comparison of values by requiring packaged consumer commodities within the purview of the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act to be priced on a per unit basis. For example, an 89-cent commodity would also be marked as 14 cents per pound or per ounce, pint or other common unit of measure.

This bill, Mr. President, is the result of hearings recently concluded by the Consumer Subcommittee of the Commerce Committee, where we heard testimony indicating that even after passage of the Act, a group of college educated shoppers, under testing conditions, were unable to select the best per unit buy roughly 40 percent of the time. We can only guess what the percentage might be for those less educated consumers who face a critical need to stretch their food dollars.

The approach of this bill, Mr. President, differs from the one we adopted in 1966, and to which I dissented in committee. The thought then adopted was that value comparison could be facilitated by reducing the proliferating numbers of package sizes. However, despite the efforts of the various agencies during two administrations, this proliferation exists today in many product categories. In other words, facilitating value comparisons by reducing proliferation in package sizes through voluntary agreements tinged with antitrust implications has proved to be not only contrary to open and innovative marketing, but plainly unworkable. Accordingly, this bill, based on our experience, would more effectively implement our original policy by providing, in a simple and direct manner, what has been thus far available to the consumer only indirectly and after complex and tedious calculations.

Mr. President, price is obviously not the only factor involved in purchasing. People buy for a variety of complex and unknown reasons. Unit pricing would only make clearer one of those factors. Selection on the basis of quality or convenience will continue to be important, perhaps more important than before. But with unit pricing, with a forthright statement as to how much one is buying for what price, the factor of price could at least be dealt with easily and with confidence.

This bill, Mr. President, recognizes the problem of the small retail grocer. The mom and pop stores, understandably, would face an administrative burden in implementing unit pricing. Moreover, the importance of familiar and convenient neighborhood grocery stores is evident to all of us. Accordingly, they are exempt from the operation of this bill.

Also, this bill provides that the unit price may be displayed either on the package of the commodity or, alternately, in close proximity to it—on the shelf, for example. This language was adopted, Mr. President, to allow retail grocers some measure of flexibility in administering unit pricing. While computerized labeling and fully automated handling may be commonplace in the future, at this particular time it is important, in my opinion, to offer the retail chain outlets the opportunity to freely develop competitive methods of unit pricing.

Mr. President, unit pricing is both timely and inevitable. It has, for years, been stamped on meat and poultry products. It is presently being used to varying degrees by several large retail chains, such as Safeway, Kroger, and Jewel. It was recently recommended in a National Chamber of Commerce report. And, in all likelihood, it soon will be required in several States.

Moreover, Mr. President, in this inflationary period, it is most timely to recognize not only the economic hardships of individual consumers of all income classes, but also to recognize that consumers account for two-thirds of all spending in the United States. Our annual food budget approaches $120 billion. The importance of unit pricing—which, according to estimates, could result in increased savings of up to 10 percent of our annual food budget—should be especially recognized.

Finally Mr. President, other provisions of this bill would clarify various aspects of existing law. It provides that the accurate statement of identity will apply to pictures or vignettes which often appear on labels. It indicates that coupons are also to be covered by the "cents off" regulations under section 5(c)(2) of the act. Further, it broadens the definition of "consumer commodity" to include those commodities customarily used in or around the household with the exception of durable goods not normally consumed during the first year of use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SAXBE). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3751) to amend the Fair Packing and Labeling Act to require the disclosure by retail distributors of unit retail prices of consumer commodities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PEARSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

## S. 3754—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO DESIGNATE THE KETTLE RIVER A COMPONENT OF THE NATIONAL WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SYSTEM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Departments of Agriculture and Interior released, on March 29, the criteria for the selection and management of wild, scenic, and recreational rivers to be added to the national wild and scenic rivers system.

The guidelines adopted by the Secretaries of the two Departments supplement policies set forth in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, Public Law 90–542, to preserve and protect outstanding freeflowing rivers and immediate adjacent lands. The wild rivers guidelines read:

> To provide river-related outdoor recreation opportunities in a closely-adjacent primitive setting. Land access generally is restricted to trails or infrequent roads, and public use and other resource management facilities must harmonize with their surroundings.

As I reviewed these guidelines, I became impressed that the Kettle River, one of Minnesota's fine untouched and beautiful rivers, meets the criteria for the wild rivers classification.

I am, therefore, introducing legislation to designate the Kettle River, in the

State of Minnesota, as a component of the national wild and scenic rivers system. Community involvement will be sought in considering this legislation. Interested citizens and the surrounding towns should be consulted on the nature of any program affecting the Kettle River.

The Kettle River is located in east-central Minnesota. In a State which is becoming increasingly urbanized, the Kettle Basin is roughly 60 to 75 miles from the Twin Cities and about 50 miles from Duluth. It lies between two major metropolitan areas which generate increasing demand for access to water and outdoor recreation—trails, canoeing, and fishing.

Thus, more than half of the population of Minnesota—over 2 million people—could reach this fine wild, scenic, and recreational river by an hour's drive over a good interstate highway.

During the 1960's, the Minnesota Department of Conservation authorized the Kettle as a canoe route. This designation tells us much of the potential of the Kettle for river-related outdoor recreational opportunities in a primitive setting.

The Kettle River is a fascinatingly wild and picturesque river. The constantly changing topography and forest cover provide an ever-changing scene. The river has rapids interspaced with long pools providing a challenge, as well as a chance for relaxation and quiet reflection, to its visitors.

The glacial geology of the area, as reflected in the river, is also a point of interest. Moraines, glacial outwash plains, gorges, kettle holes, and caves exist along the river, primarily the result of glacial activity.

The area is rich in history. Remains of the lumbering activity of the 1850's and 1860's; quarrying at Banning and Sandstone; forest fires and the birth of St. Croix State Park add great historical interest to the river corridor.

Wide varieties of wildlife roam the river corridor. Deer, beavers, muskrats, herons, and hawks all make their homes within the river basin.

Fishing is excellent, especially for walleyes, sturgeon, and small mouth bass. Northern pike, red horse, suckers, and even trout, mainly in the Pine River and Willow River tributaries, are also fished in the river.

The Kettle River has its headwaters in Carlton County and flows in a generally north to south direction, passing through Pine County and into the St. Croix River some 53 miles away. It flows through and over several types of surface and subsurface geology.

Along the northern part of the river, for the first 6 miles, the river flows through an area of glacial moraine. Pools and rapids are closely spaced and do not exceed 50 yards in length. The rapids are very difficult to canoe even in high water. The river banks are gravel with heavy forests of small aspen and birch and with an occasional stand of larger Norway pine, white pine, and black spruce. The magnificent forest growth extends very near the water's edge enclosing the river.

Starting at mile 6.9 a large open field on the left bank signifies a change in the river's characteristics. The mouth of the Kettle widens so that pools and rapids become longer (100 yards) and deeper. Rapids are more easily traversed because of the gravel bottom, and the banks of the river are higher and grassy, leveling out on top.

From mile 10 to 13 the river broadens out among islands, grass areas with low banks of sand and gravel. Distinguishing the main channel is difficult. Maple and Elm are the dominant species of hardwoods, but there are a few pine visible. At mile 12.8 the Moose River joins the Kettle contributing a great deal of water which could be the reason for the strange behavior of the Kettle River directly above.

Below the confluence with the Moose River, the Kettle becomes entrenched and narrows down once more. Pine are intermingled with hardwoods, farmland extends down to the edge of the river. The open woods, caused by grazing, are peaceful and scenic. There are no rapids in this stretch.

Beginning at mile 21, the Kettle River widens to more than 150 feet with the average depth about 4 feet. The banks slope up and away from the river and are covered with pine and hardwoods. At mile 23.9 a short set of rapids with a speed pitch occurs and running them in high water is possible. A magnificent rock outcrop stands more than 10 feet above the water on the right bank, and there is a camp site on top of the rock outcrop. Directly below these rapids, Interstate 35W crosses the river, but there is no road access to the river. Downstream, high hills begin to appear and the river's characteristics remain much the same until entering Banning State Park.

The Kettle River flows through Banning State Park in a gorge approximately 130 feet deep, which forms the Hells Gate Rapids. These rapids are about 1 mile long and consist of four major drops of about 5 feet each. There is no portage and running the rapids is exciting and challenging. The river remains entrenched for more than 100 feet until it reaches the remains of the Kettle River Dam 33 miles from its northern beginning.

Below the Kettle River Dam, the river passes through several short rapids of moderate difficulty and through numerous pools, one of which is more than 20 feet deep. At mile 36.1 skillful, swiftly flowing rapids about one-half mile long appear.

From mile 37 to 46 the river once again becomes more than 200 feet wide and placid: flood plains develop on both sides with open hardwood forests. At this point the lower Kettle River Rapids begin. These rapids are moderate in difficulty and very popular with canoeists. They are, however, wide and shallow and, like other Kettle rapids, cannot be run in low water.

The Kettle basin is largely in the central and northern part of Pine County, but headwaters are partly in Carlton County and to a lesser degree in Aitkin and Kanabec Counties. There are some farms, but roughly two-thirds of the basin is forested. Pine County, in 1964, included nearly 2,000 farms, predominantly in the southern part, outside the Kettle basin. Forest industries are important but there is no national forest.

There are several communities near the river—Sandstone and Moose Lake each have populations of about 1,500 persons. Barnum and Willow River, each less than 500, and Kettle River, about 230. In addition to the St. Croix State Park near the mouth of the river, Banning State Park, a tract of about 2,700 acres, near Sandstone, was added in 1963. There are three small municipal parks with a few picnic tables; one or more of these parks provide access to the Kettle. There are two monuments to historic events, surrounded by numerous trout streams, northern pike spawning areas, and five official fish and game areas.

By nature it is an excellent recreation area, not yet overdeveloped. Pine County, in the mid-1960's, contained five hotels, six motels, and 19 resorts. The area is thinly populated and has not begun to reach its recreational potential.

There are 17 homes located along the river's edge, although only five may be seen from the river. Two of the five are old farmsteads while the remainder are homes which have penetrated the wilderness setting. Fourteen bridges and two trestles cross the river.

There are developed access points at miles 21, 33, 40.5, and 47; however, access is also possible at other bridge crossings. There are no developed camp sites on the Kettle River.

Approximately 26 miles of the Kettle River are already in public ownership of one form or another. The General C. C. Andrews State Forest abuts on the east side of the river from mile 13 to mile 15.2. The undeveloped Banning State Park abuts both sides of the river from mile 24.2 to mile 30.8. The Sandstone Game Refuge abuts the east side of the river from mile 31.5 to mile 40.5.

Chengwatan State Forest and St. Croix State Park abut the river from mile 42.6 to mile 51. Other stretches of the river are within the municipalities of Kettle River, Rutledge, and Sandstone. Finally, the State and county own small parcels of and on the river which have not been declared parks, game refuges, et cetera.

This description can hardly touch upon the actual beauty of the Kettle, but it is a truly magnificent river which deserves the protection of the wild rivers system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SAXBE). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3753) to designate the Kettle River, in the State of Minnesota, as a component of the national wild and scenic rivers system, introduced by Mr. MONDALE, for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

---

## S. 3755—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AUTHORIZE HOUSING LOANS TO LESSEES OF NONFARM LAND IN RURAL AREAS

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to

amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 authorizing rural housing loans to lessees of nonfarm tracts in rural areas. The present law authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make such loans to, first, owners of farms in fee simple; second, owners in fee simple of nonfarm tracts; third, lessees of farm tracts.

My proposed amendment, Mr. President, will authorize the Farmers Home Administration to permit rural housing loans to lessees on nonfarm leaseholds, which is not now permitted under the existing law.

It will make eligible a new class of residents in rural areas of less than 5,500 population to apply for housing loans. This is to include nonfarming lessees of Hawaiian Homes Commission land in the State of Hawaii and lessees of tribal interests on Indian reservation land.

Many in this class of rural residents find difficulty in owning fee simple title. Their first choice of dwellings on fee simple land is scarce. Because of the scarcity of such land, they become owners of leasehold interests—their next best choice for homesites. This kind of land is available. This is particularly true in Hawaii, where the land is limited and the cost is extremely high.

Under the Farmers Home Administration rural housing loan program, the leasehold interest would have to be at least 50 years or 50 percent longer than the amortization period of the loan—amortization period might run up to 33 years—or at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture any period sufficiently beyond the repayment period of the loan to provide adequate security and a reasonable probability of accomplishing the objectives for which the loan is made.

Mr. President, the Farmers Home Administration has pointed out that there is a great need for housing loans in rural areas where only 30 percent of the Nation's population lives, but more than half of the substandard housing exists. My proposed amendment will help to meet this urgent need of rural residents who are now excluded from rural housing loans, and will permit the Department of Agriculture to finance housing developments in the Nation's rural areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SAXBE). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3755) to authorize housing loans under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to lessees of nonfarm land in rural areas, introduced by Mr. FONG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## S. 3758—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL REQUIRING ADVANCE NOTICE OF FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT CUTBACKS

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce in the Senate for myself and my colleague from New York (Mr. JAVITS), a bill providing a 120-day prior-notice requirement on any planned cutback actions of executive agencies affecting Federal civilian employment.

This bill is the same bill introduced last month by Representative DANIEL BUTTON for consideration by the House.

I share with Congressman BUTTON and other Members of the New York delegation concern over Federal cutbacks and closedowns made without prior disclosure to Congress and employee organizations.

Mr. President, I have advocated many changes in Federal Government policies and programs in order to cut out wasteful spending and to readjust the Federal budget to reflect a reordering of national priorities. I shall continue to work for change to bring about these objectives. Changes in Government programs, however, do not have to cause disruptions in employment and community economic stability.

The legislation I am introducing today, as well as additional legislation on economic conversion which I have cosponsored, are ways to minimize and eliminate employment hardship and to prevent slowdown in local economies due to needed changes in Government programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SAXBE). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3758) to amend title 5, United States Code, to require the heads of the respective executive agencies to provide the Congress with advance notice of certain planned organizational and other changes or actions which would affect Federal civilian employment, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GOODELL, for himself and Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3758

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) subchapter II of chapter 29 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 2955. Advance notice to Congress of certain proposed actions of executive agencies affecting Federal civilian employment

"Whenever it is determined by appropriate authority that any administrative action, order, or policy, or series of administrative actions, orders, or policies, shall be taken, issued, or adopted, by or within any executive agency, which will effectuate the closing disposal, relocation, dispersal, or reduction of the plant and other structural facilities of any installation, base, plant, or other physical unit or entity of that executive agency and which—

"(1) will necessitate, to any appreciable extent, a reduction in the number of civilian employees engaged in the activities performed in and through those facilities of that agency, without reasonable opportunity for their further civilian employment with the Government in the same commuting area; or

"(2) will necessitate, to any appreciable extent, the transfer or relocation of civilian employees engaged in the activities performed in and through those facilities of that agency, in order to provide those employees with reasonable opportunity for further civilian employment with the Government outside the same commuting area; or

"(3) both;

the head of that executive agency shall transmit to the respective Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and House of Representatives and to employee organizations having exclusive recognition, at least one hundred and twenty days before any such action, order, or policy is initiated, written notice that such action, order, or policy will be taken, issued, or adopted, together with such written statement, discussion, and other information in explanation thereof as such agency head considers necessary to provide complete information to the Congress with respect to that action, order, or policy. In addition, the agency head shall provide to such committees such additional pertinent information as those committees, or either of them, may request."

(b) The table of sections of subchapter II of chapter 29 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof—

"2955. Advance notice to Congress of certain proposed actions of executive agencies affecting Federal civilian employment.".

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

S. 1466

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), and the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), be added as cosponsors of S. 1466, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that certain aliens admitted to the United States for permanent residence shall be eligible to operate amateur radio stations in the United States and to hold licenses for their stations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SAXBE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 1812

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) be added as a cosponsor of S. 1812, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to include chiropractic services among the benefits provided under subpart (B) of this title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2208

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, his name be added as a cosponsor of S. 2208, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study into the feasibility and desirability of a national lakeshore on Lake Tahoe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SAXBE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 3389, S. 3390, S. 3391

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), I ask unanimous

consent that at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss) be added a_ a cosponsor of the three following bills—S. 3389, to provide for the protection, development, and enhancement of the public recreation values of the public lands; S. 3390, to amend the act of September 19, 1964 (78 Stat. 986), entitled the "Classification and Multiple Use Act," and S. 3391, to amend the act of September 19, 1964 (78 Stat. 989), as amended, entitled the "Public Land Sale Act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SAXBE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 3410

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) and the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), be added as cosponsors of S. 3410, the National Environmental Laboratory Act of 1970.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SAXBE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 3595

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) be added as a cosponsor of S. 3595 to establish a Commission on Security and Safety of Cargo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SAXBE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 3687

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA) be added a a cosponsor of S. 3687, the National Water Quality Standards Act of 1970.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SAXBE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 3739

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) be added as cosponsors of S. 3739, to amend the Small Business Act to increase the availability of management counseling to small business concerns.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 61—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF THE COMPILATION ENTITLED "FEDERAL AND STATE STUDENT AID PROGRAMS" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. PELL submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. CON. RES. 61

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the compilation entitled "Federal and State Student Aid Programs," prepared by the Library of Congress for the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be printed as a Senate document; and that there be printed sixty-two thousand two hundred additional copies of such document, of which forty-three thousand nine hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, ten thousand three hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate, four thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and four thousand copies shall be for the use of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

SEC. 2. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balances shall revert to the respective Senate and House Document Rooms.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 392—RESOLUTION SUBMITTED AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF THE THESIS ENTITLED "PRIVATE LAND CLAIMS IN THE SOUTHWEST" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. ANDERSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 392); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 392

*Resolved*, That, with the permission of the copyright holder, J. J. Bowden, his thesis entitled "Private Land Claims in the Southwest" be printed with illustrations as a Senate document; and that there be printed seven hundred additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 393—RESOLUTION SUBMITTED TO PRINT ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE HEARINGS ON THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUE ACT OF 1969 AND RELATED LEGISLATION

Mr. MUSKIE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 393); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 393

*Resolved*, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations one thousand eight hundred additional copies of the hearings before its Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations during the Ninety-first Congress, first and second sessions, on the Intergovernmental Revenue Act of 1969 and related legislation.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 394—RESOLUTION REPORTED AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF A REVISED EDITION OF THE "ELECTION LAW GUIDEBOOK" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 91-803)

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 394); and submitted a report thereon, which resolution was placed on the calendar, and the report was ordered to be printed:

S. RES. 394

*Resolved*, That a revised edition of Senate Document Numbered 76 of the Ninetieth Congress, entitled "Election Law Guidebook", be printed as a Senate document, and that there be printed three thousand additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 395—RESOLUTION REPORTED AUTHORIZING RETROACTIVE COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN SERVICES PERFORMED DURING JANUARY 1970—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 91-804)

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 395); and submitted a report thereon, which resolution was placed on the calendar, and the report was ordered to be printed:

S. RES. 395

*Resolved*, That payments of retroactive compensation authorized by law for service performed in the month of January 1970 which are chargeable to funds authorized for expenditure through January 31, 1970, by various Senate resolutions, shall be charged to funds authorized by Senate resolutions for expenditure by the committees concerned at the time such payment is made, wherever possible, without regard to the expenditure limitations contained in the Senate resolution which expired on January 31, 1970.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 396—RESOLUTION REPORTED TO PAY A GRATUITY TO SUE ELLEN TYSER—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 396); which resolution was placed on the calendar:

S. RES. 396

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Sue Ellen Tyser, widow of Henri Louis Tyser, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 397—RESOLUTION REPORTED TO PAY CERTAIN PERSONS GRATUITIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 397), which resolution was placed on the calendar:

S. RES. 397

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Freddie Cullum and Louis D. Cullum, brothers; and to Willie Mae Guyton, Iola C. Lewis, and Rosa L. Brodie, sisters of Willie Cullum, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum to each equal to one-fifth of six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 398—RESOLUTION REPORTED TO PAY A GRATUITY TO KENNITH J. NEWMAN—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administra-

tion, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 398); which was placed on the calendar:

S. RES. 398

*Resolved*, That, in lieu of the authorization contained in Senate Resolution 296, agreed to December 11, 1969, the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate to Kennith J. Newman, brother of James H. Newman, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

## NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON MEAT INSPECTION

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, hearings on amendments to the Meat Inspection Act will resume Monday, April 27. The Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will hear further testimony on S. 3512, S. 3592, and S. 3603 at 10 a.m., room 324, Old Senate Office Building.

## NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON ONE-BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency will hold hearings on S. 1052, to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 and to provide for a comprehensive study of banking laws and regulations by a National Commission on Banking; S. 1211, providing for the regulation of tender offers and exchange offers for, and certain acquisitions of, the equity securities of certain regulated bank holding companies, single-bank holding companies, and banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; S. 1664, with amendments, to broaden the definition of bank holding companies, and for other purposes; H.R. 6778, to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, and for other purposes; and any other bills or amendments referred to the committee prior to and during the hearings.

The hearings will begin on Tuesday, May 12, 1970, at 10 a.m., in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

Persons desiring to testify or to submit written statements in connection with these hearings should notify Mr. Hugh H. Smith, assistant counsel, Committee on Banking and Currency, 5300 New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510; telephone 225–7391.

## NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON EDUCATION BILLS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, recent messages from the President of the United States on both higher education and the impacted aid program have generated a great deal of comment from those most affected by these programs at both the national and local level.

The impacted aid recommendations would, if enacted, change the whole thrust of that major prop of Federal elementary and secondary education support while the higher education proposals would shift the Federal scheme of student assistance from that of a recognized responsibility to one of somewhat benign neglect.

Recognizing that major changes in Federal legislation, such as those I have alluded to, cannot be effected without in depth study, the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will be in separate hearing over the next 2 months on these two matters. Initially, I should like to announce that on April 28 we will have before us Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John Venneman and Commissioner of Education James E. Allen, Jr., to discuss the administration's impacted-aid proposals. On May 6, Secretary Finch will be before us to discuss the administration's higher education proposals. Following these dates we will be hearing from other interested parties.

Indeed, anyone who wishes to make his views known to the subcommittee should contact my staff on extension 7666.

## ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON PATIENT CARE AT A TYPICAL VA GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I wish to announce hearings by that subcommittee on Tuesday, April 28, at 9:30 a.m. in the New Senate Office Building. The hearing will be a continuation of that subcommittee's continuing oversight and investigation into the quality of medical care available in Veterans' Administration hospitals and other health facilities. This will be the seventh such hearing to date over the last several months by the subcommittee.

Next week's hearing will focus in depth upon the delivery of patient care in one particular Veterans' Administration facility: the Wadsworth VA Hospital in Los Angeles, Calif., an 1,100-bed general hospital. I believe that the problems being encountered there are fairly typical of those present at many, many Veterans' Administration hospitals throughout the Nation, including those affiliated with major medical schools. In this instance, the Wadsworth VAH has a close affiliation with the UCLA School of Medicine.

The subcommittee will attempt to develop at the hearing a graphic picture of the patient care provided on a daily basis at the ward level by house staff and nurses. It will also receive testimony regarding a pattern over the past several years at that hospital of deferring needed purchase of equipment and supplies, needed renovation of the physical plant, hiring of needed staff, adequate funding of special medical programs and programs created by new legislation, and absorption from the overall patient care budget of costs of necessary expenses in all of the above categories, as well as from many others—such as salaries and expenses—which have been a victim of budget cuts and fiscal austerity. Those scheduled to testify are:

First. Dr. J. Gary Davidson, research associate in hematology, Wadsworth Veterans' Administration Hospital, accompanied by Dr. Bernhard Votteri, third-year resident in medicine.

Second. A representative of the California Nurses Association.

Third. Dr. Baldwin Lamson, director of hospitals and clinics, UCLA School of Medicine.

## ANNOUNCEMENT OF RESUMPTION OF HEARINGS ON S. 3354, A BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL LAND USE POLICY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, hearings on S. 3354, a bill to amend the Water Resources Planning Act (79 Stat. 244) to include provision for a National Land Use Policy, will be resumed on April 28 and 29, 1970, in Room 3110, New Senate Office Building. The hearings both days will begin at 10:00 A.M. and will consist of both morning and afternoon sessions. At these hearings the Committee will take testimony from the Nixon Administration; spokesmen for State government and industrial, professional, and conservation interests; and members of the public. These are the final hearings scheduled on the bill.

I am gratified with the results of the Committee's hearing on March 24, at which we received testimony from Governor Sargent of Massachusetts, Professor Lynton Caldwell of the University of Indiana and prominent representatives of the design and planning professions. These witnesses were very helpful in focusing attention on some of our Nation's critical land use problems and suggesting some possible solutions to them. At the forthcoming hearings, we hope to discuss specific provisions of the bill and methods of implementing its policy aims.

All Americans are concerned about environmental quality. As land is the basic environmental resource, it must be used wisely if environmental quality is to be achieved. By establishing a National Land Use Policy, S. 3354 proposes to focus attention in all segments of society on the ways we can enhance our environment and accommodate growth through thoughtful use of our land resources.

I am pleased to announce the forthcoming hearings.

## AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate from the close of business today until noon on Monday next, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and the House of Representatives, and that all committees be authorized to file reports, including minority, individual, supplemental, and additional views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr.

YOUNG of Ohio). Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Because of an oversight on my part, when the Senate adjourned last Monday I forget to make the request which the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts has just made. Consequently, there is no new legislation on the calendar. But for the information of the Senate, in the interim between Monday and Thursday, a number of veterans' bills were approved by the Committee on Finance, a couple of medal bills by the Committee on Banking and Currency, a large number of bills by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and a large number of bills by the Committee on the Judiciary, as well as some nominations which were taken care of today.

I have talked with representatives of the calendar committee on the other side, and with the leadership, and they have given me reasonable assurance that it would be possible to take up many of those on Monday which we had anticipated taking up today had the Senator from Montana made the proper request.

When those are disposed of, it is anticipated, and it is very likely, that the Senate will proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 769, S. 3706, a bill to provide financial assistance for and establishment of a national rail-passenger system, and so forth.

So I make this statement, with the concurrence of the leadership on the other side, so that Senators may be aware that there will be a good deal of legislation on Monday; and that insofar as I am concerned, is what the legislation will be for that day. Following that, the pending business will be the railroad bill.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, APRIL 27, 1970

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(Subsequently, this order was modified to provide for an adjournment to Monday at 11:30 a.m.)

## THE MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT ON THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, just a few hours ago the President sent to Congress a message on the Selective Service System. I ask unanimous consent that that message be printed in the RECORD in its entirety at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The President's message is as follows:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

The draft has been with us now for many years. It was started as a temporary, emergency measure just before World War II. We have lived with the draft so long, and relied on it through such serious crises, that too many of us now accept it as a normal part of American life.

It is now time to embrace a new approach to meeting our military manpower requirements. I have two basic proposals.

The first deals with the fundamental way this nation should raise the armed force necessary to defend the lives and the rights of its people, and to fulfill its existing commitments abroad.

The second deals with reforming the present recruitment system—part volunteer, part drafted—which, in the immediate future, will be needed to maintain our armed strength.

### TO END THE DRAFT

On February 21, I received the report of the Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force, headed by former Defense Secretary Thomas S. Gates. The Commission members concluded unanimously that the interests of the nation will be better served by an all-volunteer force than by a mixed force of volunteers and draftees, and that steps should be taken in this direction.

I have carefully reviewed the report of the Commission and have discussed the subject with many others knowledgeable in this field. The preeminent consideration in any decision I make involving the American Armed Forces must be the security of the United States. I have had to weight carefully how our responsibilities in Vietnam and our overall foreign policy would be affected by ending the draft. I also had to consider the budgetary impact, and the possible effect on our economy.

On the other hand, we have all seen the effect of the draft on our young people, whose lives have been disrupted first by years of uncertainty, and then by the draft itself. We all know the unfairness of the present system, no matter how just we try to make it.

After careful consideration of the factors involved, I support the basic conclusion of the Commission. I agree that we should move now toward ending the draft.

From now on, the objective of this Administration is to reduce draft calls to zero, subject to the overriding considerations of national security.

In proposing that we move toward ending the draft, I must enter three cautions: First, the draft cannot be ended all at once. It must be phased out, so that we can be certain of maintaining our defense strength at every step. Second, existing induction authority expires on July 1, 1971, and I expect that it will be necessary for the next Congress to extend this authority. And third, as we move away from reliance on the draft, we must make provisions to establish a standby draft system that can be used in case of emergency.

To move toward reducing draft calls to zero, we are proceeding with a wide array of actions and proposals:

This Administration proposed, and the Congress has approved, a six percent across-the-board pay increase for Federal employees, retroactive to the first of this year. This raises the pay of members of the Armed Forces by $1.2 billion a year.

I shall propose an additional 20 percent pay increase for enlisted men with less than two years of service, to be effective January 1, 1971. This action, if approved by the Congress, will raise the annual pay of enlisted men with less than two years of service by $500 million a year, and is a first step in removing the present inequity pay of men serving their first two years in the Armed Forces. The cost for Fiscal Year 1971 will be $250 million.

In January 1971 I shall recommend to the Congress, in the Fiscal Year 1972 budget, an additional $2.0 billion for added pay and other benefits—especially for those serving their first two years—to help attract and retain the personnel we need for our Armed Forces.

I have today directed the Secretary of Defense to give high priority to the expansion of programs designed to increase enlistments and retentions in the services. Further, I have directed that he give me a report every quarter on the progress of this program. Other agencies have been directed to assist in the effort.

I am also directing the Secretary of Defense to review the policies and practices of the military services to give new emphasis to recognition of the individual needs, aspirations and capabilities of all military personnel.

No one can predict with precision whether or not, or precisely when, we can end conscription. It depends, in part, on the necessity of maintaining required military force levels to meet our commitments in Vietnam and elsewhere. It also depends on the degree to which the combination of military pay increases and enhanced benefits will attract and hold enough volunteers to maintain the forces we need, the attitude of young people toward military service, and the availability of jobs in the labor market.

However, I am confident that, barring any unforeseen developments, this proposed program will achieve our objective.

The starting pay of an enlisted man in our Armed Forces is—taking the latest raise into account—less than $1,500 a year. This is less than half of the minimum wage in the private sector. Of course, we should add to this the value of the food, uniforms and housing that is provided free. But it is hardly comparable to what most young men can earn as civilians. Even with special allowances, some married enlisted men have been forced to go on welfare to support their families.

The low pay illustrates another inequity of the draft. These men, in effect, pay a large hidden tax—the difference between their military pay and what they could earn as civilians. Therefore, on the grounds of equity alone, there is good reason to substantially increase pay.

While we focus on removing inequities in the pay of men serving their first few years in the military, we must not neglect the career servicemen. They are the indispensable core of our Armed Forces. The increasing technological complexity of modern defense, and the constantly changing international situation, make their assignments ever more difficult—and critical. We shall continue to make every effort to insure that they are fairly treated and justly compensated.

There is another essential element—beyond pay and benefits, beyond the best in training and equipment—that is vital to the high morale of any armed force in a free society. It is the backing, support and confidence of the people and the society the military serves. While government can provide the economic justice our men in arms deserve—moral support and backing can come only from the American people. At few times in our history has it been more needed than today.

The consideration of national security contains no argument against these historic actions; the considerations of freedom and justice argue eloquently in their behalf.

### TO REFORM THE DRAFT

As we move toward our goal of ending the draft in the United States, we must deal with the draft as it now exists. This nation has a right to expect that the responsibility for national defense will be shared equitably and consistently by all segments of our society.

Given this basic principle, I believe that there are important reforms that we must make in our present draft system.

It is my judgment, and that of the National Security Council, that future occupational, agricultural and student deferments are no longer dictated by the national interest. I am issuing today an Executive Order to direct that no future deferments shall be granted on the basis of employment. Very few young men at age 19 are in such critical positions that they cannot be replaced. All those who held occupational deferments before today, as well as any who may be granted such deferments from pending applications filed before today, will be deferred as they were previously.

This same Executive Order will also eliminate all future paternity deferments—except in those cases where a local draft board determines that extreme hardship would result. All those who held paternity deferments before today, as well as any who may be granted deferments from pending applications filed before today, will be deferred as long as they are living with and supporting child dependents.

I am also asking the Congress today to make some changes in the Military Selective Service Act of 1967.

The first would restore to the President discretionary authority on the deferment of students seeking baccalaureate degrees. If the Congress restores this authority, I shall promptly issue a second Executive Order that would bar all undergraduate deferments, except for young men who are undergraduate students prior to today. These young men would continue to be eligible for deferment under present regulations during their undergraduate years. This Executive Order would also end deferments for young men in junior college, and in apprentice and technical training programs, except for those who entered before today. Men participating in such programs before today would continue to be deferred until they complete them.

Should Congress pass the legislation I have requested, those young men who start college or enter apprentice or other technical training today or hereafter, and subsequently receive a notice of induction, will have their entry into service postponed until the end of the academic semester, or for apprentices and trainees, until some appropriate breaking point in their program.

Even if college deferments are phased out, college men who through ROTC or other military programs have chosen to obligate themselves to enter military service at a later date would be permitted to postpone their active duty until completion of their study program.

In each instance, I have spoken of the phasing out—not the elimination—of existing deferments. The sudden elimination of existing deferments would disrupt plans made in good faith by individuals, companies, colleges and local school systems on the basis of those deferments.

My second legislative proposal would establish a direct national call, by lottery sequence numbers each month, to improve the operation of the random selection system. We need to ensure that men throughout the country with the same lottery number have equal liability to induction.

Under the present law, for example, a man with sequence number 185 may be called up by one draft board while a man with a lower number in a different draft board is not called. This can happen because present law does not permit a national call of young men by lottery sequence numbers.

Some local draft boards may not have enough low numbers to fill their assigned quota for the month. As a result, these local boards are forced to call young men with higher numbers. At the same time, other draft boards throughout the country will have more low numbers than necessary to fill their quotas.

I am recommending to the Congress an amendment to suspend this quota requirement while the random selection system is in effect. If the Congress adopts this amendment, I will authorize the Selective Service System to establish a plan under which the draft call each month will be on a national basis, with the same lottery sequence numbers called throughout the country. This will result in a still more equitable draft system.

As long as we need the draft, it is incumbent upon us to make it as fair and equitable as we can. I urge favorable Congressional action on these legislative proposals for draft reform.

CONCLUSION

While I believe that these reforms in our existing draft system are essential, it should be remembered that they are improvements in a system to be used only as long as conscription continues to be necessary.

Ultimately, the preservation of a free society depends upon both the willingness of its beneficiaries to bear the burden of its defense—and the willingness of government to guarantee the freedom of the individual.

With an end to the draft, we will demonstrate to the world the responsiveness of republican government—and our continuing commitment to the maximum freedom for the individual, enshrined in our earliest traditions and founding documents. By upholding the cause of freedom without conscription we will have demonstrated in one more area the superiority of a society based upon belief in the dignity of man over a society based on the supremacy of the State.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 23, 1970.*

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I commend the President for what I think is a splendid message to Congress in terms of selective service reform. Since 1966, and perhaps even before, a number of Members of Congress have urged many of the recommendations that now have the support of President Nixon and this administration. Perhaps the most comprehensive review of the Selective Service System was made by the Burke Marshall Commission, which made many of the recommendations which, I am glad to see, have been adopted in this message of the President.

In particular, Mr. President, I feel that the position that the President has taken on abolishing occupational deferments is a courageous position. He has requested the power from Congress to abolish educational deferments, which I think is also a courageous position. He is attempting to broaden the pool from which the random selection would be made, by moving the selection process from local draft boards to a national pool, which, in turn, would eliminate some of the present inequities under the random selection system. I think he deserves credit for this.

The tone of this message, Mr. President, is to reduce compulsion by developing a system by which we select some Americans and call them to the defense of our country, but placing the greatest emphasis possible on voluntarism. I think this is a commendable approach of the President. As he has indicated in his message:

No one can predict with precision whether or not, or precisely when, we can end conscription.

But he is certainly, by this message, I think, taking a giant step forward in reducing the compulsive aspects of our Selective Service System.

He outlines in this message some of his proposals: First of all, to increase the pay of the recruits who come into the Armed Forces, for just a 2-year period, in the next fiscal year, by $500 million. He then suggests that he will recommend to Congress in fiscal year 1972 some $2 billion in added pay and other benefits. I would hope those other benefits would include the educational benefits, as I think we know how valuable these are to returning servicemen.

He also stresses and directs the Secretary of Defense to give high priority to the expansion of programs designed to increase enlistments and retentions in the services. I would hope that within that request would be included the kinds of programs, such as the Project 100,000 developed by Secretary McNamara, which was designed to assist young people who might have missed actual induction because of either physical or mental deficiencies by perhaps 1 or 2 percentage points, when they took the examination to enter the Armed Forces, but were volunteering and actually wanted to serve. The service takes these young people, gives them some additional training and some additional education, and then the volunteers serve in the Armed Forces. I understand that program has been successful.

So there have been efforts made in the past, and I am sure Secretary Laird can come up with additional means by which to permit and encourage young people to enter the Armed Forces who, for one reason or another, may not be able to enter at the present time. Certainly we do not want to lower our standards for recruitment, but no doubt there are circumstances and situations in which there can be a greater degree of flexibility, thereby bringing additional young people into the Armed Forces.

So all in all, Mr. President, although I would have liked to have seen some additional reforms in terms of the procedures followed by local boards to give a greater amount of due process to those who, for one reason or another, might have to appeal their draft board's decisions, we will have, actually, less reasons for appeals procedures once we eliminate educational paternity, and occupational deferments. I think therefore there is less urgency in these other reforms, although I would personally like to see some of the other recommendations of our Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure considered by the administration.

The other area of possible reform is conscientious objection. I would hope, when the Armed Services Committee considers the whole question of conscientious objectors, that we would be able to at least return to the Supreme Court interpretation under the Seeger case, which I do feel provides the most responsible definition of a conscientious objector, and I am sure the armed services would, in addition, consider whether we could get to selective conscientious objectors. I have my own

reservations now about allowing selective conscientious objection, but I feel some worthwhile suggestions have been made. President Kingman Brewster at Yale, for example, offered a rather ingenious recommendation in terms of the selective conscientious objector, which I would lean toward at the present time, but which I think needs additional study.

But all in all, Mr. President, this is a commendable message by the President, and I would urge all my colleagues to read it, and hope that, with this kind of guidance, the Armed Services Committee in the Senate can move expeditiously to give to the President the power that he has requested.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I want to say that I am glad to hear the remarks the Senator has just made with reference to selective service. I gathered from some of the reports that I read and heard over the radio that it is possible that changes will take place that might lead within a few years to an all-volunteer army. At least, that has been recommended, as I understand.

Does the Senator have any comment on that?

Mr. KENNEDY. The President had indicated during the course of his campaign that he supported an all-volunteer army. The Gates Commission, which was established under the direction of the President, recommended that we approach an all-volunteer army.

I think that this message leaves open the question of whether we are going to be able to reach an all-volunteer army in the near future. When we take this message in terms of the current military needs—for example, as I understand, a force level now of approximately 3.2 million men—even under this approach, I think it would be extremely difficult to reach an all-volunteer army. But if we were to reduce the Armed Forces needs from 3.2 million to post-Vietnam, which has been estimated at 2.7 million, and which some others have suggested could be reduced even below 2.5 million, I think that under this force level we would probably come almost to the point of a volunteer army.

The Gates Commission believes that we would, and the President's proposed pay increases moves us close. But I think that under the present circumstances, with present demands in terms of Vietnam and immediate post-Vietnam, it will be difficult to reach it. But at least we are reducing the compulsion and increasing the voluntarism in an important way.

That is an important underlying and fundamental theme of this message for which I think the President deserves commendation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Gates Commission recommended we reach the point of an all-volunteer army by July 1, 1971. I understand that that goal is not viewed with any prospect of it happening, but that we are tending in that direction and might reach it over the years.

I think it is appropriate at this time to say this: I always have been impressed with the manner in which the Navy treated its personnel, all of whom have been, with few exceptions, volunteers. Certainly that is true in ordinary peacetime; it would not hold true, I suppose, in wartime. First of all, they allowed a Navy person to retire after 20 years of service. But while that man was in the Navy, he was taught a useful trade.

I was impressed with the fact that a young fellow, 17 years of age, would serve in the Navy and retire at 37. He would have a good trade and in addition would have his retirement, and he was in a very much better condition than a person who had gone into the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I recall that in 1942, when a bill relating to the services was pending in the House of Representatives, I offered an amendment which would allow a person in the Army to retire under the same conditions—that is, in 20 years. I believe that is still the law. It became uniform then in the services. But the Army never has been successful in giving the same type of training to its young men that the Navy has—certainly, not to the same extent. I am sure there are reasons for it. But I believe that a great deal could be accomplished in getting volunteers if we came to something such as that.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator from Alabama always has made extremely useful observations. I share the understanding of the present training programs by the U.S. Navy and the splendid work that has been done under them. Unfortunately, with the requirements of those who serve in the Army as private first class or in the infantry, it is much more difficult than it is in the Navy to give them that kind of training.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In this day of electronics, however, it is becoming more so.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think the comments of the Senator from Alabama are valid and useful. The Navy certainly has done outstanding work.

As the Senator from Alabama perhaps realizes, one of the real additional problems of our times is that in some instances the Navy spends tens of thousands of dollars to train some personnel and then they will leave the service and work in the civilian field. Perhaps in terms of the total economy this is an advantage, but in terms of service to the Navy, it places an additional burden on them.

I think the Senator is correct in his observation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator's time be extended by 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objecton, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I noted with interest what the Senator said about the very difficult problems of conscientious objectors.

In 1940, when I was a member of the Military Affairs Committee in the House of Representatives, when we wrote the Draft Act, we provided for special treatment for men who were members of some organizations whose tenets taught against war. When the time came to renew that in 1941, I offered an amendment which I felt was good—I still feel it is good—which was adopted, to extend the right of conscientious objection to the conscience of the individual, regardless of his being a member of those organizations. Frankly, I do not know whether that is still part of the law, but I did feel it was good then. I offered the amendment, and it was written into the law in 1941.

Mr. KENNEDY. Although, obviously, I was not in the Senate at that time, I think that the sensitivity which was reflected by the Senator from Alabama then is most commendable. Put against the background of the war, it was an extremely courageous position for him to assume. I think all of us are aware of how difficult it is at any time to balance the sincerely held conscientious beliefs of young individuals who, from religious or deeply held moral beliefs, have reservations about service in the Armed Forces with what our responsibilities are in providing for an armed force in this country. This is an extremely difficult balance to strike, particularly through legislation.

I am sure the contributions made by the distinguished Senator from Alabama were extremely important in working this out.

Mr. SPARKMAN. An example would be a member of the Quaker Church. We know that the Quaker Church has tenets against war. But they have a much easier time establishing conscientious objection than would a member of my church, the Methodist Church, because our church does not have those tenets.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator for his comments. I think they have been very useful.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

## MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10105) to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The bill clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of April 20, 1970, pages 12423–12424, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in order for my colleagues to be informed of the

action taken by the House and Senate conferees on this bill, I should like to present the following statement and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HARTKE EXPLAINING CONFERENCE ACTION ON H.R. 10105

AUTHORIZATION

The Committee adopted the following dollar amounts as authorization for the Department's motor vehicle safety program:

1970, $23 million.
1971, $40 million.
1972, $40 million.

Because the Administration will begin planning for its 1972 budget next fall, the conferees thought it advantageous to include a fiscal year 1972 authorization amount in this bill. Since the Department did not request or provide justification of appropriations for fiscal year 1972, the Committee set the authorization amount at 40 million dollars for both 1971 and 1972. However, the identical amounts for these two years are not intended to be a prohibition on the necessary growth of the safety program but rather reflect the Committee's best estimate of need at this time. The Department is invited to inform the Commerce Committees if it finds that its needs for the motor vehicle safety program for fiscal year 1972 can be justified at an amount higher than $40 million.

The Committee deleted the provision in section 121(c) which would have made available in 1970 2.8 million dollars for employment of additional personnel in the National Highway Safety Bureau to carry out the provisions of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966. This deletion was made because fiscal year 1970 had nearly ended at the time of the Committee's action, and the fiscal year 1970 appropriations had already been enacted.

The Committee's action is not meant to suggest that the Committee is no longer concerned about the level of staffing in the National Highway Safety Bureau. To the contrary, the Committee believes that this is one of the Bureau's most critical needs as was shown during the authorization hearings in 1969.

The Committee is hopeful that recent actions by the Department of Transportation will be satisfactory to meet manpower needs. In the fiscal year 1970 appropriations, there was an increase of 56 staff positions provided for the National Highway Safety Bureau, reaching a total of 518 positions. With the reorganization of the Bureau into a major operating element in the Department of Transportation, a step which the Committee heartily approves, the staff positions previously allocated to the Federal Highway Administration to provide support services for the Bureau were transferred to the Bureau's staff, making a total for fiscal year 1970 of 589 staff positions. The Committee understands that for fiscal year 1971 the Department is requesting an additional 254 positions for the National Highway Safety Bureau, reaching a total of 843.

In view of these steps the Committee believes that it is not necessary, as it appeared at this time last year, to specifically allocate a portion of the authorization for appropriations solely for the purpose of hiring additional staff. However, the Committee intends to continue its oversight and review of Bureau operations to make certain that this trend is not reversed or slowed down.

DEFINITION OF MOTOR VEHICLE EQUIPMENT

The Senate-passed bill had expanded the definition of "motor vehicle equipment" to authorize the setting of standards not only for motor vehicles and motor vehicles equipment but for automotive safety accessories and equipment such as motorcycle goggles, tire repair equipment and tire inflation equipment. The House conferees agreed with the thrust of the Senate amendment but they expressed concern that the Senate definition might be interpreted to include items which had only tangential relationship to automotive safety such as shoes or gloves. To clarify the intention of the conferees not to include such tangential items, the Senate amendment was limited to accessories intended for use "exclusively" to safeguard motor vehicles, drivers, passengers and other highway users from risk of accident, injury or death.

PROSPECTIVE PURCHASERS—CONSUMER INFORMATION

The Committee amended the provisions of section 112(d) of the Act concerning consumer information to make it clear that manufacturers would be required to provide consumer information to prospective purchasers as well as to owners. Thus, the bill requires that the information be given to each prospective purchaser at each location where any such manufacturer of vehicles or items of equipment are offered for sale by a person with whom the manufacturer has a contractual, proprietary, or other legal relationship. The information must, as a minimum, include printed material which can be retained by the prospective purchaser or sent to him by mail at his request. For the purchaser, the printed material must be placed in the motor vehicle or attached to or accompany the item of equipment.

The Committee recognizes the great difficulty and complicated task facing the Department and the manufacturers in developing comparable technical safety information which is useful for consumers. Nevertheless, the Committee believes that these requirements are essentials of the Safety Act. The Committee was impressed with the first effort made by the Department to collect and organize the vast amount of consumer information submitted by the manufacturers in December 1969 and urges the Secretary to continue and perfect the document entitled "Performance Data for new Passenger Cars and Motorcycles". Because of the importance of disseminating this information for all makes and models of vehicles sold in the United States, the Committee urges the Secretary to disseminate this booklet as widely as possible and require manufacturers to make it available at each dealership.

It has come to the Committee's attention that despite the promulgation of the first consumer information regulations on January 1, 1970, the vast majority of motor vehicle dealers have not been volunteering the information to consumers. In other words, the dealers are not posting the information at the dealerships or in other ways attempting to inform the consumer about the availability of this information. The Department of Transportation made a survey of dealers to determine the extent to which they made the consumer information available during the first months of 1970. The survey showed that only 1.8% of the dealers had the information on display although 85% were able to produce the information when specifically requested to do so by the survey team.

The Committee expects that the Department will, under the new language of this bill, issue regulations which specifically show the steps the manufacturers, distributors and dealers are expected to take in assuring that consumers are fully informed and have access to the consumer information provided in accordance with section 112(d) of the Act.

DEFECT NOTIFICATION AND RECALL

The Committee considered the addition to the bill of the Senate language which would have specifically required motor vehicle and tire manufacturers to remedy without charge the vehicle or equipment determined to be defective or not in compliance with Federal vehicle safety standards. However, the Committee did not believe it necessary at this time to adopt the Senate language. It is the Committee's understanding that it has to date been the general practice for the industry to remedy without charge any vehicle or equipment about which safety defect notification (concerning a defect or violation of standard) has been sent to owners. The Committee agrees that it is implicit in present law, in the requirements for notification of owners, that the manufacturer must remedy the defect or violation without charge.

Thus, the Committee emphasizes that this action is in no way intended to suggest that the Committee does not expect all manufacturers to remedy defective and non-complying vehicles and equipment without charge. It is obvious that unless the manufacturers accept this responsibility, there is little likelihood that owners will bring their vehicles to dealers for correction. It would be an intolerable situation if the manufacturers, after notifying owners that the product they manufactured was defective or in violation of a safety standard and in need of correction, would not also effect the correction without charge.

The Committee is not interested in needlessly adding legislative language to the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act. However, the Committee fully intends to carefully watch the performance of all manufacturers and the extent to which they cooperate with the Department of Transportation in carrying out the intent of the Act. If it should come to the attention of the Committee that the manufacturers are not recalling any vehicle or equipment which is defective or in violation of the Federal standards and remedying these without charge, we will not hesitate immediately to initiate legislation which would require manufacturers to recall and remedy such vehicles and equipment, to be penalized by the Government for failure to do so immediately, and to require payment of punitive damages to owners whose vehicles contain safety defects or fail to comply with safety standards.

The Committee believes that the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act is of vital importance to the Nation, and expects that its benefits will be even more evident in reducing the death and injury rate within the next several years. Assurance that defective or unsafe vehicles are not travelling on the highways is a critical part of the Act, and the Committee expects that the Department of Transportation and the automotive industry will work jointly to assure that the millions of vehicles on the highways are in the safest possible condition at all times.

TIRE DEFECT NOTIFICATION

The bill requires tire manufacturers, as vehicle manufacturers are already obligated under present law, to provide defect notification of defective or noncomplying tires. As Senate Report 91–559 makes clear, the motor vehicle manufacturers will continue to be responsible for safety defect notifications to owners of original equipment tires sold with new motor vehicles, while the tire manufacturers under this bill will be responsible for notification to owners of aftermarket tires

The bill also requries the motor vehicle and tire manufacturers to maintain records of the names and addresses of first purchasers so that the company is able to provide notification as the present law requires by certified mail. Language adopted by the conferees authorizes the Secretary to establish procedures under which distributors and dealers must assist manufacturers in securing the names and addresses of first purchasers on the condition that such procedures do not affect the basic obligation

of the manufacturer to keep records. The purpose of this provision is to assure that dealers and distributors, whose efforts are important and necessary in securing the names and addresses of first purchasers, will cooperate fully with the manufacturers. However, the Committee also expects the Department in its regulations to take care not to compromise the competitive position of these small businessmen in their dealings with the manufacturers, and expects that the Department will penalize manufacturers if the lists of purchasers are in any way used for commercial purposes by the manufacturers to the detriment of independent distributors or dealers.

FACILITIES

The Committee gave thorough consideration to the need for research and development facilities as well as Bureau compliance testing facilities. The Committee believes that the provisions in the bill as reported by the conferees will provide the Department with the maximum flexibility in rapidly designing and constructing the needed facilities. Thus, the bill, as reported, provides an unlimited authorization for the Secretary of Transportation to plan, design and construct facilities suitable to conduct research, development and compliance and other testing in traffic safety.

The burden now rests with the Secretary of Transportation to provide the Senate and House Committees and the Senate and House Public Works Committees with an appropriate prospectus of his plans for requesting appropriations for design and construction of these facilities. The Conference Committee is cognizant of the great need for testing facilities both for the purpose of developing standards and other research information as well as for assuring compliance with these standards. The conferees pledged that they will provide every assistance to the Secretary in securing passage of the resolutions called for in H.R. 12105 to expedite appropriations by the Congress. The conferees are anxious to assist the Secretary in dramatically reducing the enormous death and injury toll and stand ready to act on his own requests as soon as they are forwarded to the Congress.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, as one of the conferees on the amendments to the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, I am pleased that we were able to reach substantial agreement with the managers for the other body.

Mr. President, I believe that these amendments represent another step forward to solving one of our Nation's most serious problems. Yesterday as we all celebrated Earth Day, the value of human life and the concern that we all have for living was utmost in all our minds. Deaths from motor vehicle accidents, Mr. President, day in and day out snuff out lives for thousands of Americans. We all know the statistics which remind us that last year alone over 56,000 lives were lost because of motor vehicle accidents.

We all know that there are over 70,000 accidents a day.

We all know that the economic cost to the Nation is over $16 billion a year.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, we sometimes become callous to these statistics and relax in our efforts to insure traffic safety.

There are three basic elements in any traffic accident: people, vehicles, and the highway. Over the past decade we have made great strides in improving the safety of our Nation's highways. The Interstate Highway System has certainly averted many accidents.

Beginning in 1966, we in Congress enacted legislation designed to make the vehicles we use safer. I, for one, am convinced that we have made considerable progress in that area. The 1970 motor vehicle is in fact a safer vehicle than its counterpart of 10 years ago. I am also convinced that the amendments to the Motor Vehicle and Highways Safety Act of 1966, which were agreed to by the House and Senate conferees, represent another step toward our developing the safest possible motor vehicle. For example, Mr. President, we have provided for the establishment of research and test facilities by the Federal Government which would be used to insure that the manufacturer of motor vehicles and tires complies with standards set by the Federal Government. Those facilities would also be used to conduct tests for devising ways and means for improving the structure, the design, and the material used in motor vehicles so that they would be able to save additional lives.

Also, Mr. President, these amendments expand the definition of motor vehicle equipment so as to include such safety related items as motorcycle helmets. State after State has continued to pass legislation to require motor cyclists to use safety helmets. Unfortunately, some of the helmets made for such use are not designed or manufactured in such a way so as to insure the maximum possible protection. Our amendments would enable the Secretary of Transportation to set standards in this very important area so that fewer deaths would occur. In addition, Mr. President, the act is expanded so that the Secretary of Transportation can look at another group of vehicles which often contribute to death and accidents. The Secretary is directed to study ways and means of improving the safety of the farm tractor. When his report is completed, I am certain that Congress may wish to further amend this act.

Mr. President, since 1966 real progress has been made. The Department of Transportation has issued 29 motor vehicle safety standards alone since 1967 and have proposed an additional 95. Some of the results obtained by those standards are clearly indicated by the hard data gathered in the last 3 years.

For example, fatality statistics for the 1966 to 1969 interval show a definite improvement in safety. Although the absolute number of deaths per year continued upward, the increase slowed from a 6.8 percent per year to only 2.1 percent per year.

In addition, hard data gathered in the 3 years since the safety legislation was enacted show conclusively that crash survivability is a successful concept for highway safety. The data were gathered from various crash experience and actual accident records:

No fatal injuries at crash speeds up to 60 miles per hour when occupants wore lap and shoulder safety belts.

Motorcycle fatalities down 30 percent due to protective crash helmets.

The rate of fatal head injuries due to contact with new high penetration resistant windshields is 32 percent less than the rate in crashes involving pre-1966 cars.

No fatal or dangerous injuries to drivers in crash impacts at 50 miles per hour with new energy-absorbing steering columns.

This downward trend should continue to improve based on the very positive steps taken by the Department of Transportation during the past year. For example, in 1969 alone the following steps were taken:

First fines levied at vehicle manufacturers for not complying with vehicle safety standards.

State programs approved by the Secretary, thus providing a blueprint for progress by the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico in implementing the highway safety program standards.

Shift from piecemeal project-by-project approval of Federal grant-in-aid assistance to States to an annual work-plan concept whereby an entire year's State safety program will be funded when approved.

Issue of first consumer information regulations requiring automobile and motorcycle manufacturers to provide prospective purchasers information on such important safety features as stopping distance, acceleration, and tire reserve load.

Initiation of rulemaking procedures to require all cars be equipped with passive occupant restraint system, such as the air bag, in order to increase crash survivability.

Issue of detailed manuals to help States and communities implement the 16 Federal standards established under the Highway Safety Act.

Some 1,200 new findings on the real causative factors behind crashes submitted by 15 medical engineering accident investigation teams.

Moreover, Mr. President, the Secretary of Transportation moved the National Highway Safety Bureau to the same level as other modal administrations reporting directly to him. This action gave a greater voice to the entire area of highway safety.

Mr. President, the only disappointment I have in the agreement reached by the conferees is that the funds necessary for research and compliance testing facilities must be given approval by two committees in the House and two committees in the Senate. The managers for the other body would not recede on this item, and while I, for one, feel that it is an unnecessary incumbrance on getting the job done, I am convinced that all of the committees involved will expedite any request by the Secretary.

Now, Mr. President, while I feel that these amendments represent another step toward obtaining the safest possible motor vehicle, I want to point out that we still have a long way to go. The motor vehicle can be made to be safer, and those of us in Congress are dedicated to achieving that goal.

Mr. President, I want to close by mentioning the final element in any automobile accident. That element is the driver. We must at all levels of govern-

ment take a hard look at ways and means for improving driver performance because all of us agree that driver error constitutes the greatest single cause of automobile accidents. Somehow all of us must keep in mind that automobile accidents represent the leading killer for those in the 5 to 35 age group. For all Americans motor vehicle accidents constitute the fourth greatest cause of death. As we put renewed emphasis on a clean environment and the need for preserving human life, we must continue to give a high priority to reducing deaths on the highway.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate further insist on its amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

## EARTH DAY

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in West Virginia there are two universities and 19 colleges. Yesterday, and the days preceding what we know as "Earth Day," there were 19 institutions in West Virginia which, through student leadership, conducted programs on the challenge to the environment as well as the threat of degradation and the desecration and the deterioration of the earth in which we live.

It was my privilege to address several of these groups at West Virginia colleges. And I noted particularly the student leadership with respect to the concern and the desire not to march in the street, or wave the flag, but to counsel with others on these pressing problems that have to do with the enhancement of the values of the American way of life.

I sense that in this crusade, the zeroing in on environmental matters, there was cooperation between the citizens within the community and the students on the campus of those communities.

In my home town of Elkins, W. Va., at Davis-Elkins College, the program was one of student leadership, but with citizen participation. The people from downtown came up the hill to work on this matter with the concerned students, as I have said, on these programs to alleviate the conditions which frankly are not only burdensome but also which must not be tolerated in the United States of America.

We certainly need not only a recycling of the waste material so that it may be used again, but we also need a recycling of the human spirit in regard to these matters.

It is encouraging that it is possible for me to report from my State on the active participation of students. As I indicated, students from 19 of the 21 colleges and universities participated. I assume that the students from the other two colleges will come forward with programs within the next few days to give us unanimity of action. It is my hope that the action which has been taken has not been overcharged with emotion but will continue to be carried forward in constructive and meaningful programs.

Our concern with problems of the environment should continue and the decade of the 1970's should be the "Age of Ecology."

## TRIBUTE TO SENATOR FULBRIGHT, CHAIRMAN OF THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I had really intended to make my remarks on this matter tomorrow. However, the Senate will not be in session tomorrow. So, I will make my remarks a little ahead of time.

On tomorrow the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, will become the holder of the record with respect to the tenure of that office. He will have been in the office of chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations for longer than any other man in history. And there have been some who have held that office for a rather long time.

Senator Sumner, of Massachusetts, was chairman of the committee for 10 years, from March 4, 1861, to March 4, 1871.

Senator Shelby M. Cullom, of Illinois, was chairman of the committee for more than 11 years, having served from December 18, 1901, until March 4, 1913.

Senator FULBRIGHT has already exceeded the record of service of Senator Sumner. And in length of service and tenure, Senator FULBRIGHT will have tomorrow exceeded the service of Senator Cullom.

There have been, as I say, some who have had rather extensive tenure of office—Senator Connally, of Texas, Senator Pittman, of Nevada, Senator Borah, of Idaho, Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, James Mason, of Virginia.

There have been some two dozen or more committee chairmen over the years.

BILL FULBRIGHT was named chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee on February 6, 1959. And he has served continuously as its chairman since that time. So, as of tomorrow, he will have held the post of chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee for longer than any other man in the history of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. President, BILL FULBRIGHT first served in the House of Representatives. There he was the author of the Fulbright resolution. In a short time he came to the Senate and, more or less naturally, became a member of the Foreign Relations Committee because of the great interest he had shown in international affairs.

He also served on the Banking and Currency Committee. When I came to the Senate and was first assigned to the committees in January 1947, I was assigned to the Banking and Currency Committee. And I had the pleasure of sitting just below him for 12 years. In the meantime, I, too, had become a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. But he was a good bit ahead of me.

As time went on and seniority played its part, I reached the point of sitting next to him. So I have often said that I sat next to BILL FULBRIGHT for the nearly 24 years that I have been a Member of the Senate.

On the Banking and Currency Committee and on the Foreign Relations Committee, I thought at times that it was pretty much like the old saying, "So often a bridesmaid, but never a bride." But I did eventually become chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee some time after Senator FULBRIGHT had left that committee.

I pay tribute to BILL FULBRIGHT not only for the length of service he has had, but also for the tremendous service he has rendered his country.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join the distinguished Senator from Alabama in paying tribute and I express my own high personal esteem for the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. As has been pointed out, he has been the chairman of that committee for the longest time ever.

BILL FULBRIGHT and I came to Congress and sat together in the House of Representatives almost 28 years ago. In fact, the first man I met on the floor was BILL FULBRIGHT, who had resigned from the presidency of the University of Arkansas to run for the House.

I had just retired temporarily from the faculty of the University of Montana—temporarily I say because I did not return for the next 28 years. It is understood that that is considered only temporary.

However, I got to know BILL FULBRIGHT. As I said, he was the first man I met when I went into the House Chamber. I sat next to him on the Foreign Affairs Committee in the House. He was my senior then. And today I sit under him in the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

I have a pretty good idea of what could be called the ups and downs of BILL FULBRIGHT, of what he has gone through, of his remarkable stamina and resiliency. He has always been honest and frank—for some people, perhaps, too honest and too frank; without enough doubletalk, or enough weaseling, or enough edging away.

I have watched BILL FULBRIGHT carefully. I have watched him in his service to his own State, his service on the committee, and on the floor of the Chamber.

In all of the time that has passed since we first met so many years ago, I have yet to see the day when BILL has had to take second place to anyone. I consider it a high privilege to have been associated with him and to be associated with him today, to call him friend, and to be the recipient of his advice and counsel down through the years. It has been a deep honor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Montana for his remarks.

I call attention to the fact that in the committee I sit between BILL FULBRIGHT and MIKE MANSFIELD, but it has not always been that way. I used to sit between BILL FULBRIGHT and Wayne Morse, and sometimes I had a little rough going sitting there.

But I do want to say that BILL FULBRIGHT has always handled that committee with the greatest of courtesy, fairness, and consideration for everyone, with a respect for the views of everyone, whether he agreed with them or not.

By the way, there is another honor BILL FULBRIGHT holds, which the Senator from Montana may not have thought of. RUSSELL LONG once introduced me as the most senior junior Senator in Congress. I said to him I appreciated that introduction but I did not deserve it. I do not hold that honor. The most senior junior Senator in the Senate is BILL FULBRIGHT and he is still the junior Senator.

I appreciate the opportunity to have served with him, under him, and to have worked with him.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may have sufficient time to complete these remarks, so far as they may be completed in a single day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding to me at this time particularly. As successor to Theodore Francis Green, the chairman emeritus in the Committee on Foreign Relations, and one who held his own outstanding record for longevity, I take particular delight in paying tribute to my chairman, Senator FULBRIGHT. Long before I was a Member of this body I had admired him and my admiration has grown on coming here.

It is often said no man is a hero to his valet. There are very few valets in the world today, but as a junior member of a committee one sometimes approaches that role. In this regard, our chairman is very much a hero in my eyes, and in the very real sense of the word when "hero" combines the quality of courage with integrity.

From a professional point of view, as I believe the only former American Foreign Service officer ever to have served in the Senate, I would doff my hat to the chairman for his in-depth of knowledge of the history and background of foreign affairs, for his diplomacy, and for his awareness of the problems that our diplomatists face abroad.

I am happy, indeed, that this well justified tribute is being made to Senator FULBRIGHT at this time.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I do not know who started this exercise, but it may have been the committee staff. We are grateful to whoever started it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Several months ago in a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations, during an open hearing, it was casually brought up that on April 24 the Senator from Arkansas would reach that point. We had quite a discussion of it there in committee. Incidentally, it was brought about because of the name of the man we were approving as Ambassador was a kinsman of Shelby Cullom. I said at that time that when April 24 rolled around, I wanted to be sure to call this matter to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator, and I thank him for taking the lead in this matter, because we can now say what we otherwise seldom have a chance to say about a man who has added so much to the richness of life in the Senate and in our committee. He makes service for all of us on the committee a delight. It is so nice to be able to say something and to be understood by a man whose intellect is just as good as your own, if not twice as good as your own, without having to explain something 10 times. Just because he has contributed so much to our esthetic pleasure, I want to pay this tribute.

All kinds of qualities go with him. He has a touch of impatience once in a while, which he keeps within tolerable bounds, not strict bounds, that adds spice to his leadership. He is impatient with the excesses of verbosity to which we are all inclined.

Seriously, and all I have said is serious, his leadership of this committee is a little offbeat and provides that kind of stimulation to the thinking of this body on questions that certainly equal, and perhaps exceed, all others in importance at this time.

Any contribution any of us have made will likely prove twice as important and twice as significant because he has helped us, because he has led us, has prodded us, and has encouraged us.

I want to thank him, Mr. President, through you, for what he has meant to me personally as well as all those who serve under him.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am the newest member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. When I first became a member of the committee, which I had tried to join for a long time, the Senator from Arkansas, as chairman, perhaps may have greeted that event with mixed emotions not knowing how I would perform. I did not know him any too well at that time. I consider it one of the real highlights of my career in this body that I did finally "make," as the saying goes, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that I had to work with BILL FULBRIGHT. I count him as a friend. I speak with absolute assurance when I say that he counts me as a friend. In our case that is extremely important.

He is a man of very, very deep insight. As the Senator from New Jersey properly said, he has an unusually fine intellect, and—notwithstanding the touch of impatience—he does want to hear the facts. He masters his own impatience and that is the true measure of a man. He has also the great ability, which I admire so much, to be able to say, I am persuaded. To me those are among the significant words in our language.

Finally, there is his truly historic service. I think this is very important to emphasize for us on the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Some people in this country call BILL FULBRIGHT irresponsible and the reason is that he does not hesitate to take an extremely independent position which walks off the beaten path. If ever there was a time in the history of our country and in the history of the world when this absolutely irreconcilable spirit of questioning was in need, it is now. It is precisely because he will not accept the yoke of conformity that he is such a magnificent chairman of the committee.

I hope very much that these short remarks are listened to. The Senator from Arkansas has been the chairman of this great committee longer than anyone else in the history of the committee. We who serve on the Committee on Foreign Relations have a great diversity of views and we respect him not only as a chairman, but as a person and as a friend. The path on which he beckons this country will lead to the promise of constructive achievement in terms of justice and well-being in the world, with a far less doctrinaire approach to problems than shown so far, with deep understanding and friendship for all people in the feeling we are going to have to live with them, and we cannot live with them if we are afraid to try new ways.

So, Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in honoring BILL FULBRIGHT. I hope very much that he may exceed the longevity of Senator Green of Rhode Island and that we may have the benefit of his integrity, friendship, and leadership for decades to come.

Mr. President, I suggest—and I do this symbolically; perhaps the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) can introduce it into the RECORD—that there be placed in the RECORD a list of the chairmen of the Committee on Foreign Relations, with the term of office, which is official evidence of the fact that the Senator from Arkansas is the chairman who has served the longest.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of all the chairmen who have served in that capacity in the Committee on Foreign Relations, as was suggested by the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS).

There being no objection the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAIRMEN OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

[Senator, Congress, and date]

James Barbour, Virginia: 14th, 1816–1817.

James Barbour, Virginia; Nathaniel Macon, North Carolina (2d session): 15th, 1817–1819.

James Brown, Louisiana; James Barbour, Virginia (2d session): 16th, 1819–1821.

Rufus King, New York; James Barbour, Virginia (2d session): 17th, 1821–1823.

James Barbour, Virginia: 18th, 1823–1825.

Nathaniel Macon, North Carolina; Nathan Sanford, New York (2d session): 19th, 1825–1827.

Nathaniel Macon, North Carolina; Littleton W. Tazewell, Virginia (2d session): 20th, 1827–1829.

Littleton W. Tazewell, Virginia: 21st, 1829–1831.

Littleton W. Tazewell, Virginia; John Forsyth, Georgia (2d session): 22d, 1831–1833.

William Wilkins, Pennsylvania; Henry Clay, Kentucky (2d session): 23d, 1833–1835.

Henry Clay, Kentucky; James Buchanan, Pennsylvania (2d session): 24th, 1835–1837.

James Buchanan, Pennsylvania: 25th, 1837–1839.
James Buchanan, Pennsylvania: 26th, 1839–1841.
William C. Rives, Virginia; William S. Archer, Virginia (3d session): 27th, 1841–1843.
William S. Archer, Virginia: 28th, 1843–1845.
William Allen, Ohio; Ambrose H. Sevier, Arkansas (2d session): 29th, 1845–1847.
Ambrose H. Sevier, Arkansas; Edward A. Hannegan, Indiana (2d session and part of 1st beginning Mar. 14, 1848): 30th, 1847–1849.
Thomas H. Benton, Missouri (special session); William R. King, Alabama (1st session); Henry S. Foote, Mississippi (2d session); 31st, 1849–1851.
Henry S. Foote, Mississippi (special session); 32d, 1851–1853.
Henry S. Foote, Mississippi (special session); James M. Mason, Virginia; 32d, 1851–1853.
James M. Mason, Virginia; 33d, 1853–1855.
James M. Mason, Virginia; 34th, 1855–1857.
James M. Mason, Virginia; 35th, 1857–1859.
James M. Mason, Virginia; 36th, 1859–1861.
Charles Sumner, Massachusetts; 37th, 1861–1863.
Charles Sumner, Massachusetts; 38th, 1863–1865.
Charles Sumner, Massachusetts; 39th, 1865–1867.
Charles Sumner, Massachusetts; 40th, 1867–1869.
Charles Sumner, Massachusetts; 41st, 1869–1871.
Simon Cameron, Pennsylvania; 42d, 1871–1873.
Simon Cameron, Pennsylvania; 43d, 1873–1875.
Simon Cameron, Pennsylvania; 44th, 1875–1877.
Simon Cameron, Pennsylvania (special session); Hannibal Hamlin, Maine; 45th, 1877–1879.
William W. Eaton, Connecticut; 46th, 1879–1881.
Ambrose E. Burnside, Rhode Island (1st special session); George F. Edmunds, Vermont (2d special session); William Windon, Minnesota: 47th,1871–1883.
John F. Miller, California: 48th, 1883–1885.
John F. Miller, California: 49th, 1885–1887.
John Sherman, Ohio: 50th, 1887–1889.
John Sherman, Ohio: 51st, 1889–1891.
John Sherman, Ohio: 52d, 1891–1893.
John T. Morgan, Alabama: 53d, 1893–1895.
John Sherman, Ohio: 54th, 1895–1897.
William P. Frye, Maine (acting, special session); Cushman K. Davis, Minnesota: 55th, 1897–1899.
Cushman K. Davis, Minnesota: 56th, 1899–1901.
William P. Frye, Maine (acting, special session); Shelby M. Cullom, Illinois: 57th, 1901–1903.
Shelby M. Cullom, Illinois: 58th, 1903–1905.
Shelby M. Cullom, Illinois: 59th, 1905–1907.
Shelby M. Cullom, Illinois: 60th, 1907–1909.
Shelby M. Cullom, Illinois: 61st, 1909–1911.
Shelby M. Cullom, Illinois: 63d, 1911–1913.
Augustus O. Bacon, Georgia: 63d, 1913–1915.
William J. Stone, Missouri: 64th, 1915–1917.
William J. Stone, Missouri: 65th, 1917–1919.
Henry Cabot Lodge, Massachusetts: 66th, 1919–1921.
Henry Cabot Lodge, Massachusetts: 67th, 1921–1923.
Henry Cabot Lodge, Massachusetts (died Nov. 9, 1924): 68th, 1923–1925.
William E. Borah, Idaho: 69th, 1925–1927.
William E. Borah, Idaho: 70th, 1927–1929.
William E. Borah, Idaho: 71st, 1929–1931.
William E. Borah, Idaho: 72d, 1931–1933.
Key Pittman, Nevada: 73d, 1933–1934.
Key Pittman, Nevada: 74th, 1935–1936.
Key Pittman, Nevada: 75th, 1937–1938.
Key Pittman, Nevada: 76th, 1939–1941.
Walter F. George, Georgia (excused from chairmanship June 31, 1941); Tom Connally, Texas: 77th, 1941–1943.
Tom Connally, Texas: 78th, 1943–1945.
Tom Connally, Texas: 79th, 1945–1947.
Arthur H. Vandenberg, Michigan: 80th, 1947–1949.
Tom Connally, Texas: 81st, 1949–1951.
Tom Connally, Texas: 82d, 1951–1953.
Alexander Wiley, Wisconsin: 83d, 1953–1955.
Walter F. George (Georgia: 84th, 1955–1957.
Theodore Francis Green, Rhode Island: 85th, 1957–1959.
Theodore Francis Green, Rhode Island (resigned chairmanship Feb. 6, 1959); J. W. Fulbright, Arkansas: 86th, 1959–1961.
J. W. Fulbright, Arkansas: 87th, 1961–1963.
J. W. Fulbright, Arkansas: 88th, 1963–1965.
J. W. Fulbright, Arkansas: 89th, 1965–1967.
J. W. Fulbright, Arkansas: 90th, 1967– .

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I would join my colleagues in commending without reservation one of the most courageous Members it has ever been my privilege to work with.

Many years ago the distinguished Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee said it was time for us to start thinking about the unthinkable, and based on the record, that may have been the most important statement of our time.

From the standpoint of my personally working with him over the years on this committee, I have come to learn that he has one of the finer intellects it has been my privilege to know. People say, "You have changed some of your thinking. All should have the right to change, but I have broadened.

Other things are now equally important to what I thought in the past was perhaps most important. To the able and courageous Senator from Arkansas, it is with great respect that I owe much of that thinking, that broadening, to the way he runs the committee, and to him.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas, more than any other American, has asked quietly, and despite bitter criticism, What is the price, and is it all worth the cost, these foreign adventures which are bleeding the American economy to death and, what is far more important, exacting as price the lives of many young Americans.

If it is right, then so be it. We who have the decision to make in our hearts and minds are grateful that we have a colleague who constantly urges us to weigh the high cost as against what can be achieved. I salute him for that.

Finally, Mr. President, it was many years ago that I became disturbed about how much of the foreign policy of the United States was conducted in secrecy. As a former member of the executive branch, and a former member of the National Security Council, I knew something about this. But it was not when I came to the Senate, rather when I went on the Foreign Relations Committee, that I began to really understand how the foreign policy of the United States was conducted; again, thanks to the work of this committee and its chairman.

Mr. President, we all know that in recent months we have been deescalating a war in public, but escalating a war in secret.

In due time this great country will recognize the contribution being made by this independent and thoughtful gentleman who is doing his best to see the people get the facts, important facts that have to do with the survival and prosperity of the Nation. I am honored to be on his committee. It is thought provoking, stimulating, and challenging. There is no committee in the Congress contributing more to the welfare of the country.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, it has been a great honor to know Senator FULBRIGHT, as a colleague in the Senate for 17 years. And, it has been a special privilege and an opportunity to serve under his leadership for over 3 years on the Foreign Relations Committee.

I think on this day of his diverse qualities, but it seems to me very appropriate that the Senator from Arkansas has diverse qualities. We can recall that he was a great halfback on the Arkansas football team. We know him as a scholar and as an intellectual. He can be very graceful in his speech and writings, but those of us who have served with him on the Foreign Relations Committee know that, if it is necessary, he has all the skill of a county attorney in the Ozarks of Arkansas.

I read about him before I came to the Senate, when, as a Member of the House of Representatives, he introduced the Fulbright resolution which laid down the broad framework of foreign policy for this country in the aftermath of World War II.

Then in the Senate, he was the one who initiated the program of exchange for students and scholars known as the Fulbright program, which has made such a positive contribution to international understanding and good will. He has proposed for many years that the foreign aid program should be administered through a multilateral organization. Two years ago, he was the one who proposed the national commitments resolution to strengthen constitutional processes used in the formulation of foreign policy.

I believe that his present service in the Senate may be his greatest in a distinguished career. He has insisted that the Congress, and particularly the Senate, exercise its responsibility—its joint responsibilty—in the field of foreign policy with the President of the United States. And most important of all, at this time, he has insisted that before our country shall be taken into war or take new directions that involve our security or foreign policy, the Congress of the United States shall join with the Executive in the making of such decisions.

So today I am glad that I can speak about his accomplishments, and glad that I have had the opportunity to serve with him. I pay my tribute to him and also to Mrs. Fulbright.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I had occasion not long ago to read a fairly recent biography of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, and in connection with it, read, as a portion of that book, some of the highlights, selected speeches of the Senator, including not only his more recent speeches, with which many of us are more familiar, but earlier speeches, including his speech on the occasion of the Senate's rejection of the Bricker amendment.

I think that particular speech is as fine an exposition of the relative powers and responsibilities of the Senate and the President in regard to the making of treaties and the conduct of foreign affairs as has been written since the Federalist Papers themselves. I was very much impressed again, Mr. President, in reading through that and all the other speeches there collected with the great intellect, clarity of thinking, and the wonderful command of the English language shown in the excellent writings of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

I shall not detain the Senate longer, except to say that I warmly endorse the other words which have been said by Senators on this occasion.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I add my voice to those who have spoken in congratulation to the Senator from Arkansas on his many years of tireless and diligent work on the Foreign Relations Committee.

As one who arrived in the Chamber during the course of another speech, I have not heard all that has been said. Particularly, I did not hear it stated precisely how long the Senator has served on the committee, but I think I can recall, because I believe on my first day in the Senate the Senator from Arkansas was assigned to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that was about 21 years ago.

I once had the privilege of serving on the committee with the Senator, and later under his leadership; and I must say that it is a very thankless and frustrating job. One can vote to do what he can to help others with their problems, but it is not within the power of this committee or of this country to make people use wisely the things that we are able to provide to them or do for them. When one has to study not merely the problems of one country, but the problems of 100 countries, and try to act wisely with respect to our relationships to those countries, it really consumes one's full time—more than one's full time, to be entirely fair about the matter—and it is not the kind of work that tends to get one reelected in his home State. It is something that he must do in addition to staying in touch with his constituents.

I can recall times when I gave my chairman considerable headaches, and times when he gave me some; but I am positive that he was in complete good faith and sincerity in pursuing his duty as he saw it, just as he is today, and that there is no one in the Senate more conscientious and more dedicated to the cause of world peace, nor is there any man in the Senate more completely independent, both of his colleagues and of the executive branch of the Government, than the Senator from Arkansas.

He has given the very best that he had to offer his country over a great number of years, and I join my colleagues in saluting him for the great contribution that he has made, as well as for the endless and painful efforts that he has devoted, year after year, through long hours day after day, to trying to help advise this Nation upon the wisest course, and trying to see that decisions which he regarded as being in error were corrected.

So I salute the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, a Senator whom I am proud to call a member of the Finance Committee as well.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I join those who have been saluting the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations today.

I do not know of a more exciting term of years with such responsibilities as the years which Senator FULBRIGHT'S command of the committee has covered. The speed of change, the closeness of the issues on decisions that defy simple right and wrong answers or good and bad solutions, and the emotions of the times, have all combined to make a chairmanship on that committee in these days as trying as I could imagine any chairmanship in this body could ever be. As a member of his committee—to be sure, the lowest in the pecking order, but still a serving member of the committee—I personally salute my chairman for his patience, his understanding, his energy, and most of all his imaginativeness, at a time when we are desperately searching, not for his answer or my answer alone, but for the wisest answers that we can come up with. I would not want this occasion to go by without this personal salute from me.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PERCY. I am very grateful to the distinguished and beloved chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency for this colloquy. I would feel very remiss if I did not comment, and I have patiently waited for the colloquy to get down to my level of seniority, because of the high seniority of those who have preceded me.

Most of the speakers today have been members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I think we ought to have someone speak who aspires some day to be on that committee, and I hope the number of years in the future that will require will not be so great that I shall not have the opportunity to serve under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

I speak as a near neighbor in the New Senate Office Building, where I have been the recipient, as has my staff, since we moved into that office, of the Senator's southern hospitality. We have shared not only the refreshments offered as a welcome when we moved in, but also the only color television set I know of on that floor. When matters of earth-shaking importance would occur, we have congregated around Senator FULBRIGHT'S television set.

Just four things occur to me that I think are particularly representative of the Senator from Arkansas.

First, I think the distinguished Senator offers tremendous hope to youth all over the country. He may be senior in the Senate, and he may be very senior in service, now, as chairman of this distinguished committee, but he has touched young people. He has made them feel that the Government is really responsible, and that senior Members of the Senate can express and articulate many of the deep-seated feelings that they have; and that is not just the young people of his State, but young people all over the country.

When I had the honor of addressing the students at the University of Arkansas, I mentioned a number of things that brought forth favorable responses, and some that brought forth unfavorable responses, that were hard for them to hear. But when I mentioned the name of their distinguished Senator, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations (Mr. FULBRIGHT), we received a standing ovation, as an indication of the affection and high regard in which he is held by the young people of his State.

Second, he has demonstrated and proved that government can be made responsive to the strong feelings of people.

Third, he has demonstrated the independence of the Senate. He has demonstrated that we have a form of government which has three separate and distinct branches, and whether it is pressure from the executive branch under the control of his own party's leadership, or the leadership of the opposition party, there is no partisanship in the independent expressions of feelings and attitude of Senator FULBRIGHT, nor in his sense of purpose and conviction in carrying out those feelings.

Finally, I think we should not leave unmentioned the very difficult vote he placed with respect to the confirmation of the nomination of an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. That was a difficult decision for many of us—for all of us, possibly. But I think that in his way he searched his own conscience and his own judgment and decided to cast his vote on the side of his own judgment and his own conscience, without giving in to the many pressures that prevailed. In the spirit of the independence of the Senate and the right of every Senator to stand up and vote his conscience as best he sees it, in his own judgment, he once again demonstrated the best traditions of the U.S. Senate.

I am honored, indeed, to pay tribute to my friend and my neighbor in the New Senate Office Building, Senator FULBRIGHT.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous

consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Fulbright Sets Record as Foreign Relations Chairman," written by Elizabeth Wharton, and published in the Washington Star of Sunday, April 19.

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

FULBRIGHT SETS RECORD AS FOREIGN RELATIONS CHAIRMAN

(By Elizabeth Wharton)

Whenever J. William Fulbright speaks, half of his listeners purr. The other half feel their hackles rise.

"I'm abrasive, I know," he says. "I don't know why that is."

Next Friday, the Arkansas Democrat will have been chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee longer than anyone in history—11 years and 77 days.

In an interview, Fulbright said his greatest fear is that "if we make too big a mess of things, you'll have a right-wing takeover here just as has occurred in so many countries all over the world.

"All I try to do is meet each day as I can and, hopefully, to save this country from going down the wrong road," he said.

Fulbright also expressed his philosophy on a number of other subjects:

The U.S. role in the world—"it should be a modest one—we have so much to be modest about."

Super-patriotism—"A substitute for thought."

His battles with former President Johnson—"I never have liked these things to be on a personal basis—I was giving him what I thought was good advice."

Vice President Agnew's attacks on him—"I'm both offended by the crudeness of his expressions and at the same time complimented by the fact that he thought there was sufficient significance to warrant his special attention."

Fulbright also considers it "just a shame that President Nixon didn't move to close the war out" when he took office.

"Now he's going to have to sooner or later, but it's going to cost an enormous amount of money and deaths and so on, and he's going to wind up about the same way . . . ."

BREAKING RECORD

Fulbright is breaking the record of Sen. Shelby M. Cullom, an Illinois Republican who served as committee chairman from Dec., 18, 1901, until March 4, 1913.

Fulbright's nationally televised committee hearings on Vietnam in 1966 and 1968, and the second Tonkin Gulf investigation, were largely responsible for building anti-war sentiment and making public dissent respectable during the Johnson years.

But the resulting controversy also has tended to obscure his innovative moves in other areas during his chairmanship.

In 1959, while birth control was still a dirty word in many circles, Fulbright urged that some foreign aid funds be earmarked for population control assistance to overcrowded countries. The AID agency now spends up to $100 million a year for that purpose.

He was the first, in 1960, to propose channeling U.S. foreign aid through multi-nation agencies, rather than distributing it to individual countries on the handout basis—the approach now being recommended by a presidential task force.

Fulbright's investigation of lobbyists for foreign governments (including such political "untouchables" as the United Jewish Appeal) led to a tightening of registration and reporting requirements.

In 1966, he conducted a series of hearings on "U.S. policy toward mainland China," in which a number of "old China hands"—former State Department experts—testified on possible moves to begin normalizing relations. The moves now are beginning to be put into effect.

Fulbright steered to Senate ratification such landmark treaties as the atomic test ban agreement, the nuclear non-proliferation pact and the less-publicized but significant agreement to increase consular representation between the United States and the Soviet Union.

For the interview, Fulbright sat at a crowded but uncluttered desk in his walnut-paneled office. There was a large American flag on a brass staff by the window behind him, and a few miniature Democratic donkeys on a bookcase near the door.

Fulbright, who was 65 April 9, was dressed in his usual impeccably conservative suit, vest and tie.

How does he assess those 11 years and 77 days, and what are his hopes for the future?

"Well, they've been very strenuous years. I thought there was a great prospect for a new era in America, with the young president, you know, beginning with President Kennedy . . . but you know what happened to that . . .

"All I try to do is to meet each day as I can and, hopefully, to save this country from going down the wrong road. I mean, whenever I'm able to ascertain whatever I think the direction is. I think we've overdone the militarism. Their own figures indicate to me we've grossly overdone the militarism.

"The expenditures have drained the substance of the country, and I think this has a relation even to such things as the strike of the mailmen. Their wages have been eroded to where they are perfectly justified in their complaints, and then the government reacts to meet those complaints too slowly and so you get this kind of illegal strike . . . and other people are going to say, 'Well, we'd better strike.' These things are cumulative you know.

"But this is anarchy. This is dangerous—you look around the world at Greece and Peru and Pakistan and others—they all end up in the hands of the military. And when you look at the size of the military establishment here . . . this isn't any reflection on any particular military man's mind, he's not grasping, but it's built into the situation. This is what happened in these other places. Why should we be immune?

"So, the real immediate task is to preserve our system with all its faults, I think. When the revolutionaries destroy the system, invariably they end up with an extreme right wing. The people who make the revolution usually end up in the hoosegow and have their heads cut off. They don't benefit, nobody benefits. It's almost always destructive and the conditions are worse than they were, so I'm not a revolutionary at all . . . the number one objective at a time of great stress like this is to preserve the system through which you can work for revolutionary improvements. This is going to be a great challenge for it to survive—a terrific challenge."

What would he like to be remembered for 100 years from now?

"Oh, I don't have any great urge for immortality . . . I doubt if I'll be remembered for anything . . . all I'm concerned with is doing the best I can and trying to get the war over and trying to make it possible for a free system to survive."

Fulbright's critics claim he is leading the country back into an era of isolationism. What is his view of the U.S. role in the world?

"Isolationist is merely a pejorative term that people use, hopefully to discredit you . . . I don't know of anybody who is an isolationist in the sense that they want to come home and have nothing to do with the world. . . .

"Our role in the world should be a modest one—we have, as they say, so much to be modest about. It's a big country, but it has big problems, and I don't think it has the background, experience or the capacity to organize everybody else's business. I certainly don't subscribe to the view that we should respond to every country's request. . . .

"This is in a sense an outgrowth of the so-called Truman Doctrine at the time when . . . there was good apprehension that Stalin would move to overrun all of Europe. This would have been a catastrophic change in the whole balance of power, and under the impact of that, precipitated by the withdrawal of the British from Greece, the Truman Doctrine was announced as a temporary, stop-gap measure. I guess it was justified, but the trouble was that people like Rusk (former Secretary of State Dean Rusk) took it seriously as if we had been designated by the Lord to go about and convert evrybody all over the world. This is a romantic and utterly unrealistic policy. We not only can't do it but the world doesn't want us to do it. . . ."

TONKIN RESOLUTION

If he had the past 11 years to live over again, what would he do differently?

(Fulbright is a quiet man. He almost never raises his voice above normal conversational tones, and he never doodles or fidgets. But at this point he picked up a paper clip and began twisting it.)

"Well, if I knew at the time what I know now, I most certainly would have made an all-out fight against the adoption of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. . . . I object to it because the basis for it was a misrepresentation. In other words, what they alleged as the grounds for passing it didn't happen. It was a misrepresentation . . . the President (Johnson) was urging all during that (discussion) that he didn't want a wider war. The resolution was to be used to stop the war, not to authorize its expansion. That was also a misrepresentation of the President's state of mind, of what he was thinking, of what his intentions were. . . .

"The President lost touch with reality because he was such an efficient manager of the Senate. Having been majority leader and having been the protege of Sam Rayburn, he knew how to subvert the Congress and he neutralized and nullified its influence. He didn't have the judgment on his own to make the right decisions and he lost contact with the Senate that might have helped him if he had allowed it to. But he manipulated it, he used his influence to overpower it. . .

"If he had come on the other hand and asked for a declaration of war . . . and had not alleged these other things but said it is in our interest to go to war over there, on the basis of the need to stop communism and so on, now what would have been the situation if he had put it on that basis and followed the constitution and asked the Senate to declare war? And given the reasons, real reasons, not phony and false reasons?

"Well, you would have had a terrific debate, wouldn't you? You would have had a real debate and you wouldn't have been carried away by emotions. My guess is that after debate the decision would have been no, it is not in our interest to fight a land war 10,000 miles away. . .

"Instead of getting in the war, we would have stayed out. This is a major thing, just think of the difference it would have made. . ."

Was it true he had attempted a reconciliation with Johnson?

"I wrote to him when he was in the hospital, that's right. I never had liked these things to be on a personal basis . . . I thought I was giving him good advice, with the friendliest nature . . . Mike Mansfield (now Democratic leader) did, too. I am abrasive, I know. I assume Mike is not as abrasive in the way he expresses himself. Very often, I know, he

said in substance the same things that I said. But they seem to take offense when I say it—I don't know why that is so."

Does it disturb Fulbright that some elements of the "silent majority" have attempted to picture themselves as the only true patriots?

"No, this is not new. It is the usual substitute for thought. I mean, to think and understand our policies and determine where our national interests lie is a difficult thing, a painful thing . . . it is easiest to wrap a flag around you and shout patriotism and the other shibboleths that accompany this type of thing."

Vice President Agnew seems to have selected Fulbright as a prime target for criticism. How does he feel about that?

"When anyone—the vice president or just a man in the street—thinks ill of you and says so, it is not pleasant. On the other hand, the fact that the Vice President of the United States would select me to give special attention to indicates that he must have thought that what I was saying, what I stood for, had some significance . . . So I'm both offended by the crudeness of his expressions and at the same time complimented by the fact that he thought there was sufficient significance to warrant his special attention. He was out to make an impression, to paint a picture with a broad brush and not to be too meticulous about the truth . . ."

How about President Nixon and the Vietnamization policy?

"It is just a shame that the President didn't move to close the war out when he took office. It wasn't his war, and he could have moved to close it out. Now, he's going to have to sooner or later, but it's going to cost an enormous amount of money and deaths and so on and he's going to wind up about the same way. . . . That's the shame of it, and it's just too bad."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I merely wish to add, in concluding the remarks of those who serve closely with BILL FULBRIGHT and other good friends who have spoken: These thoughts have come from the hearts of those who work closely with him, day in and day out. I suppose no other committee is called upon to do more work.

I should like to offer this word of advice to my friend and chairman: If Betty or anyone else ever gets critical of you, keep this RECORD and show them what those who know you most closely think of you.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am overwhelmed by the kind words that have been said here today. In the position I have held during this long period, I have become quite unaccustomed to any such compliments, in or out of the Senate. I am not well equipped to respond adequately.

But I do appreciate very much indeed, the Senator from Alabama for having taken the lead in drawing attention to my length of service as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, as well as in the Senate, and also the kind words of the members of the committee and others who have spoken here today.

It has been an extremely interesting experience. The Senator from Alabama has already mentioned it, but again I cannot refrain from calling attention to the unique relationship we have had. Senator SPARKMAN was a Member of the House when I first came there. He has had a very long and distinguished career in Congress—longer than I have—but I came to the Senate before he did, which is the reason why I have been just above him in seniority on the Committee on Foreign Relations and on the Committee on Banking and Currency. I have enjoyed our long association immensely. His good judgment, his thorough calm, and his wise counsel have meant a great deal to me during my service on both of those committees.

One other Senator from Arkansas, Senator Ambrose Sevier, was chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations from 1847 to 1849. He is the only other Senator from Arkansas who has been chairman of the committee. I might add, however, other Arkansans have been members of the committee.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has been in existence since 1816, a period of 154 years. It is one of the oldest standing committees in the Senate. In the early days it did not have the continuity it has today. The committee was merely appointed for a single Congress, and the following Congress could appoint an entirely new committee. It did not have continuity.

At the time Ambrose Sevier served as chairman, there were only five members on the committee. The matter of continuity is a more recent development.

Since I became a member of the committee, I have served under four chairmen—Senator Connally, Senator Vandenberg, Senator George, and Senator Green. They all were distinguished senior members of the Senate. During their service and mine we have been in extremely difficult and interesting times.

I did not become a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations when I first came to the Senate. I served on other committees such as Education and Labor, and for a short period of time, on the Judiciary Committee. I became a member of the Foreign Relations Committee in 1949.

There were a number of Senators ahead of me on the committee. Because of the hazards of elections and several unfortunate deaths such as that of Brien McMahon of Connecticut, who died prematurely, my progress on the committee was more rapid than might have been expected. One interesting sidelight concerns former Senator CLAUDE PEPPER. He was senior to me and had been a former professor of mine when I was at the University of Arkansas, back in 1924. We all know what happened to Senator PEPPER. He ran for the Presidency in 1948 and then was defeated for the Senate. However, he came back to Congress as a Representative, and he is a Representative today. He would have been chairman today had his continuity in the Senate not been interrupted. The vagaries of political life lead to some rather unexpected results.

I do not want to delay the Senate. I know that everyone is anxious to conclude. But I do wish to respond to some of the remarks that have been made about what we have done during these years in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

One of my principal objectives in recent years has been, as was said by the senior Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), to reassert what I believe to be the responsibility of the committee, as the agent of the Senate—to reassert its constitutional responsibility. In this respect, I confess that I am a strict constructionist. I want to live up to the Constitution. I want the Senate to play its proper role in our system, not only because the Constitution is a sound document but because the framers of the Constitution were very wise men. I also believe that the collective judgment of a hundred men from all 50 States has great value in basic decisions.

Of course 100 Members of the Senate, collectively, or through their committees, cannot become involved with every daily decision dealing with our foreign policy. We cannot be involved in tactical decisions such as whether 1,000 men should go into a particular paddy. But on questions of large strategy—of whether it is in the national interest to be waging a war 10,000 miles away, then I think this body is more likely to reach a sound and wise decision for the country as a whole than is a bureaucrat or a small select group of officers in the executive branch.

The commitments, resolutions, and other things that I have tried to promote—and the Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate has joined in these efforts—are of vast importance, I think, to the future of the country. I believe very much in the democratic process, and essential to the democratic process is the debate and discussion of 100 men with a background of experience, representing their constituents from all parts of the country and reflecting these varied viewpoints. From such debate and discussion, I think we are more likely to get wise decisions as to the general direction of our policy as distinguished from daily conduct of operations. Of course some of the daily conduct of operations has great bearing upon direction and larger strategic decisions.

As an illustration, the question of whether or not we should give assistance today or tomorrow to a country like Cambodia may look like a small thing. But it can well set the direction and larger strategic consequences, if it results in involvement and in the escalation of the war itself. Some small decisions may bring a whole new element into the war.

I recall that when we got into the war in Vietnam, we were told, with respect to the Gulf of Tonkin incident, that all that a congressional resolution would do would be to make a very small gesture of unity which would result in preventing the spread of that war. We were told that this was the way to stop the war from widening. The war was a very minor affair so far as we were concerned in August of 1964. At that time we had less than 20,000 people in that area.

The war was not really escalated until February of the following year. At the time the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was passed we were not supposed to have combat troops in Vietnam. We were told they were only advisers and assistants. But, in any case, I think the committee and the Senate learned a lesson and know now how important it is that we assert our proper constitutional role of giving advice to the Executive.

Every President needs it. They will

all benefit from it. Hopefully, they will take our advice seriously. It is not lightly or frivilously given.

Recently, when the Senate voted 72 to 6 for the Brooke-Cooper resolution, I was convinced, and still am, that history will say that was a wise piece of advice, and that the President would be well advised to pay attention to what the opinions of 72 Senators were as to what would be the right course to follow.

Fortunately, he has not rejected it. I think that he spoke too soon when he said the resolution was irrevelant. I do not think he meant to say "irrelevant", but that he meant to say "redundant." But I think the Senate is doing a great job.

I am proud to be a Member of this body and of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The committee's hearings are of a highly educational nature and of great importance to the understanding by the people of this country of the difficult and complex problems which confront them.

As long as we have a democracy—I certainly hope we will have it forever—I think it is essential that congressional committees play their part.

From time to time I have witnessed a tendency on the part of some Members of this body to feel that the President has the sole responsibility in the field of foreign policy, and that our duty is only to review and to agree with him.

I must say, with all deference, that I think this attitude is simply a failure to recognize the meaning of the Constitution. If we are going to take that attitude, there would be no need for a Senate. We would soon become no more than a ceremonial body, such as the House of Lords has now become in Great Britain.

I reject subservience to the Executive in the field of foreign policy as the proper role of the Senate. The concept of bipartisanship tended to downgrade the role of the Senate. I do not think that was the intent of proponents of bipartisanship. When I first came to the Senate, and during World War II, the idea grew up that there should be greater bipartisanship in the Senate, which is, in a sense, a perfectly proper concept. We do not want to play politics with foreign policy in the narrow sense. We use that terminology only for domestic matters. Nevertheless, if the concept of bipartisanship is used to mean that the Senate should stifle all discussion and exposition of its views which may differ from those of the administration, then I think it is a very faulty concept. I do not think it serves the country well or serves even the Executive if the Senate declines seriously to debate and make decisions on matters of great national importance, especially when decisions involve the kind of problems we face now with wars, which are, as the Senator from Missouri stated so well, beating our country to death. I shall not pursue that, but I am very grateful indeed to the senior Senator from Alabama and all my colleagues, and especially to the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, who have spoken here today. It is very encouraging to have some words of approval come in my direction because, as I say, we get plenty of the other kind from outside agencies.

Foreign policy is a controversial subject. It is one which nearly everyone feels he is entitled to discuss.

Mr. President, I serve on the Finance Committee with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), who is now in the Chamber. It is true that many of our constituents do not like the subject of taxes, but they also do not feel competent to pass sentence on the complexities of many of the tax bills that come before the Senate. I have had little criticism of my votes in that field, certainly less than I have received regarding foreign policy. Everyone considers himself an authority on foreign policy. Everyone is willing to express himself in this very controversial area.

One reason is that it involves directly the lives of so many people, especially the lives of our young men, and the vast expenditures of money required. Thus, naturally, it is an area in which there is great controversy.

Mr. President, once more, I thank very much the distinguished Senator from Alabama and other Senators who have today expressed themselves.

I appreciate it very much.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2306) to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 743) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Touchet division, Walla Walla project, Oregon-Washington, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HOSMER, and Mr. BURTON of Utah were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2062) to provide for the differentiation between private and public ownership of lands in the administration of the acreage limitation provisions of Federal reclamation law, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HOSMER, and Mr. MCCLURE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 515) to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to clarify responsibilities related to providing free and reduced-price meals and preventing discrimination against children, to revise program matching requirements, to strengthen the nutrition training and education benefits of the programs, and otherwise to strengthen the food service programs for children in schools and service institutions"; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD of Michigan, Mr. AYRES, and Mr. QUIE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SAXBE). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT AND CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE), I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 515.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SAXBE) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 515) to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to clarify responsibilities related to providing free and reduced-price meals and preventing discrimination against children, to revise program matching requirements, to strengthen the nutrition training and education benefits of the programs, and otherwise to strengthen the food service programs for children in schools and service institutions and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HARRIS. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment and agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

## INDIAN HEALTH IS A NATIONAL SHAME

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr.

PERCY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, Senators are aware that America, generally, faces a well-documented health crisis, characterized by a severe and growing shortage of health personnel and by such alarming facts as those which show that America stands twelfth or worse among nations in infant mortality and compares even less favorably with other nations in average life expectancy.

If America, generally, faces a health crisis, think, then, how much more acute that crisis presently is for American Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts.

One who is not familiar with the sad state of the health of American Indians might consider the administration's proposed increase of $11,688,000 for the Indian Health Service for 1971, over the amount appropriated last year, a significant step forward. Given increased costs, however, that amount of money—providing a proposed budget total of $113,217,000—will only allow the Indian Health Service to continue the present level of its tragically inadequate health care.

Most Americans have begun to recognize the injustices suffered by American Indians in the past. But more and more Americans must also begin to realize that injustices and broken promises are still suffered by American Indians—that present and past injustices have produced terribly damaging and lingering impact.

The level of health of American Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts lags 20 to 25 years behind the health advances of the general population in America—and we have seen that this, itself, is highly unsatisfactory. The average age of death for American Indians is 44 years of age, about one-third less than the national average of 64. American Indians are 8 times as likely to suffer from tuberculosis as the rest of us, and deaths due to influenza and pneumonia are nearly 2½ times higher for American Indians. There are 3½ times as many homicides and 2 times as many suicides among American Indians as there are among the general population.

If one is an American Indian, he is 10 times more likely to suffer from rheumatic fever, strep throat, and hepatitis. The incidence of otitis media, a middle ear disease which leaves hearing impaired, is far more prevalent among American Indians than among any other people in our society.

Twenty-eight percent of all Indian homes still lack running water and an adequate means of waste disposal. The average American Indian family of five or six members still lives in a one- or two-room house, and only about 24 percent of the dental care needs of American Indians are being met.

In September of last year, representatives from several tribes came to Washington to seek increased funds for Indian health. The story they told was shocking and almost unbelievable, confirming the facts and figures which I have just related.

That story has not basically changed since September of last year and will not change unless our commitment is greater than that demonstrated by the proposed 1971 administration budget. Statutory increases in salaries and rising costs for contract medical care will alone absorb most of the increase provided for in the 1971 budget.

Because of personnel shortages, it is not uncommon for one nurse in an Indian hospital to be responsible for more than one floor. Members of a patient's family, untrained in medical care, often have to be called upon to assist.

Physicians in Indian hospitals frequently have an impossible patient load, and those physicians going to field stations or clinics see as many as 80 patients a day. One physician at an Indian hospital in Oklahoma has a patient load which allows him only 3 minutes per patient per day. The result is long lines and degrading treatment.

The Indian Health Service estimates that outpatient visits for the past 2 years have increased 6 to 7 percent a year, but there has been no provision for any staff increase in the past 2 years. In fact, since expenditure controls were implemented in 1968, there has been a decrease in personnel working in the Indian Health Service—218 vital positions in the hospital health activity of the Service have been lost.

It is estimated by the Indian Health Service that, in order to meet the staffing requirements for Indian hospital facilities, 225 to 250 employees are needed for each 100 average daily patients hospitalized, and that 120 employees are required for each 100,000 outpatient visits. In fact, however, in 1968 the Indian Health Service was staffed with only 165 employees for each 100 average daily patients and with only 47.8 employees for each 100,000 outpatient visits.

Along with shortages of personnel, most of the Indian hospitals have serious drug shortages. Last month, an Indian hospital in Oklahoma chosen at random was telephoned by my office to determine its needs for drugs and supplies.

The administration of the hospital reported:

We have in the past run out of essential antibiotics—penicillin, ampicillin injectible, tranquilizers, such as the anti-depressant, librium, and analgesics (pain relievers), as well as Darvon and aspirin on occasions. At the present time we are completely out of Fiorinal—dentists use this for pain from extractions.

Essidrix, which is a diuretic most essential for removal of fluid from the body, is often not in stock. From time to time, we have run out of birth control pills.

At the present time there are no baby vitamin drops and they have not had any for at least one month. On occasions we have run out of cough syrup. Also, a very inexpensive item, sodium salicylate, used for rheumatoid arthritis is often out of stock as well as Indocin which is a more expensive drug used for rheumatoid arthritis.

The hospital stockroom would need $18,000 in order to bring their stock up to a safety stock. These items are surgical items such as sutures, examination gowns, gloves, x-ray film, band-aids, bandages, paper towels, and other items. In the past we have had to give diabetics reuseable syringes because they did not have disposable syringes.

Our basic problem is that we cannot obtain sufficient supplies so as not to run out before we can get funds to replenish the supply.

At present we have a shortage of approximately twenty-one people in the hospital and the lack of help has required a lot of unpaid overtime on the part of the whole staff in order to care for the sick.

Earlier reports from other hospitals in Oklahoma indicated that testing for tuberculosis had from time to time been discontinued because necessary supplies were not available. Last year, influenza shots could not be given to more than 600 Indian students at Chilocco Indian School because the vaccine was not available. Almost all of the hospitals were sometimes either low in supply or out of many of the basic and needed drugs.

With the tremendous increase in medical costs, the increases in the Indian Health Service appropriations have not really resulted in increases in the level of care. In 1968, the appropriation was $84,862,000; in 1969, the appropriation was $91,710,000; in 1970, the appropriation was $101,529,000; and in 1971, the budget request is $113,217,000. This is a percentage increase from 1968 to 1971, of approximately 33 percent, yet the cost of providing the same medical care by the Indian Health Service has increased approximately 34 percent during the same period.

There is little hope that any significant changes will occur in the shameful statistics I have recited or that the pathetic lack of personnel and drugs in the Indian hospitals will be materially improved unless there is a substantial increase in funds.

As the Indian members of the National Council on Indian Opportunity stated February 16, 1970:

In light of the dire need for all health facilities and health needs, it is criminal to impose a personnel and budget freeze on Indian health programs. Even without a freeze, Indian hospitals are woefully understaffed and under supplied, even to the extent of lacking basic equipment and medicine. We deplore the budget decisions that have caused this state of inadequacy.

The crisis we are facing will not be solved by the level of commitment we have thus far been willing to make. Because the situation is as grave as it is, established not only by statistics, but also by the strong words of tribal representatives and by my own personal research to which I have referred, I think a thorough investigation should be made of all Indian health facilities and programs, not for the purpose of determining what is necessary to continue operating at our present inadequate levels, but to determine how we can bring the level of health care of American Indians up to a decent level.

I do not advocate some long, drawn-out study. American Indians and their needs have been studied to death. It is time for action, and no field of concern requires more urgent action than the health of American Indians. It would be an easy matter to call Indian Health Service and other officials before the Subcommittee on Interior of the Senate Appropriations Committee and learn almost overnight the detailed justifications for greatly increased appropriations for this purpose. I urge that this be done.

The jurisdictional disputes between the Indian Health Service and the U.S.

Public Health Service must end. American Indians are American citizens and are entitled to all the services of their Government. Indian health services must be extended into the communities where Indian people live, rather than, as is often true, just at far away hospital locations. Indian hospitals should be governed by Indian hospital boards with actual, not just advisory, authority. And a national health insurance system for all, Indians and non-Indians, must be established. The National Council on Indian Opportunity stressed these recommendations.

Emphasizing, as I do, that nothing less than a quantum jump upward in appropriations for Indian health will suffice to meet the crying needs, I want to point out some obvious steps which can be taken immediately to improve the 1971 administration budget. I trust and hope that, before the 1971 budget is finally processed by Congress, the Appropriations Committee will have an opportunity to secure the necessary information and figures to add other and more substantial items to it.

First, additional personnel in the Indian health field is an extremely pressing need. Last year, in the closing days of the session, the Senate adopted an amendment which I offered to add $2 million to the supplemental appropriations bill for Indian health programs, in addition to $1 million already contained in the bill for that purpose.

The conference between the House and Senate reduced this $3 million figure to $2,048,000, of which $1,048,000 was to be used to provide 300 desperately needed additional positions in Indian hospitals. Instead, the administration used these funds to extend last year's Federal pay raise to Indian health service personnel. Obviously, this should have been done, but not at the expense of Indian health. The personnel shortage, therefore, continues and worsens.

Moreover, even though Congress last year clearly recognized the need for these 300 additional positions, the administration budget for 1971 does not contain funds for such additional Indian health positions. Funds are requested for 178 new positions, but of this number 100 would staff new facilities and 40 would be positions in nutrition and mental health programs. These new positions are needed, but additional such staffing does nothing to alleviate the basic shortage in personnel generally. One Oklahoma hospital alone has a shortage of 21 employees who are critically needed.

I believe the case for at least these additional 300 positions has been overwhelmingly proved. To many American Indians it is a life and death matter, and I think it is clearly our duty to respond to the plain facts. Testimony which has already been presented to the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee established that, because of the shortage of personnel, treatment of the health problems of many Indians is being "deferred." It is intolerable that because of a lack of funds some Indian hospitals have had to adopt a policy of treating only the most serious health problems, those which cannot be ignored and which require immediate treatment.

To provide the 300 positions for fiscal year 1971 would only cost approximately $2,514,000, a small sum in relation to the need and to the resources of this Nation.

Second, funds should be increased to provide the basic and needed drugs for Indian hospitals. The appalling set of conditions which I have outlined ought not to be allowed to continue for one additional day. The severity of these problems was recently called to the attention of the President in a letter signed by 90 Members of Congress, myself included. Shortly thereafter, the President released $957,000, which had been held in reserve from the 1970 Labor-HEW appropriation for this purpose.

Notwithstanding the fact that the need for at least this $957,000 in additional funds to help meet the shortage of critical drugs and supplies was thus established, even this inadequate amount of $957,000 was nevertheless not carried forward in the 1971 administration budget. I therefore strongly recommend that this serious defect in the budget be corrected.

Third, I recommend that the appropriation to improve the sanitation facilities for Indian communities be increased, rather than decreased, from $19,120,792 for 1970 to $17,950,000 for 1971, as the administration budget recommends.

The undisputed fact that lack of safe water and adequate waste facilities contributes greatly to gastroenteritis, which is second among the reportable diseases for Indians, and to amoebic and bacillary dysentery, which is 35 times worse among American Indians than in the general population, demands that we give these problems high priority. Twenty-five percent of all patients discharged from Indian hospitals last year were treated for infectious diseases which could be traced to poor sanitation.

The death rate for American Indian infants 1 through 11 months of age is 3 times the death rate of the same age groups in the general population, and this sad situation is largely attributable to poor living conditions.

I recommend an increase of $5 million for the sanitation program for fiscal year 1971.

A fourth recommendation is that the U.S. Government begin really to attack the tragic situation in regard to Indian mental health services. Much has been written to explain how the pressures of the reservations, with ways often at variance from those of the white man's world, have led to mental health problems in the Indian population far in excess of those of other citizens on a proportionate basis, but next to nothing has been done about treating them.

The high rate of suicide and homicide, as well as the problem of alcoholism, are all symptoms of the deeper failures in American policy toward American Indians; we must correct these failures and not just treat the symptoms. But we must also give greater and immediate attention to the problems of mental health. Only $984,000 is provided for this purpose in the 1971 administration budget. An increase of only $404,000 is requested, but the Indian Health Service estimates that before a good program can be offered an additional $1 million would be needed. The enormity of this problem justifies at a minimum an increase of $1 million to provide additional mental health care.

Fifth, we need to increase the funds for community health representatives. There is no way to meet the alarming shortage of health personnel in America, generally, except by greatly increasing the use of paramedical and subprofessional people. This is especially true in the Indian Health Service. While community health representatives cannot take the place of professionals, nor fully answer the great need for increased professional personnel, they can take up a great deal of the slack. Moreover, community health representatives can help to humanize Indian health programs, make them more responsive to the needs of the people whom they seek to serve, and help bring such services to the people.

It is sad enough that this program only provided for training 125 community health representatives in 1970. It is even sadder that the 1971 administration budget reduces this figure to 100 trainees for 1971; $282,000, added to the 1971 administration budget, would enable training to continue for all those presently in training and permit the addition of another 25 trainees. These numbers, spread out all over the United States, and serving the entire Indian population are pitifully low, and I hope they can be greatly expanded. There is not enough human warmth and sensitivity in most Government programs which deal with American Indians, and that is true of the Indian Health Service which is greatly overworked and understaffed. American Indians want to have a greater say in these programs and a greater part in carrying them out. That is why I have so vigorously advocated the establishment of Indian hospital boards, and it is a strong additional reason for greatly increasing the number of community health representatives as well.

Mr. President, these specific recommendations are much too modest and are mere stopgap measures.

I have already communicated these views and recommendations to the Interior Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee. I present them here, so that, hopefully, other Senators may become more aware of these critical health needs and join in efforts to meet them.

I commend the Appropriations Committee for all it has done in the past. I know that the requests made to it and the calls on the budget generally are enormous, but I know of no needs more urgent, no claims more valid, no conditions more shocking than those in the field of Indian health.

The late Robert F. Kennedy, who did so much to further the cause of the American Indian, Eskimo and Aleut, frequently quoted the words of Camus, who wrote:

> Perhaps we cannot prevent this from being a world in which children are tortured. But we can reduce the number of tortured children. And if you don't help us, who else in the world can help us do this?

The American Indian, the first American, is the last American in health. Except with compensatory attention to his health, housing, employment, education and income needs, coupled with full assurance at last of his right to self-determination, these health needs cannot fully be met. But we can make a start, and we must do what we can.

Thousands of little Indian children will continue to suffer the personal, social and economic crippling of bad health unless we help. We can reduce the number. And, if we do not help, who will?

## THE PRESIDENT'S WELFARE BILL

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the Committee on Finance has just begun its consideration of the President's welfare bill, H.R. 16311. This bill has been hailed by the administration as a workfare bill instead of a welfare bill. It is said that the emphasis is on welfare reform and work incentives. Based on our committee's first look at the bill, it looks like a reenactment of the work incentive program Congress wrote into law in 1967—which I had the privilege to sponsor in the Senate—and an expansion of welfare to make 15 million people eligible for welfare payments, in addition to the 10 million now on the rolls.

A great deal has been said about the need to provide incentives for welfare recipients to work, and I think we would all agree that a person's total income should rise as his earned income rises, so that he does not have an incentive to stop working or reduce the amount he earns in order to increase his total family income.

I am in agreement with the President that present law needs some revision if we are to meet this goal. But Senators should be aware that the welfare bill before the Finance Committee today does not solve the problem—it just makes it cost $4 billion more. Under the bill, a fully employed father of a family of four with low earnings could increase his family's total income if he quit work, or if he reduced his earnings.

Let me cite a few specific examples. A typical aid to families with dependent children payment for a family of four today in many States is $250 a month, or $3,000 a year. A father in a family of four who earns $2,000 annually will be eligible under the bill for welfare payments of $960, bringing his total income up to $2,960. This is less than what he would get if he were totally unemployed. In other words, he can increase his family's income $40 a year by quitting work entirely.

But that would not be his best move. For, by working part time, he could increase his family's income substantially by reducing his earnings to $1,000 a year. Instead of $2,960, his family's income would jump to $3,813—$853 more than if he continued working full time.

That, Mr. President, is an obviously ridiculous situation, for if a man works and makes $2,000 a year, he does not receive substantial assistance. He receives a payment of $853 a year more by working part time compared to what he would receive if he were working full time.

Mr. President, in April of last year, the Washington Post reported on a conference held by the National Welfare Rights Organization in Washington. I would like to quote from it because in that conference they discussed the provisions we had passed in the Senate, and which became law, to try and provide work for people who are capable of working. That was directed at mothers who could work, as well as others. Let me read a quotation from the Washington Post as of that time:

> At one conference session yesterday, for example, participants got a two-hour course on how they could avoid job training or work under the city's new Work Incentive Program if they wished to stay at home with their children.
>
> Steven Wexler, a lawyer on the National Welfare Rights Organization staff, told them how they could "exhaust appeal after appeal to stay out of the work program, designed to train and place welfare clients in jobs.
>
> "You can stay out of the program until Hell freezes over if you know how to do it," he said.

I hate to say it, but the Department of Labor made a contract for about $430,000 to that same organization which shows people how not to go to work. It is still being helped with Federal aid, so it can show able-bodied people how they can avoid going to work, as Congress intended they should as a condition of receiving welfare assistance.

The examples of the work disincentive features under the bill show just how important the provisions are to these people.

The estimates submitted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare admit that the cost of the present welfare program for families is going up at a rapid rate and will continue to do so for the foreseeable future. However, they assume that once the welfare bill is enacted, the number of families receiving welfare will decline rapidly from year to year. Today, about 1.8 million families are receiving welfare. By 1972, the first year the bill goes into effect, this is estimated to increase to 2.2 million families. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare assumes that 1.5 million families will be added to the rolls in 1972, but that the number of families will decline by a quarter of a million a year so that by 1976, only 2.7 million families will be receiving welfare. I find it difficult to believe that the enactment of this bill will result in a continual decrease in families on welfare when it provides major incentives not to go to work, or to quit full-time work and work only part-time and achieve greater total income.

The cost estimates of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are related to their estimates of the numbers of families receiving welfare. While they admit that the cost of aid to families with dependent children will rise from $2.9 billion in 1972 to $5 billion in 1976—almost twice the 1972 figure—they assume that declining welfare rolls will keep the cost of payments to families under the bill at an almost even level year after year. The cost of welfare payments to families under the bill, says the administration, will be $4.7 billion in 1972. Five years later, that cost is predicted to be only $4.9 billion. This prediction is made notwithstanding the fact that under this bill families can increase their total income by quitting full-time employment and working only part time, and in many cases they can increase their income by quitting full-time employment and being unemployed full time. Once the working poor understand this, why should they continue to work when they can make more money by not working?

Mr. President, the Committee on Finance is going to have to look at this bill carefully so that we can help the President achieve his goal of turning welfare into workfare as far as can be done, and make this a decent program—one that will dignify employment, rather than unemployment. We will be questioning the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare closely next week, and with a view toward making the bill what it is supposed to be.

Along this line, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a feature article that appeared in the Washington Star on Tuesday, April 21, 1970. I will read the headline, which shows the problem: "Mother of Five Can't Afford to Keep Working."

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

### MOTHER OF FIVE CAN'T AFFORD TO KEEP WORKING

(By Harvey Kabaker)

When you boil it all down, Mrs. Marie Beverly can't afford to keep working.

Since her husband left two weeks ago, it seems her $1.80-an-hour cashier's job in a Peoples Drug Store won't support her five children and stay the marshal at the door.

So with great reluctance, on the advice of the D.C. Welfare Department and her lawyer, she intends to quit working for a few months and apply for public assistance. And she most likely will move into public housing.

Mrs. Beverly, attractive at 37 and scarcely showing any sign of strain, spoke yesterday in her far Southeast apartment of her plan for self-help.

She said all she needs is a cash grant for two months' rent, until her 18-year-old daughter, Veronica, graduates from high school in June and begins a full-time job. Food stamps and Medicaid would supplement their incomes, and they could get by, she believes.

Her story of the past week might have been composed by critics of the present welfare system in America:

During several stops at various offices, it was always another office that might help, and one official even gave her the brush-off, before she finally encountered a Welfare Department supervisor sensitive to her plight, and aware of the built-in problems of government procedures.

#### ENCOURAGED TO STOP

Hardest for Mrs. Beverly to accept was that the system encourages the poor to stop working and move into public housing, because rents are cheaper and the income is higher.

"I was really hurt when they said I would have to quit my job to get public assistance," she said. If she could keep working, by July they could subsist on the $50 a week extra her daughter will earn, she predicted.

At the same time, the family would keep the bright, well-kept four-bedroom apartment they have had since 1967—after a two-year wait.

But the welfare people already are applying subtle pressure for her to move into a cheaper place: The monthly rent of $154 is too great a proportion of her $250 net income, or even the combined $475 she and her

daughter will net beginning in June, the supervisor fears.

If Mrs. Beverly decides to apply for the aid to dependent children money, she'll get $317 a month, still not enough to keep the apartment. If she can be placed in a training program, as the supervisor has urged, Mrs. Beverly will get another $75, plus free day care for Valerie, 5, who won't go to school until the fall.

YIELDING TO SUPERVISOR

Yesterday, learning that the training program probably would include refresher courses for a high school equivalency exam, Mrs. Beverly, who finished only elementary school in rural Virginia, began to accept the welfare supervisor's point of view.

Her lawyer thinks the public cost of $308—April and May rent—would be cheaper than the tax-free $317 a month the family will get from the Welfare Department for several months while Mrs. Beverly is in training. The welfare supervisor thinks the training will help Mrs. Beverly get a better job later, since she already is motivated to get off welfare within a few months.

Normally, the rent grant would be made from a $70,000 fund the department allots for emergencies every month. But Mrs. Beverly's husband nas already drawn from the fund, the department found, and she may not do so herself this year.

All of this might not have come about, if the Nixon administration's welfare reform plan, passed last week by the House, were in effect. The program for the first time would benefit the working poor by giving cash grants without requiring the head of the household to be unemployed.

These figures were calculated for Mrs. Beverly's situation: The federal government would contribute $57 a month, and the D.C. government would pay another $121, to add to her $312 salary (before taxes).

HER GROSS INCOME

Her gross income, then, would be $490 a month, and she would be working. If her daughter chose to keep her own salary, the allotment would be unaffected (present law requires a reduction in the welfare payment if a minor is working).

The Senate Finance Committee has scheduled hearings on the bill next month, and liberals are expected to push for increased allotments.

But none of this will affect Mrs. Beverly, who must appear tomorrow in landlord-tenant court, may have problems with bill collectors trying to satisfy a note she cosigned with her husband and, reluctantly, will apply for public housing by the end of the week.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, in this article it is explained how welfare workers have advised this very fine Negro mother here in Washington how she must not work so she can increase her income, because if she continues to work she will have a lower income. This mother points out that if someone would give her help for 2 or 3 months, until her oldest daughter graduates from high school, that daughter will go to work and help supplement that family income and they would not require welfare assistance. Notwithstanding that fact, she is being urged to go onto welfare and to move out of private housing into public housing, subsidized with Government money, quit her job, live on welfare—all at the advice of the Department of Welfare.

That type of thing is just exactly the opposite of what we ought to be doing.

This is an oversight in the law that ought to be corrected. We ought to be moving in the direction of giving this woman such help as she may need to stay at work, rather than providing her a 50-percent increase in her income if she quits working. In my judgment, it is utterly ridiculous to proceed in such a fashion. This is the kind of ridiculous situation we ought to try and correct.

The bill before the Committee on Finance is not much better. It, too, would provide an incentive for many low-income working people to quit work, rather than try a little harder to improve their condition and that of their families.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two tables, both of which show the earnings disincentive effect of H.R. 16311 compared to the situation under present law.

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

TABLE 1.—EFFECT OF H.R. 16311 IN A STATE THAT BASES AFDC PAYMENTS ON A NEEDS STANDARD OF $3,000 FOR A FAMILY OF 4, AND WHICH AIDS FAMILIES IN WHICH THE FATHER IS UNEMPLOYED

| Family of 4 headed by | Income under present law | Income under H.R. 16311 |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Mother, earnings of $2,000, work expenses $30 per month | [1] $2,267<br>[3] 2,000 | [2] $960<br>[4] 1,187 |
| Total under present law | 4,267 | 2,000 |
| Total under H.R. 16311 | | 4,147 |
| 2. Unemployed father, no earnings | [1] 3,000 | [2] 1,600<br>[4] 1,400 |
| Total under H.R. 16311 | | 3,000 |
| 3. Unemployed father, part-time earnings of $1,000, work expenses $15 per month | [1] 2,753<br>[3] 1,000 | [2] 1,460<br>[4] 1,353<br>[3] 1,000 |
| Total under present law | 3,753 | |
| Total under H.R. 16311 | | 3,813 |
| 4. Employed father, earnings of $2,000, work expenses $30 per month | [3] 2,000 | [2] 960<br>[3] 2,000 |
| Total under H.R. 16311 | | 2,960 |

[1] AFDC.
[2] FAP.
[3] Earnings.
[4] State supplement.

TABLE 2.—EFFECT OF H.R. 16311 IN A STATE THAT BASES AFDC PAYMENTS ON A NEEDS STANDARD OF $2,200 FOR A FAMILY OF 4, AND WHICH DOES NOT AID FAMILIES IN WHICH THE FATHER IS UNEMPLOYED

| Family of 4 headed by | Income under present law | Income under H.R. 16311 |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Mother, earnings of $2,000, work expenses $30 per month | [1] $1,467<br>[3] 2,000 | [2] $960<br>[4] 387 |
| Total under present law | 3,467 | [3] 2,000 |
| Total under H.R. 16311 | | 3,347 |
| 2. Unemployed father, no earnings | None | [2] 1,600<br>[4] 600 |
| Total under H.R. 16311 | | 2,200 |
| 3. Unemployed father, part-time earnings of $1,000, work expenses $15 per month | [3] 1,000 | [2] 1,460<br>[4] 553<br>[3] 1,000 |
| Total under H.R. 16311 | | 3,013 |
| 4. Employed father, earnings of $2,000, work expenses $30 per month | [3] 2,000 | [2] 960<br>[3] 2,000 |
| Total under H.R. 16311 | | 2,960 |

[1] AFDC.
[2] FAP.
[3] Earnings.
[4] State supplement.

Mr. LONG. This is the highlight of the problem: Do we want to pass a bill which develops the course of public welfare in such a way as to provide fantastic, illogical incentives for people to quit work, or do we want to pass a bill which helps those who have need and have a problem—a bill which encourages them to find constructive employment for their own advantage, and to move up the economic ladder?

Mr. President, I really do not believe that anyone ever explained these illogical situations to the President of the United States when this bill was sent to Capitol Hill with the blessings of the White House. It is my judgment that the President, looking at the same facts, will agree with the kind of solutions that we on the Finance Committee hope to recommend, so that we will have a program that would subsidize the working poor, rather than taking them off the job, or at least away from prospective jobs, and that would provide an incentive for them to continue to improve themselves until they no longer require welfare assistance from their government.

Insofar as the bill before the committee moves in the wrong direction, it is my hope that we can develop a bill which will move in the right direction. May I say in that connection, Mr. President, that it has been very disappointing and frustrating, under two administrations, now, to find that we in the Senate and we on the Finance Committee in particular provided a work incentive program to put people to work for their own betterment, only to find that the administration—and I am now speaking of the previous administration, and I am not blaming the President, but I am blaming those holdovers in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and in Labor who are handling the program in the fashion they are handling it—proceeded to frustrate the intention of that program. They declined to spend the money that was appropriated to be spent in work training, and in providing day care for children so that mothers could work. Instead, they frittered away government money hiring professional troublemakers and professional agitators to show people how not to go to work.

Those who have the present responsibility, such as Secretary Finch, can point out, and very correctly, that they did not start this kind of mischief in the way of poor administration, but it is continuing under their administration, and they cannot blame it on the other fellow any longer. It is time they should start making the program work, for if they spend their money to frustrate the existing work program, we can have little confidence that they will wisely spend money we provide in the future to make their own programs work.

Therefore, Mr. President, I pledge my own efforts to see that we work out a good bill, to help preserve the national interest and the interests of all concerned, and at the same time enact a bill that would ultimately reduce the welfare burden on the taxpayers of this country.

I believe that the technicians over in the Department of Health, Education,

and Welfare should sharpen their pencils and redo their estimates of the effects of the bill before our Finance Committee hearings begin next year. I point out, Mr. President, that in recent years we on the Finance Committee have been much more accurate in predicting the costs of these HEW programs than has the Department. For example, the cost of medicare was predicted on the basis that it would exceed existing costs for similar services by 20 percent, and the actual cost has been far in excess of that. So where we have pointed out that realism and commonsense would dictate that a program will cost more than the Department was estimating, we are in a position to tell them that history has proved us correct, and that we would hope that in the future they would try to be more realistic, and that when they send us a program whereby a person could increase his income by 50 percent by working only part time instead of full time, that they recognize it would greatly increase the burden of welfare, and that commonsense would so dictate.

So, Mr. President, it is my hope that we can move ahead expeditiously with this bill. It is my hope we can pass it in this Congress. But I would hope that the Senate again this time, as it has in the past, would take a major bill as passed in the House of Representatives, under conditions that did not permit amendments to be offered, and provide the amendments and improvements to such a bill that logic and commonsense would dictate.

## S. 3757—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO EXEMPT OVERNIGHT PADDLEWHEEL RIVER STEAMBOATS FROM THE SAFETY-AT-SEA ACT

Mr. SAXBE. Mr. President, unless the 91st Congress acts, 159 years of passenger service on the Mississippi River and its tributaries will be legislated out of existence November 2, 1970.

The *Delta Queen,* the last overnight paddlewheel passenger steamboat in operational condition in the United States must stop serving Americans who want to catch the flavor of the great steamboat tradition that developed commerce in mid-America unless she is exempted from certain provisions applicable to deepwater vessels. I am particularly interested in the continued operation of the *Delta Queen* since her home port is Cincinnati, Ohio.

The safety-at-sea law, Public Law 89–777, which this bill amends was passed in 1966. It condemns America's last overnight passenger riverboat to an existence as a dockside museum, or even worse to be modified as a day excursion boat carrying many passengers packed together on all decks without any overnight accommodations. This condemnation must occur unless we act here in the Congress of the United States because the *Delta Queen's* construction cannot meet the requirements of the safety-at-sea law which were designed to protect Americans from substandard foreign-flag deep-draft operators.

There are many reasons why the *Delta Queen* should continue to operate in overnight river passenger service. She regularly plies the Mississippi, Ohio, Tennessee, and Cumberland Rivers, never more than a few minutes from shore. Her safety record is unblemished. In 1926 when the *Queen* was launched she was the most expensive, $875,000, most luxurious, and safest paddlewheel riverboat ever built. Every compartment and room is equipped with full coverage sprinkler systems maintaining constant pressure.

Unlike ocean vessels most of the *Delta Queen's* staterooms open directly to the outside decks. There are no long enclosed corridors where passengers or crew members could be trapped. In an emergency everyone can reach outside deck areas in seconds.

Further, many major improvements have been made that substantially contribute to the *Delta Queen's* safety. Oil-fired galley stoves were removed immediately after passage of the 1966 law and replaced with electrical equipment. Fire-retardant coatings were applied to crew quarters, all master lounge areas and many individual passenger staterooms. New and additional communications equipment, firefighting equipment and emergency devices have been voluntarily added. A stepped-up program of crew fire drill training was initiated by the company immediately after message of the 1966 law and since then the Coast Guard inspections have been more frequent and more effective in preparing the crew to cope with an emergency.

It is impossible at this time to replace the *Delta Queen.* The money is not available in today's market at reasonable rates. Shipbuilding costs are prohibitive. Consideration has been given to rebuilding the *Delta Queen* but it is impossible to meet the requirements of the present law because no wood may be used and requirements on stairway, steamplants and electrical machinery as well as hull design are different. Practically every piece of the *Delta Queen* would have to be rebuilt in order to make it conform to the deep-draft safety standards. This cost would be astronomical and the net result would be an architectural monstrosity.

I have been assured by the owners of the *Delta Queen,* Overseas National Airways, that they will voluntarily make many additional safety improvements in the boat. Their plans include augmentation of the fire sprinkler system as well as new detection and firefighting improvements. They plan to dry-dock the *Queen* and make major structural improvements in her plating and framing. One of the most important improvements will be a diesel-powered variable-speed bowthruster which will allow better maneuverability in midstream or docking. In short, the owners of the *Delta Queen* intend to do everything possible to meet or exceed present safety standards. All safety changes would be at substantial expense to the owner. Such expense could not be economically justified without the knowledge that the *Delta Queen* would be allowed to operate for several years. If the *Queen* remains in operation her owners feel that she would develop an increasing demand for riverboat passenger service. The company then plans to construct and operate new boats to meet this demand. All new boats will meet or exceed the requirements of the present Safety-At-Sea Act.

However, it is apparent that no amount of modification can realistically bring the *Delta Queen* under Public Law 89–777. For this reason a permanent exemption from the law is the only appropriate means to preserve this historic riverboat in operating condition, and give some assurance of future safe riverboat passenger service.

Mr. President, my distinguished colleague from Kentucky, Senator COOK, and I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to exempt certain overnight paddlewheel river steamboats operating on inland rivers from the safety-at-sea law. Joining us in the introduction of this legislation is our distinguished colleague from Tennessee, Senator BAKER, who earlier introduced S. 3737, a bill directed at the same subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERCY). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3757) to amend the act requiring evidence of certain financial responsibility and establishing minimum standards for certain passenger vessels in order to exempt certain vessels operating on inland rivers, introduced by Mr. SAXBE, for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

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

Mr. SAXBE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the Senator is to be congratulated for introducing this bill.

As a practical matter, the very thing that makes the *Delta Queen* desirable for passenger traffic is not that it gets there faster, not that it is safer, but that it restores an era that passed perhaps a hundred years ago. The boat, for example, has a virtually all-mahogany interior. The mahogany staircase would have to go if the *Delta Queen* is to be replaced and made to meet the standards that we require of vessels plying the high seas.

I traveled on that steam paddlewheeler about 21 years ago, and enjoyed it immensely. I was in the company of other Senators who were inspecting the flood-control situation on the Mississippi River at that time, and all of us fondly remember the luxurious accommodations of the boat, which had all the markings of the old river steamboats. We would certainly not like to see it taken from service, because I am sure it would mean as much to others as it meant to us to travel on it.

The boat is safer today than it was when I traveled on it 21 years ago, and there has been no accident or mishap to anyone because of any safety defect in the boat since that time. As I understand it, those who own the boat are proposing to install an additional quarter of a million dollars worth of safety devices, so that for the future it would be safer than it ever has been for the 40 years in the past. I understand that there has never been an accident in that time.

Unfortunately, the boat is affected by

a bill which we passed directed toward navigation on the high seas. It is true that the *Delta Queen* has lifejackets under every bunk, so that if there were an accident, one could don a lifejacket.

Mr. SAXBE. And it has lifeboats.

Mr. LONG. As a practical matter, if the boat sprang a leak, the bank is only a hundred yards away; and all that would be necessary would be to give the boat a full right or left rudder and run it aground on a sandbar. So that the dangers one would fear are nonexistent.

Of course, one can never tell whether there will be an accident at some point in the future. It may be that that boat, like any other, might run into a barge carrying explosive chemicals, or something of that sort. If that type of commercial accident should happen, there could perhaps be a disaster, just as there would be if two boats meeting all the safety standards should meet.

Mr. SAXBE. It has not happened in 40 years.

Mr. LONG. In 40 years nothing of that sort has happened. As the Senator has explained, the boat would be safer than it ever has been in the last 40 years, under the bill the Senator is introducing.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine of the Committee on Commerce, I say to the Senator with confidence that had we been aware of this problem when the bill was passed which makes it necessary to retire this boat from service, we would have provided some sort of grandfather clause to provide for this fine old boat, which is about 40 years old but looks like those which would be 140 years old if they were still available, to remain in service.

I think the Senator will find that every chamber of commerce and every civic organization up and down the Mississippi River, the Ohio River, and the Missouri River, upon becoming aware of the facts, would express themselves to us by saying that we should by all means save the *Delta Queen*.

I am happy that the Senator is introducing this measure.

Mr. SAXBE. I thank the Senator from Louisiana, because he has stated very directly the fact that when this bill was passed in 1966, there was no intention to throw the *Delta Queen* off the Mississippi River. As he has pointed out, lifeboat drill on a river boat is really rather ridiculous, because if there were a fire, they need only run it aground and run off on the bank.

In introducing this bill, we want to give these communities on the river an opportunity to retain this nostalgic reminder of the day when the riverboat was king of the river and when that was the primary means for all of central United States—what is known as the United States—to market their goods. There are several other smaller boats, some that are barges and some that are showboats that can be moved around; but this is the only remaining riverboat that supplies overnight accommodations and still gives people the opportunity to visit the far reaches of the Tennessee River and the Kentucky lakes, as well as north to the head of navigation.

I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, I know that this may seem like a rather mundane measure to bring before the Senate; but it is a bill—and one of the few bills, I believe—that would cost the Federal Government absolutely nothing. As a matter of fact, the corporation that owns the *Delta Queen* is a taxpaying corporation in the United States.

Mr. President, those who never have seen a paddle steamboat in mid-America really have missed something. In 1962 it was my pleasure, when I was county executive in Louisville and Jefferson Counties, to buy a steamboat for our community. We bought a steamboat at public auction, and we renamed it the *Belle of Louisville*. It is an excursion boat, and it carries a thousand people.

Every year, on the Tuesday before the Derby—next week, that race has been changed to Thursday rather than Tuesday—every year for the past 6 years before the Kentucky Derby on Saturday, there is an old-fashioned steamboat race on the Ohio River, over a 12-mile course, between the *Delta Queen*, out of Cincinnati, and the *Belle of Louisville*. Over 200,000 people gather on each side of the Ohio River to see this reenactment of what young children used to read in Mark Twain and all the stories of the past about the nostalgic history of the river.

Although its home port is Cincinnati, the *Delta Queen* takes excursions during the year down to New Orleans. They go down to New Orleans for the Mardi Gras. They get back to Louisville in time for the Derby. During the course of the summer, they take excursions up to Pittsburgh, down the Ohio River, into the Kentucky lakes. Late in the fall they take a trip up to Minneapolis-St. Paul. It is probably one of the most beautiful vessels one could ever see. This is in a day when one can no longer get on a train and go anywhere—and in my part of the country, one cannot, although one can still do so on the east coast of the United States. But one can no longer get on a train and go anywhere through the central United States.

I might say, for the benefit of those who are not familiar with the reasons for the act of 1966, that it was because of the horrible fire on the *Yarmouth Castle* in the Caribbean. It was one of the old vessels, and it was full of wood. It caught on fire, and it was far out at sea and was not available to rescue very many of the passengers on the vessel.

I may say that the Senator from Ohio is wrong. No serious fires delayed the river boat. The Coast Guard sees to it that the steamboat *Belle of Louisville* has fire drills every week. But I will say to him that he is right in one respect, that the *Belle of Louisville*, which takes over 300,000 people a year on excursions, on occasions during the rather fast storms that can come up along the Ohio River, with winds from 75 to 80 miles an hour, the *Belle of Louisville*, which is, of course, a short draft vessel, merely pulls over to the side of the river and is held to the banks and waits for the storm to pass, and then proceeds on its way.

I might say, too, that the history of the *Delta King* is interesting. The *Delta King* is a sister ship of the *Delta Queen*. Both boats were night packets on the Sacramento River and passed between San Francisco and Sacramento.

During World War II, the *Delta Queen* was used by the U.S. Navy which took it up to Tacoma, Wash., where it operated between ports in the Navy shipyards up there.

After World War II was over, the *Delta Queen* was purchased by people in Cincinnati, Ohio, who took off its paddlewheel, boarded up the sides of the vessel, and towed it all the way from the west coast through the Panama Canal and into New Orleans.

I am delighted that the Senator has introduced the bill. I am happy to be a cosponsor, and I think that everyone that has anything to do with the Ohio River, the Mississippi River, or the Missouri River, all the States all the way north to Minneapolis-St. Paul, as well as all the States going all the way down to New Orleans, feel that they have a vital interest in maintaining a part of American history, especially at a time when, somehow or other, we seem so anxious to fly so far ahead of history, that to see us go by default in the case of the *Delta Queen* would be a horrible mistake.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, in Louisiana, we have, as does Kentucky, some magnificent antebellum homes. Unfortunately, because those fine old edifices were not built to modern standards, they were built for the most part of wood and were pegged together rather than nailed together, and, of course, they did not have sprinklers or firefighting equipment in those homes, there were fires in some instances. The rivers have climbed their banks and proceeded to form new channels which have taken away many of those magnificent antebellum homes. However, I am glad to say that we do have a few left, and they are beautiful sights which everyone loves to see.

Mr. President, those who ride on the *Delta Queen* find it a meaningful experience to be on that magnificent old boat as it steams on the river. It is something that warms the heart and brings back memories of previous days. So that not just those who have occasion to take a trip on the *Delta Queen* would benefit by the passage of this bill but those who live along the river in Louisville, Baton Rouge, New Orleans, and so forth, would also be beneficiaries of the bill, to continue the *Delta Queen* in service for the future.

I regret that I have never seen the steamboat race between the *Belle of Louisville* and the *Delta Queen* to which the Senator from Kentucky refers, but, perhaps, if this bill passes, I may yet have the opportunity to witness it.

Mr. COOK. I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for his kind remarks. Truly this is a matter of being able, by a simple procedure—as I said to the Senator from Illinois—to pass a bill that will cost the Federal Government and Congress absolutely nothing in order to preserve an era of history.

It would be most unfortunate for this country if that opportunity should be lost.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, on the basis of the knowledgeable representations which have been made today, the uniqueness of a bill that will not cost the Federal Government any money, and the further fact that we have all just returned, on yesterday, from engaging and participating with millions of other Americans in commemorating Earth Day, that our environment must be preserved, I cannot imagine anything that we could do in the Senate that would be more in keeping with our objectives, rather than just to file away copies of speeches and bring them out again next year, than to do something like this today that would be constructive.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR

I cannot imagine anything more fitting than to preserve a vessel that would help thousands of Americans better appreciate what can be possible when we navigate our streams, and reinforce in them the desire to make our streams and rivers clean and preserve the fine heritage given to us by our forefathers.

Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SAXBE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11:30 A.M. ON MONDAY, APRIL 27, 1970

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, notwithstanding the preceding order, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11:30 o'clock a.m. on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SAXBE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR BAKER ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, immediately after the convening of the Senate, and after the prayer, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) be recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## CURRENT CRISIS IN INDOCHINA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, since I introduced Senate Resolution 383 for myself and the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON) on April 2, the current crisis in Indochina has intensified. In addition to increased fighting between Communist and non-Communist forces throughout the Indochina Peninsula, long-held national and racial enmities have again surfaced, resulting in additional needless slaughter and adding another difficult-to-resolve dimension to an already confused and complex situation.

Developments off the battlefields also give cause for great concern. Transcripts of a portion of the hearings on U.S. commitments conducted by the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) have finally become available. They reveal to the country that the so-called neutral status of Laos has been at best a polite fiction for more than 5 years. Today we learned that the administration has agreed to send several thousand rifles to Cambodia, which is a most disturbing development.

There is another course of action open to us, if we will seize the initiative. That is the policy suggested in Senate Resolution 383. This resolution, if adopted, would express the sense of the Senate that affirmative U.S. action is needed to bring the hostilities in Indochina to an end, and, further, that a comprehensive multilateral conference of all interested parties, with the end of true neutralization of all of Indochina, would be the most promising form such affirmative action could take.

I ask unanimous consent that the names of the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN) and the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) be added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 383 at its next printing, which brings the total number of cosponsors of the resolution to 12.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am under no illusions that such a conference would be easy to bring about or that it would inevitably produce substantial results and neutralization of Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam. But we will never know what is possible unless we make a serious attempt to find out, including consideration of changes in U.S. policy which might be necessary to bring all the interested parties to the conference table in Geneva or some other suitable place.

Events of the past week illustrate both the potential of such an approach and some of the difficulties which need to be overcome. Soviet Ambassador Yakov Malik's support of a new Geneva Conference as the only way to "bring about a new solution and relax tension on the Indochina peninsula," was a clear indication of interest, despite subsequent backtracking somewhat. On Saturday, Secretary Rogers said that the United States was pressing the Soviet Union to see if they had any specific proposals concerning a new conference. While I am pleased that the administration is showing interest in the idea proposed in Senate Resolution 383, I am afraid that it has been too passive, preferring to wait for initiatives from others, rather than attempting to break the logjam itself.

We need movement in our policy, if we want to bring hostilities in Indochina to an end. I believe the course charted by Senate Resolution 383 would offer the best chance for movement in the right direction. I am pleased to announce these additional cosponsors.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

## EUROPEAN TRAINS PROSPER AS U.S. TRAINS DIE

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the Denver Post of April 15 contained an important article pertaining to railroads in the United States and Europe.

The article was filed from Paris by Warren Trabant and it confirms something that American specialists in transportation—and American tourists abroad—have been saying for some time.

That is, European railroads are showing continued steady improvement, while American railroads continue to suffer a variety of ailments, and continue to provide passenger service that is not attracting passengers.

Various European nations are proving that passenger rail service can be a success even in modern industrial nations which enjoy good roads and convenient air service. The Europeans are showing that rail passenger service can coexist with competnig forms of passenger transportation.

I commend this article to the attention of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

EUROPEAN TRAINS PROSPER AS U.S. TRAINS DIE

(By Warren Trabant)

PARIS.—European railways are announcing faster and more comfortable trains at about the same rate American railways abandon them.

Recently, just as the California Zephyr was making one of its final runs, the French railways announced it would, in a few years, be setting passengers down in Lyon two hours after leaving Paris. (The present running time is 3 hours 50 minutes.)

It is possible today to beat air travel from city center to city center on the famous "Capitole"—the fastest train in Europe. It runs the 250 miles between Paris and Limoges in 2 hours 45 minutes at an average speed of 85 miles an hour.

The "Societe National Chemin de Fer," France's state-owned railroad, has just completed a study of turbo trains that will travel up to 185 miles an hour. In cooperation with builders of new super highways, they are rerouting the old roadbeds, cutting almost 60 miles of track between Paris and Lyon. The plan calls for an investment of $220 million.

TRAINS ON TIME

Trains are completely international in Europe and almost always on time. Every afternoon at exactly 2:45 a train leaves the North Station of Paris with cars for Berlin, Copenhagen, Warsaw and Moscow. The Moscow car, Russian owned and operated, is much like an old American pullman, completely staffed with a Russian crew.

French express trains run with great precision. In 1969, 95.1 per cent arrived on time or less than 15 minutes late.

There are 28 special daytime trains connecting the major cities of Europe. Called Trans European Express (TEE), they consist of four to eight lightweight, roomy, tastefully decorated cars including a club car and restaurant. It is possible to set your watch with the arrivals and departures, as they pull in at a station for exactly a 60-second stop.

TEEs average better than 60 miles an hour. On certain stretches they hit 100 m.p.h. Each bears its own romantic name: Rheingold, Le Cisalpin, L'Oiseau Blue, etc. The routes range from 700 miles (Bremen to Milan—12 hours 39 minutes) to as short a run as 220 miles (Zurich to Munich—4 hours 20 minutes).

Meals on TEEs are superior to those on average trains. Each serves the specialities of the country of origin. The seats are wide and roomy.

MOST SPECTACULAR

The most spectacular is the "Mistral" running from Paris to Nice. It averages 74 miles an hour, making the 670-mile run in 9 hours 5 minutes. Aside from an excellent restaurant and bar, it carries a gift shop, newsstand, secretary, barber and beauty parlor.

A good selection of night trains crisscross Europe, as well. Most are comfortable with roomy first-class sleeping compartments, less roomy but practical second-class space. Many offer "couchette" accommodations, made up from day coaches in which each compartment contains six or eight bunks. A blanket and pillow are provided, but passengers sleep in their clothes as they do not separate sexes. The advantage is economy; they cost about one third as much as first class.

Certain trains include automobile carriers. For little more than it would cost to drive, you can start driving when 100 miles or more away from the heavy traffic.

A new train between Paris and Rome has introduced the "all in" fare. Called the "Palatino," it leaves Paris at six p.m., arrives in Rome at 9:30 a.m. the next morning. Dinner and breakfast are included in the fare. It's a delightful trip, especially from the breakfast car as the train rolls through Lombardy and Tuscany toward Rome.

LESS ROMANTIC

The famous old "Orient Express"—no longer luxurious or glamorous, but still international—leaves Paris at 10 p.m. with cars marked Munich, Salzburg, Vienna, Bucharest, Sofia and Belgrade. Breakfast is served in bed, if you wish.

There is still an excitement in the bustling, noisy railway stations of Europe that no airport can match. Although the trains are no longer as romantic as described by the filmmakers and novelists of the '20 and '30s, they still offer some exciting scenery, interesting people and adventurous travel.

The clean, comfortable TEEs are soundproofed, but conversations can be heard for several seats away. Friendships can be made at the bar or during a relaxed meal over a bottle of good vine and a glass of Napoleon brandy. The atmosphere of the train contrasts to that of a plane—there is freedom of movement that makes it possible to choose a dinner companion rather than accept the person assigned to the next seat.

TOURIST BENEFIT

Tourists can benefit as well with a money-saving "Eurail Pass." For as little as $110, one can travel first class an unlimited number of miles in 21 days on the railroads of 13 European countries. A 20-day trip by train, for example, from Paris to Copenhagen, to Naples and back, including stops in 10 major cities (a distance of over 3,000 miles) would cost only $140 (for a one-month pass) plus perhaps $10 to $20 for sleeping accommodations. The cost without a Eurail pass would be close to $300.

---

## MODERN TRANSIT MARKETING

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the concept of modern transit marketing is one about which very little valuable material has been written.

Therefore, I was extremely pleased to read a new booklet entitled "Transit Marketing in Chicago" by George Krambles, Superintendent of Research and Planning of the Chicago Transit Authority.

Working with the full cooperation of CTA's outstanding Chairman George De Ment, Mr. Krambles, who is an internationally known expert on these concepts, has developed some very practical and workable ideas for encouraging patronage of rapid transit lines.

The ideas have been largely put to work in several recently completed rapid transit projects in the Chicago area, all of which were assisted financially by the Federal Government, through the Urban Mass Transportation Administration.

Because I have long contended that the money we have spent on the Skokie, Englewood, Dan Ryan and Kennedy lines in Chicago is among the best investment in transit DOT has made since the beginning of the urban transit program, I found this statement by Mr. Krambles to be further confirmation of my belief in this regard.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of "Transit Marketing in Chicago" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the booklet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSIT MARKETING IN CHICAGO

(By George Krambles)

In transit, an ideal market-oriented planning effort increases ridership and simultaneously reduces unit cost.

Transit is a service industry with high capital content in its equipment and high labor content in its product. The possibility of reducing labor content per vehicle hour is small. On buses the limit may have already been reached. Trains, even with automation, will be at the limit when policing and maintenance manhours begin to overtake operator manhours; a point that does not seem very far off.

Transit must increase its labor rates in parallel with the whole economy or not have an adequate labor force, yet may not increase its fares without serious sociological impact.

Useful service output per hour of transit equipment and manpower must be increased therefore to minimize subsidy from outside the farebox.

The approach to increasing productivity adopted for the new Chicago projects is that of increasing average speed so that more passenger miles are served for each hour of work of man or machine. Not only may unit costs thus be minimized, but existing riders are benefitted and new riding is generated by the improvement in competitive qualities of transit. Intermodal journeys are a vital ingredient in accomplishing these goals.

A glance backward through time shows how this policy developed. In 1948, buses (and streetcars) in Chicago generated about 2.7 million fares on an average weekday. Rapid transit brought in a little less than 400 thousand fares. Twenty years later, buses were bringing in only about 1.2 million fares—a loss of more than half, but rapid transit had no loss. In the downtown area rapid transit has for 15 years served more people than have buses. 70% of the people downtown each day use the L-subway.

Over the last 20 years continuous changes were made to both the bus and rapid transit systems to adapt to changing land use, and to optimize the Authority's position in the face of the injection into the city of at least $3 billion in new urban highway and personal automobiles.

To service newly developing areas, the number and length of bus routes was increased, expanding route mileage by 30%. Buses replaced fixed track streetcars. All surface vehicles were replaced by new ones.

There was constant attack on problems of vehicle design, performance and operation and continuous effort in traffic engineering, but speed, dependability and regularity in bus operation have shown discouraging little improvement.

In the same 20 years rapid transit was not expanded in coverage. To the contrary, without reducing coverage, 11 miles of weak branches were taken out of service; the number of cars required was reduced about 30%, and the number of stations was reduced 42%. By this process, plus the introduction of 'A' and 'B' express service, however, the average distance between stops of trains, and hence average speed, was substantially increased.

It has only been possible so far to replace about 80% of the rapid transit car fleet, but even so through the combination of better cars and wider stop spacing average speed was raised 30%. Furthermore, because of the exclusive right-of-way of the rapid transit system, and using modern line supervision technology, the all-weather dependability and regularity of rapid transit service was greatly improved.

We believe the public is better served when opportunity for the use of rapid transit is maximized. Speed and dependability only obtainable from that mode is vital if we are to serve a growing share of the market.

In planning for the new Chicago transit projects it was therefore the aim to shift passenger-miles from buses, averaging 12 to 14 mph, to rapid transit averaging 25 to 32 mph. Rapid transit is made conveniently accessible to a greater number of multi-modal riders by having buses complement, rather than compete with, rapid transit.

The basic change in the rapid transit system is its extension farther from the city center, although still well within city limits. In the bus system the accompanying change is that appropriate routes focus into, rather than continuing to parallel, rail lines.

The flat geography of Chicago led to a rather unimaginative gridiron street pattern. Surface transit followed the arterial street pattern with a network of very long north-south and east-west routes. Aiming at the concentrated needs of the central business district, the rapid transit and suburban railroads followed a radial course as did expressways, when they were built.

To make every station in the new Chicago transit projects an intermodal interchange point, parts of the historic grid of parallel bus routes are rearranged to form neighborhood-oriented radial networks, each focussing at an appropriate intermodal transfer station. As a result, within a year it is expected that some 26,000 *new* rides daily will be generated and at least another 140,000 per day will have changed their mode of travel to ride the new lines for a shorter journey time.

Fifty-four bus route changes were made to contact the new stations. For example, seven CTA bus lines are routed to the 95th station, while ten are routed to the Jefferson Park station. Formerly, only two served each location.

Bus routes changed to feed the new rapid transit lines are in many cases shortened yielding important incidental improvement in dependability and regularity. For example, no longer will service on North Michigan Avenue be disrupted by a ball game break in the peak of the afternoon rush. Service on Milwaukee Avenue north of Jefferson Park won't be short-changed, as it was in the past, by congestion on Washington Street or a parade downtown.

Off-street bus turnarounds are provided for intermodal transfer at the most important stations on the new projects. At others, buses stop in front of station accesses provided on each side of the expressway overpass, or passengers use marked crosswalks protected by traffic signals.

The current series of projects began with an extension of the Englewood line only about one quarter mile in length. The major aspect of this project was to provide an adequate intermodal transfer station facility, not possible at the original terminal because

of street access and property limitations. Much attention was given to improved amenities for passengers and to better handling of trains as compared to the previous terminal which had been "temporary" for 60 years!

The Dan Ryan line is an extension of the present Lake rapid transit route from Chicago's historic Loop via expressway median strip to the south side of the city. A trip over the 20.5 miles between Harlem/Lake and 95/Dan Ryan is made in only 41 to 45 minutes with 'A' and 'B' express service. The new route is the first rapid transit through service between the south and west sides of the city and eases the travel burdens of many who are employed outside the central business district.

The 95th street terminal represents a unique solution for a major transfer facility, being contained wholly within the expressway right-of-way. It is built over the outside slopes adjacent to the shoulders of the roadways, and on a new bridge across the highway 300 feet north of 95th street. CTA, Suburban and Greyhound buses circulate around the station providing passengers direct access to the rapid transit facilities. At 69th station a similar exclusive bus bridge was built.

Even the car storage yard and maintenance shop at the end of the line was squeezed into expressway median space.

The Kennedy line is an extension of the West-Northwest rapid transit route about five miles northwest from Logan Square. About ¾ of the extension is in expressway median and the remainder is in subway. 'A' and 'B' skip-stop express service is being operated. Under this plan, used on most Chicago rapid transit lines, stations with heavy traffic are designated 'AB' stations; lighter stations are successively 'A' or 'B' stations and alternate 'A' and 'B' trains make the corresponding skip-stops. As applied to the Kennedy extension the plan doubles the average distance between station stops and decreases travel time 20%.

The most extensive and comprehensive intermodal interchange on Chicago's new projects is at Jefferson Park station, which is served by a dozen city and suburban bus routes, the Chicago & North Western Railway as well as, of course, rapid transit trains to the city center and beyond to two important west suburban destinations. Here the railroad lies between the rapid transit in the Kennedy median and Milwaukee Avenue. The bus terminal is on land connected to the railroad and rapid transit platforms by a pasageway under the railway and over the southbound expressway lane. There are two separate bus loops, each with eight lanes.

Ultimate extension of rapid transit to the passenger terminals at O'Hare International airport was anticipated in the planning for the Kennedy project, as it was in the design of the expressway itself. However, the short supply of both city and federal funding and the urgency of spending what was available to meet the highest priority transit needs throughout the city made Jefferson Park the logical terminal at this stage. Although the North Western Railway, which claimed that rapid transit to O'Hare would irreparably damage its suburban service through rider diversion, threatened to block the whole project until CTA agreed not to operate in the median beyond Jefferson Park, the decision to build rail only that far had already been reached.

However, under a project sponsored by the Mayor's Office of Cultural and Economic Development, the immediate need for direct service from O'Hare to Jefferson Park is being tested by an entirely new non-stop bus route, thus adding our highest level of intermodal link.

Greyhound buses, which originate in its downtown station (with grade-separated access) now emerge from the expressway to use Jefferson Park, Skokie Swift and 95th as satellite stations. Some suburban buses terminate at 95th or Jefferson Park instead of continuing into slow-moving central area streets.

One type of intermodal interface yet to be developed on the Dan Ryan and Kennedy extensions is Park 'n' Ride. With the exception of the Englewood project, there is no new parking available initially on the new Chicago projects. It is planned that this deficiency should be overcome in a next phase with modest parking lots at key stations, and a later phase with high capacity facilities at terminals, which by that time are likely to be farther out than the present ones.

Additional car requirements imposed by the Dan Ryan and Kennedy extensions are being met by an order of 150 stainless steel cars now being delivered. These silver sky liners are notable for the panoramic windows usually found only in special sightseeing equipment.

In the Northwest Passage project, the Clinton 'L' station of the Lake-Dan Ryan route is being linked with the terminal of the North Western Railway by a shortcut passageway with escalators. This will afford suburban railroad passengers broad distribution throughout the central business district and beyond into the south and west sides of Chicago.

The construction of each of the major projects was completed within three years from approval of the respective grants by the federal government.

ILL–UTG, project, HUD approval, in service

First, Englewood, 5/6/66, 5/6/69.

Fourth, Dan Ryan, 3/13/67, 9/28/69.

Second, Kennedy, 3/13/67, 2/1/70.

Third, Northwest Passage, 6/23/67, Est. 5/11/70.

Fifth, 150 cars, 6/12/68, Est. 6/ /70.

This accomplishment is made more remarkable by the fact that all of the projects were in progress at the same time.

An important part of the preliminary planning work for all the projects was the series of traffic estimates and related cost/benefit studies. Although there had been several line relocation projects through the years, the last previous rapid transit extension within Chicago was completed in 1907, so there was no clear precedent to guide traffic estimates. Nevertheless the results to this writing indicate reasonable expectation of meeting the traffic projections.

The Dan Ryan extension after about six months of service is providing about 82,000 rides per weekday, which is 86% of the one-year goal.

The Kennedy extension after less than three months is now about 53,000 per weekday, which is 76% of the one-year goal.

Planning of the new Chicago projects was a comprehensive coordinated effort of the City of Chicago, the Chicago Area Transportation Study, the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission and the Chicago Transit Authority. Construction was sponsored by the City of Chicago and the U.S. Department of Transportation under urban mass transportation programs initiated in the last few years.

The combination of these diverse viewpoints, we believe, has led to even better utilization of the best qualities of each mode of travel to provide the urban transportation system needed for Chicago in the 1970s.

## TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSIONAL SECRETARIES ON OCCASION OF NATIONAL SECRETARY WEEK

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, as I have been reminded—constantly, not to mention aggressively—by a slew of constituents right in my own office, this is National Secretary Week.

Thus I come to this Chamber today to profess my profound appreciation for God's handiwork in creating the secretary, and to urge all Senators to join me in a special salute to the Capitol Hill variety of that species.

I urge this for two reasons.

First, it is prudent to salute them. There are more of them than there are of us. The spirit of women's liberation is abroad in the land and, for all we know, some of those demure creatures in the offices have been out practicing karate in their copious spare time, the better to avenge themselves for centuries of what today is called male chauvinism.

Second, we should love, honor, and cherish our secretaries during National Secretary Week, and maybe even into the middle of next week, because they are such cheerful and vital parts of any functioning office.

So to those who say "Three cheers for secretaries!" I say "Yea, verily," type it in triplicate, and file under the appropriate headings.

## DENVER—LEADING TRAINING CENTER FOR PILOTS OF MODERN JET AIRCRAFT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am pleased and proud to note that Denver, Colo., is serving as a leading training center for pilots learning to fly the most modern jet aircraft.

The training takes place at an installation run by United Air Lines. An interesting article concerning this center appeared in the Washington Star on March 25, and I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 25, 1970]

UAL PILOT CENTER: CREWS OF 22 AIRLINES TRAINED AT DENVER

(By Dean C. Miller)

NEW YORK.—Japanese pilots go to school in Denver to brush up on their skills and to learn how to fly the big new jets.

The $30-million United Air Lines flight training center at Stapleton Airport is something like a United Nations with wings. Business executives and corporate pilots from the Congo, West Germany and Pittsburgh go there to learn to fly the Learjet and other company-sized planes. Dancer Danny Kaye and Golfer Arnold Palmer, who fly their own planes for business reasons, also drop in for brush up work or just to kibitz with Glenn Allred, manager of airline and corporate flight training activities for United.

"We think this is a growing segment of the airlines business," said Allred in a recent trip to New York, "and we're out to get business."

MAJOR TRAINING CENTER

Last year the UAL center trained the crews of 22 other airlines, including 11 foreign carriers. It put 175 corporate pilots from 52 companies, 10 from overseas, through the paces of handling a Learjet. Another 107 flight personnel from 87 companies underwent special training. Companies like Anheuser Busch, Boise Cascade, Federated Department Stores and Trimof Fertilizers of Johannesburg, South Africa, put in time at the UAL center and get paid for it.

United collected $2 million in training fees from outside companies aside from giving $22 million worth training to its own crews. United captains must take refresher courses every six months.

"We're projecting a $3-million intake from other companies this year," said Allred, a pilot for 29 years.

One reason for the optimism is the need for training on the big new Boeing 747. Three Japan Air Lines crewmen began 747 training at the center on March 23 and other JAL crews will follow. Braniff also will get its 747 training at the UAL center.

Tuition is expensive, about $11,000 per man on the 747. That is figured on the basis of a three man crew, training for 28 days and getting 32 hours of simulator time and six of actual flight time. Simulator time goes for $360 per hour. It soars to $3,200 per hour when the students actually fly the big bird.

TUITION IS EXPENSIVE

Expenses also run high. Insurance on the $22-million plane is expensive. Instructor time, fuel, cost of the plane itself, maintenance crews and the like run into big money.

Even training on the 737 doesn't come cheap. It costs $800 per hour. Learjet lessons go for $500 per hour.

To offer training in so many different planes requires a tremendous amount of equipment at the center. UAL has $25 million invested in its 16 all-jet simulators, nine cockpit procedure trainers in addition to a standby fleet of 12 planes.

"When you consider that an airline spends about $10,000 training each pilot, and another $90,000 keeping him brushed up during his career," said Allred, "you get an idea of why we think we're in a growth business. Consider all the companies which are going in for flying and you know you are."

## ONE-THOUSAND-DAY DELAY IN TRIAL OF H. RAP BROWN

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on July 24, 1967, H. Rap Brown made an incendiary speech in Cambridge, Md. He urged burning down America, and suggested that his listeners might begin the job right there in Cambridge. That night rioting and arson did $300,000 worth of damage in Cambridge. In August 1967, Mr. Brown was indicted by a Dorchester County grand jury on charges of incitement to riot, incitement to arson, and arson.

Last Monday, there was another development in the interminable process of trying to bring Mr. Brown to trial in nearby Maryland.

The development was another failure to get the trial underway. This would hardly be news—such failures are depressingly common—but it is worth noting for one reason.

This delay came exactly 1,000 days since H. Rap Brown made his famous visit to Cambridge back in 1967.

Yesterday the trial was postponed again—for the eighth or ninth time—depending on whose count you accept—until at least next Monday. Then, or some time thereafter, a three-judge panel from the Fourth Circuit will hear arguments on the defense contention that the State of Maryland is violating Mr. Brown's rights.

Mr. President, I am not concerned about the details of the arguments being advanced over the years by the prosecution or the defense. I am concerned with the way the current state of our judicial system causes a case such as this to be strung out over many years.

For over 1,000 days Mr. Brown's team of lawyers has managed to spare him the inconvenience of coming to trial. This has been the special handiwork of Mr. William M. Kunstler, who divides his time between inciting crimes and defeating attempts to prosecute persons accused of crimes.

For a number of weeks there has been much disingenuous talk from Kunstler about how anxious he was to find a Maryland community suitable for a trial. But the other day, Mr. Kunstler revealed what has been apparent to the trained observer right along—Mr. Kunstler said that even if he knew where Mr. Brown is hiding, he would not bring his client into court.

Kunstler thinks the climate of opinion in Maryland is so corrupted and threatening that it would be risky to the physical safety of Mr. Brown to ask him to enter the State.

This is patent nonsense. But it is part of the current strategy to get the case shifted from a State court to a Federal court. The case is now tenuously lodged in a Baltimore Federal court, pending a ruling by a Federal judge as to whether it shall remain there or go back to a State court in Ellicott City. Senators recall that it landed in Ellicott City after it was moved from Bel Air, where it arrived after being moved from Cambridge.

Approximately 5 weeks ago I spoke to the Senate about the tortured attempts to bring Mr. Brown to justice. At that time I voiced the fear that radical Leftists may have hit upon a new way of avoiding trial and punishment for their sundry forms of misbehavior. The new tactic is stunningly simple: They refuse to come to trial or, failing that, they turn the courtroom into a circus and refuse to allow the trial to proceed.

This last was the technique adopted by Mr. Kunstler's defendants in the Chicago conspiracy trial. It worked so well that seven of the conspirators are roaming the country giving lectures, publishing books, inciting riots, and making money fist over glove.

So far it appears that Mr. Brown will not have to go to all the trouble of disrupting a courtroom. On the evidence of the past 1,000 days, Mr. Brown may never see the inside of a courtroom.

Many bad consequences can result if radical defendants are allowed to escape trial and punishment. For example, this may have unfortunate consequences with regard to police behavior.

Let us be very candid. The last 5 years have been very difficult years for policemen. They have been confronted with extremely explosive mob situations—some of which have posed military problems rather than police problems.

Further, there have been instances when the police have used excessive force in dealing with these situations. When this has happened the good name of the American policeman has suffered, and so has respect for the enforcement of law.

There are several possible explanations for these few instances of police excesses, but one thing is clear. The police often feel that the individuals who are making their lives so unpleasant and so dangerous will never be punished by the due process of law.

Mr. President, it is very dangerous for any part of the citizenry to become convinced that persons who flagrantly break the law are going to indefinitely delay any day of reckoning in court. It is doubly dangerous when the police become convinced that this is so.

When this happens, the police feel a strong temptation to take on the punishing function of the law. This is an intolerable usurpation of a function which properly belongs to persons and institutions other than the police.

To say that the policeman's temptation is understandable is not to say that it is pardonable for the policeman to yield to that temptation. Yielding to that temptation is an unconscionable violation of police professionalism, and a grave threat to law and order.

Nevertheless, we all should be worried when we see an instance such as the case of Mr. Brown, wherein the fears of the police seem to be confirmed.

There is great concern in some circles that the youth of the Nation will get the impression that the "system" does not work. In some circles there is even a tendency to violence on the part of young people when they believe the "system" is not working.

It is important to remember that there are other Americans beside young people who have moments when they doubt whether the "system" will work. And it is important to remember that frustration can lead to violence among various groups of Americans when they feel that some part of the "system"—for example, the courts—is not functioning.

For this reason let us hope that the depressing example of the Brown episode soon becomes the encouraging example of a trial conducted according to due process.

## FUTURE OF THE U.S. SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on April 18 on his way to Honolulu, President Nixon discussed the future of the U.S. space program at length with Dr. Thomas O. Paine, the NASA Administrator. Excerpts of the President's views expressed during this conversation have appeared in the press in the last few days, but so that these views are placed in proper context, I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD the complete statement by Dr. Paine on his conversation with the President.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF DR. THOMAS O. PAINE, NASA ADMINISTRATOR, APRIL 19, 1970

During the flight to Honolulu yesterday I had an opportunity to spend an hour and a half with President Nixon talking about the future of the U.S. space program. The President has authorized me to tell you about the conversation, and I would like to share a few of his thoughts with you tonight.

The President reiterated his strongest support for a vigorous, on-going program and

particularly in manned space flight. We will press on, he said, in the exploration of the moon and eventually explore the planets.

There will be those, the President said, who will seize upon this accident as an opportunity to call for a slowdown or a turning back; but, he said, we are not the kind of people whose purpose is diverted by adversity or setback. We have set a good course, a forward course, he added, and we will not falter in our resolve.

During the past few months I have visited a number of countries on the President's behalf to express to scientific and space leaders the President's strong desire for all nations to share in the exploration of space. I briefed the President on my recent trips to Bonn, London, Ottawa, Canberra, and Tokyo, and he was pleased to hear that other nations were considering new ways to cooperate with us in very tangible ventures. He told me that we should continue these efforts and that he was particularly gratified by the messages of good will and support that he received from scores of nations during the Apollo 13 mission.

I told the President of our plans for a thorough review of the Apollo 13 accident. He once again expressed his confidence in, and his admiration for, the NASA organization, and he said that these men and women, joining with our colleagues in other Government agencies, in industrial plants, and on college campuses would find a solution, fix the problem, and set forth again.

I told the President that I cannot yet set a firm schedule for the Apollo 14 mission and as soon as the Apollo 13 review board has completed its review of the accident and we know that we are ready to apply the lessons of Apollo 13 to the next mission, fix the equipment, and understand the procedures, we will announce the launch date for Apollo 14.

Finally, the President was pleased to see an enthusiastic flight crew in Hawaii, but they are tired, and he told me to go easy on the debriefings and to give Jim and Fred and Jack some well-deserved rest and relaxation. The President generously offered the use of Government facilities for this purpose, and I expressed my deep appreciation for his thoughtfulness, and I have passed this on to the Apollo 13 crew.

We in NASA heartily agree they have earned all the vacation we can give them.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am pleased to read this report of the conversation between the President and Dr. Paine. I am especially pleased to note Dr. Paine's report that other nations are now considering ways to increase cooperation with the United States in space exploration.

Such added cooperation is much to be desired. In this regard, I would like to call to the attention of the Senate a most interesting comment from an editorial in the distinguished British weekly, the Economist, dated April 13:

During the long hours, the world, listening to reports of deteriorating conditions inside the spaceship, hearing the edge creep into Lovell's professionally cool voice, has had plenty of time to think about whether the Americans should any longer be left to carry the whole burden of pioneering space, or whether they do not need at least a token moral support from other countries to encourage them in what they are doing—something more positive than taking their television programs from space, and placing rescue ships at the American's disposal. That answer, at least, ought not to be in doubt.

This statement by the Economist does, I believe, add emphasis to the point that the U.S. space program benefits many nations and peoples—it is truly an effort for all mankind—and thus the United States might feel more willing and able to bear the cost of this wonderful program if it received some more support from other nations.

Mr. President, when the Apollo 13 mission made its safe return to earth last week, I issued a statement expressing some of my thoughts on the space program—its past, its present, its purposes, and its future. I have been associated intimately with the program since I first became a member of the Committee on Appropriations, in 1959.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement which I made last week may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUCCESS OF APOLLO 13

The safe return of astronauts Lovell, Haise, and Swigert was a joyous event for all Americans, and for prayerful people the world over.

It is simply not possible to find words adequate to the task of praising these men. Suffice it to say that they gave the world a glimpse of the greatness of real men locked in combat against a hostile environment.

I think it is appropriate to pause a moment today and examine once again the many benefits we—and the world—derive from our vigorous program of manned space exploration.

Bismarck was so bewildered by the American ability to get into tight scrapes—and then escape unharmed—that he was moved to declare: "God must love drunks, babies and the United States."

Well, surely God was looking after the astronauts. But they were also looking after themselves.

They displayed one absolutely American virtue—splendid Yankee know-how. Faced with the desperate necessity to improvise breathing equipment, they used odds and ends—including the plastic wrapper from a piece of clothing—to construct a gadget that does add new luster to the idea of a "Rube Goldberg invention."

There is a big moral in this small facet of Apollo 13. It is quite possible that we learned as much about space, and space craft, from this difficult Apollo 13 mission than we have learned from any other to date.

Apollo 13, far from being the failure, is a many-faceted triumph. This is not really surprising. The social return from space exploration has always been enormous.

The yield in scientific knowledge about our universe is beyond the dreams of all prior generations of scientists. Our dedicated pursuit of this knowledge reaffirms our dedication to the principles of enlightened respect for truth.

Further, Americans are increasingly well-aware of how much they have gained from technological spin-offs from the space program. One can hardly overestimate the myriad social benefits these have brought.

But perhaps we have not given sufficient attention to another kind of benefit we—and other peoples—receive from the space effort. Beyond the intellectual and material gains from the space program there is a moral and spiritual gain.

This gain is hard to express, and impossible to quantify, but it is nevertheless very real. It is a gain for the American community, and for the world community.

I would venture to guess that the flight of Apollo 13 has given to Americans—and to the world—something more precious than we ever thought could be brought merely from a voyage of exploration.

What these three astronauts brought us was new knowledge of the most precious sort. They brought new knowledge of the human spirit.

By their own bravery they showed the world again what resources the individual has when faced with an extreme challenge.

By the splendid moral support they received from all the world's peoples, they demonstrated the common humanity which transcends—and will outlive—the political divisions that divide the planet.

The outpouring of prayers and concern from around the world has been astonishing, gratifying, and instructive. It has demonstrated another ancillary value of the space effort. It has shown how the personal heroism of a relatively few men, supported by the technological competence and steadfast backing of a great nation, can win the admiration of men and women everywhere.

The multi-national gathering of rescue ships in the Pacific, and anywhere else they are needed, has produced a temporary comity among nations.

Of course, this comity is a gossamer thing. It cannot erase the real differences that now divide the family of man. But any moment of harmony and common concern in this troubled world is precious, and anything that produces such a moment is to be cherished by all mankind.

The space programs has allowed all human beings to feel and demonstrate once again the common ties of sympathy that unite mankind. The numbing fear and desperate hope which the world felt while the astronauts fought their fight were, in their very humanness, powerful reminders of the common humanity of all peoples.

Back at the beginning of the 1960's there was much talk about the bold exploration of "new frontiers." The words belong to John F. Kennedy. The space program which he did so much to advance is a clear commitment to the idea of exploring new frontiers. Indeed, rarely has there been such a successful translation of political rhetoric into practical and successful programs.

Theodore Roosevelt understood this. His call for Americans to lead the "strenuous life" represented his understanding of the fact that national greatness depends on a citizenry that hungers for challenges.

John F. Kennedy understood this. His constant emphasis of national "vigor" represented his understanding of the fact that a nation that does not thrive on vigorous exertions will not thrive at all.

There will undoubtedly be some men of small soul and constricted vision who cannot comprehend the moral significance of the space program. They will look at this most recent triumph of the human spirit and wonder merely if it is not slowing the march of urban renewal, or some other personally favored enterprise.

Perhaps these persons can be reached with this single argument. Of course we face many challenges here on earth. Of course they will not be solved without a large and steady commitment. And even with such a commitment, the tests will be severe and the sacrifices painful.

But none of this will be possible—not the commitment, not the steadfastness, not the capacity for sacrifice—if we lose our appetite for rigorous exertions.

For this reason we must not panic in the face of Apollo 13's difficulties. We must not be led to abandon manned space flights.

Yesterday a Navy jet and an Air Force jet collided in midair over North Carolina. Six men died in this accident. Such accidents are not common, but nor are they unknown. No one is complacent about them. But no one thinks accidents can be entirely eliminated from the many flight training programs and regular operations of all the parts of the armed services which use aircraft.

Hazards—and even death—are grim, but

accepted features of life in the air age. But, it is interesting to note that we do not hear people asking that we abandon the use of airplanes every time there is an airborne mishap. Yet in recent days we have heard talk to the effect that the difficulties experienced by Apollo 13 constitute a good reason for putting an end to manned space flights.

Our three astronauts have survived a narrow brush with death. Yet the only time they showed even a flicker of emotion was when, upon separating from the service module, they saw the extent of the damage their equipment has suffered.

These are cool men, confident men, men enjoying a spiritual self-sufficiency that embodies all the classic heroic virtues. We do not honor them, we do not serve the nation, when we engage in a lot of nervous nattering about putting an end to manned space flights simply because three heroes were called upon to display heroism.

From the space program Americans gain a re-affirmation of their continuing capacity for great exertions and splendid achievements. They gain a chance to demonstrate and pay tribute to the most noble qualities of the human soul—ingenuity, comradeship and courage.

Hemingway defined courage as "grace under pressure." By this defintion—by any definition—the three astronauts have written a bright new chapter in the history of American courage.

## S. 3759—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO REMOVE LIMITATION TO PERMIT THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY TO SATISFY CLAIMS IN CONNECTION WITH CHESAPEAKE BAY BRIDGE-TUNNEL ACCIDENT

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I introduce a bill and ask that it be appropriately referred. I offer this legislation for myself and for my distinguished colleague from Virginia (Mr. SPONG). Identical legislation will be introduced by all Members of the Virginia delegation in the House of Representatives.

The legislation concerns the accident of a naval vessel on January 21, 1970, which collided with the Chesapeake Bay Bridge Tunnel and did substantial damage to that bridge-tunnel. There is no doubt that the Government has a liability and an obligation in regard to this matter. It will be handled in the appropriate and customary manner.

However, this legislation is necessary because at the present time there is a limitation of $1 million as to the amount for which the Secretary of the Navy may settle claims affecting naval vessels. The damage to the Chesapeake Bay Bridge-Tunnel by this accident has not been permanently established but it is estimated to be about $2.7 million.

The purpose of the legislation is to remove the limitation so as to permit the Secretary of the Navy, after all the facts have been established, to take action to satisfy justified claims against the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SAXBE). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3758), to remove the present $1 million limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Navy from settling and paying the claim of the Chesapeake Bay Bridge and Tunnel District arising out of the collision of the U.S.S. *Yancey* with the bridge-tunnel span, introduced by Mr. BYRD of Virginia, for himself and Mr. SPONG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## AUTHORIZATION FOR PRESIDENT TO PROCLAIM THE LAST FRIDAY OF APRIL 1970 AS "NATIONAL ARBOR DAY"

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 251 to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April 1970 as "National Arbor Day."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I wish to state to Senators that this matter has been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 251) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

## DRAFT AND THE VOLUNTEER ARMED FORCE

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, at the request of the distinguished Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), I ask unanimous consent that a speech by him on the President's message on the draft and the volunteer armed force be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement by Senator DOLE was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRAFT AND THE VOLUNTEER ARMED FORCE

(By Mr. DOLE)

During his campaign for the Presidency, Richard Nixon announced his support for the concept of a volunteer Army. Soon after taking office, he appointed a Commission to study the feasibility of creating such a force. On February 21, the Gates Commission reported that the interests of the Nation would be best served by the creation of an all-volunteer force.

During the time the Commission was studying this question, President Nixon forwarded several recommendations for changes in the draft system. The Congress responded to the need for immediate action and passed legislation restoring to the President the discretionary authority to determine the relative order for induction within specific age groups.

Today, President Nixon took another important step to remove the unfairness and discrimination in our present draft system. Because of our commitment in Southeast Asia, he declined to abolish the draft, but stated that it was "the objective of this administration" to reduce draft calls to zero. To achieve this objective, the President recommended a combination of financial incentives and improved enlistment procedures. Of particular note was the President's directive to give new emphasis to the needs, capabilities and aspirations of all military personnel. Too often, the individual's needs and desires are disregarded, which ultimately effects the reenlistment rate.

Although the President proposes continuation of the draft, he has recommended significant changes in the present system. Employment and paternity deferments will be abolished by Executive order. At the same time, the President's request for discretionary authority to grant student deferments will insure that all young men are treated equally.

His second legislative proposal to abolish quotas and establish a direct national call will guarantee that the system applies equitably nationwide.

Of course, we would all like to see the need for a draft and voluntary army cease to exist. But the realities of world politics will not permit this. The President has recognized these realities as well as the discouragement and disillusionment felt by many young people toward the present system. I am hopeful that this message, along with the actual performance of the President, will demonstrate his commitment to youth and the vitality of our institutions.

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS OF SENATORS

### GO FLY A KITE?

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I am very much pleased that the Secretary of the Interior has added his support to the campaign to repeal one of the District of Columbia's most inane laws, the prohibition against flying kites in the city of Washington.

The freedom to go fly a kite is one of the traditional rites of spring in most parts of the world—but not in the city of Washington. This ridiculous prohibition, ensconced in the District of Columbia Code for over 60 years, deprives Washington residents of one of the most innocent of outdoor pleasures. It threatens to make misdemeanants of young children. It distracts the District of Columbia Police and the Park Police from the serious business of combating crime. Recently, it has even tied up the time and efforts of a number of lawyers.

The kiteflying ban ought to be repealed. Language to this effect has been included in the Senate version of S. 2601, the omnibus District of Columbia crime control bill now in conference. I am much pleased that Secretary Hickel has endorsed the Senate action as being fully consistent with his drive to open up our national and local parks for all the people.

While the right to fly a kite is hardly the most serious issue confronting us in the District of Columbia crime conference, I hope that we can reach prompt agreement on the Senate position.

### AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the United States has again shown its resolve to bring, as soon as possible, a permanent peace to Vietnam. President Nixon's announcement of the withdrawal of 150,000 additional troops from Vietnam during the next 12 months should be an explicit indication to the Government of North Vietnam and the Vietcong of our sincere intention to bring peace to Vietnam.

I continue to be concerned over the American men held prisoners in North Vietnam. Repeatedly, the American Government has asked the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong to respect existing international legal and moral standards in their treatment of the unfortunate

American prisoners now their captives. In response, the other side has demanded that the United States withdraw all its troops from Vietnam before negotiations on the prisoner-of-war issue could commence.

Mr. President, the fact is that, with the announcement just made by the President, the United States will have withdrawn a total of 265,500 American troops by April 1971. What this means is that the United States will have reduced its forces by almost one-half of the maximum troop level reached in April of 1969.

It is time now for the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong to indicate, with a proper response, that their desire for peace is also sincere.

I can think of no better way for the other side to do this than to release immediately the seriously ill and wounded Americans held prisoners. The South Vietnamese have been releasing the seriously ill North Vietnamese POW's for years. Surely, no military advantage can be gained by keeping these men as hostages.

Furthermore, it would be appropriate at this time for the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong to begin immediate negotiations for the mutual exchange of prisoners and to open their prisoner-of-war camps to international inspection so that we and the world can be assured that our men are receiving adequate food and medical care. Hanoi could easily release an accurate list of all Americans held captive, and they could allow these men to communicate with their families on a regular basis.

Mr. President, I hope the other side will now show at least a modicum of sincerity by acceding to the wishes expressed over the years by the Vatican, the United Nations, and the International Red Cross. Similar pleas have come from the prisoners' families, who have traveled to all parts of the world in vain, from foreign governments and from the great humanitarian organizations of the world. To date, all these appeals have been met by stubborn refusals.

The President of the United States has taken a forward step to end the conflict in Vietnam. He is steadily withdrawing American troops on an orderly basis. I commend the President for these efforts to bring peace to Vietnam.

However, Mr. President, we cannot rest 1 minute while there are Americans held prisoner. I have today written to the President urging him to intensify our Government efforts in Paris, and through private channels on behalf of those Americans now held captive.

Mr. President, the United States has declared its intentions. We have made a commitment to withdraw a total of 265,500 American troops by April of next year. If the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong are men of conscience, let them now respond. If they are not, let the whole world bear witness.

## BROKEN PROMISES OF NORTHEAST AIRLINES

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the record of Northeast Airlines is one of years of broken promises to the people of Maine. Repeatedly Northeast Airlines has welshed on its promises to expand and improve air service to Maine.

Because it has welshed on its promises, I have refused to join other Members of the Maine congressional delegation and other congressional delegations from New England to support Northeast's applications for routes outside of Maine.

For a long time, I felt like a lone "voice in the wilderness" in my refusal to support Northeast's applications. But, in time, growing numbers of officials began to see through Northeast as I did, and as thousands of air travelers in Maine and northern New England long have.

Among those who have publicly expressed disenchantment and resentment at Northeast Airlines is the Maine Sunday Telegram. Because of its excellent and blunt to-the-point editorial in its April 19, 1970, issue, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD, and I pointedly call the attention of the Civil Aeronautics Board to it.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Maine Sunday Telegram, Apr. 19, 1970]

CURE NEEDED FOR MAINE'S AWFUL AIR SERVICE

Next Wednesday in Washington the Civil Aeronautics Board will consider whether Maine will get a different airline. Northwest Airlines wants to take over and merge with Northeast Airlines, the carrier which "serves" Maine today.

Our interest is whether the proposed merger will provide an air service for Maine which is as bad, worse or better than the "service" we now get from Northeast.

Northwest is not promising us much. That at least is a change from Northeast, which promised lavishly when it was ogling to get the longdistance run to Florida, Bermuda, etc., but has since welshed on many of those promises to expand and improve air service to Maine.

Northwest promises Maine that if they come here they will "continue the service as presently provided by Northeast."

That service is best described by a three-letter word, BAD.

The Greater Portland Chamber of Commerce told CAB Northeast's service had been "erratic and deteriorating."

The Chamber showed CAB dismal evidence that daily round trips by Northeast at Portland had been reduced from 12.4 in November 1969 to 8.6 in March 1970. This is a reduction of 31 per cent.

Now, Northwest states it does not intend to increase or improve service between Maine and Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Washington.

Furthermore, Northwest will abandon nonchange flights from Maine to Florida, for which there were 17,550 passengers in 1968. Northeast instead offers as a substitute, service to Minneapolis, for which there were only 1250 passengers in 1968. Northwest will NOT restore service to Augusta-Waterville or Lewiston-Auburn, on which Northeast reneged. Northwest is likely to abandon service to the 150,000 people in the Presque Isle area.

Maine may gain nothing by this proposed merger, by which an international carrier will give us skimpy short haul service.

CAB should refuse to grant permission for Northwest to absorb Northeast if the best Northwest promises to Maine is to continue the "erratic and deteriorating" service our state gets from Northeast.

CAB should, at minimum, insist that Northwest deliver on the promises made to Maine by Northeast, but never kept. Better still, CAB should encourage a competent regional carrier, such as Alleghany, to bring excellent short haul service to Maine.

We urge the Maine Congressional delegation now go to work with CAB and insist upon better service for Maine, as a condition of any new arrangement.

Linwood F. Wright, Director of the Department of Aeronautics for the State of Maine told the blunt truth to the CAB examiner this week when he said:

"Mr. Examiner, the public convenience and necessity of air travellers to, and from, and within Maine have been flaunted by Northeast Airlines and neglected by CAB for the past 15 years. Instead of receiving a satisfactory level of air service we have received broken promises and suspensions of service."

The needs of Maine will be met, said Mr. Wright "only if the CAB directs Northwest to provide and maintain the required level of service, and periodically reviews in public hearings the service and performance of Northwest on the routes serving the State of Maine."

CAB, unless it too wants to earn the reputation of a regulatory agency which is a 'patsy' for the industry it is supposed to police, would do well to judge this case from the view of the public, whom it is in existence to represent, rather than from the view of the airlines, whom it is in business to "keep up to snuff."

Talk of "keeping up to snuff," we turned to the air schedules of thirty years ago. And we found that back in 1939 the Boston-Maine Airline provided five flights daily between Portland and Boston. In 1970, guess how many flights Northeast provides? Still Five flights—when the weather is fair and the Yellowbird feels up to it.

How's that for "keeping pace with the American public's expanding need for air service," Mr. CAB examiner?

## NAPA AIR POLLUTION CONTROLS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, our country is at last awakening to the dangers posed to our environment by continuing air and water pollution. This week, which will be known forevermore as "Earth Week," has brought an impressive demonstration of public concern with the problem of pollution. Millions of Americans have gathered in "teach-ins" all across the country to discuss how we can protect our threatened environment. Government and industry must redouble their antipollution efforts if they are to meet their responsibility to enhance the quality of American life. One industrial group, the National Asphalt Pavement Association, adopted voluntary air pollution controls 5 years ago, and like many other socially concerned business operations continues today to urge its member firms to make every effort to meet their obligations to help preserve the endangered character of our ecology.

Mr. President, as we consider the various legislative proposals designed to control pollution that will be coming before this body in the months ahead, let us also pause to remember that a number of industries have already been accelerating their efforts in this field and have much to offer us in the way of experience and research. As explained in a recent letter which I received from Mr. George M. Myers, a fellow Kansan of outstanding reputation and national president of NAPA, his industry has es-

tablished, for example, a special environmental quality committee to upgrade the character of the industry's voluntary air pollution controls and to gather data which will be of use to all of us who are active in this field. Other industries, too, are active in this regard and all deserve our commendation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Myers' letter outlining his industry's antipollution efforts be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASPHALT PAVEMENT ASSOCIATION,
*Riverdale, Md., March 25, 1970.*

Hon. JAMES B. PEARSON,
*New Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR PEARSON: Recent issues of the *Congressional Record* make reference to the 1970's as the Environmental Decade. We at the National Asphalt Pavement Association share the government's concern for improving the quality of our ecology. We enclose a copy of voluntary air pollution controls adopted by our industry in 1965, well before the beginning of the current degree of public concern for an improved environment. With five years behind us upon which to reflect, we feel that even our model codification of voluntary restraints requires adjustment. We are moving toward that end by assigning a special Environmental Quality Committee to study the matter prior to our taking further action. Our new task force will study water pollution, noise abatement and land usage as well as further work on air pollution.

We plan to continue our precedent of sharing otherwise marketable technological information. Moreover, our lead has been shared with our counterparts in the Netherlands and Japan and could have great international implications in keeping with the President's proposal for a third dimension of NATO (the Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society) and would also be beneficial to other international councils.

We pledge our collective energy to do our part as an industry in helping to improve the quality of American life. We place ourselves at your disposal should you require the benefit of our experience and research. We do hope that in the same fashion that we as an Association led our industry into action on behalf of the general public, we may be of service to you in your deliberations in successfully combating this grave national problem.

Very sincerely yours,
GEORGE M. MYERS,
*President.*

---

## SENATE-HOUSE CONFEREES AGREE ON VITAL AIRPORT/AIRWAYS PROGRAM — STOL AIRCRAFT BREAKTHROUGH COMES NEARER—PARADE ARTICLE PROVIDES PROOF OF PROGRESS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, we have experienced the advent of the jumbo jets and their high speeds—their fast traveling between distant cities and between continents. Yes, they provide fast traveling, indeed—but, too often only while airborne.

Ben Kocivar, writing in the April 19, 1970, issue of the Parade supplement to many Sunday newspapers, reminded us that we suffer through long delays in traffic to arrive at the airport and in waiting for takeoff from overcrowded runways. And, furthermore, at a busy destination airport, there are often delays on landing, on achieving a gate for deplaning, in baggage handling, and in proceeding by taxi or limousine into the city.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION TAKEN

Mr. President, I believe a major step was taken last Tuesday toward providing a means for correction of many of the vexing and frustrating delays air travelers have been experiencing. My reference is to the significant development which took place April 21 when the Senate-House conferees agreed to file a conference report on the differences between the Senate-passed and the House-passed versions of H.R. 14465, providing Federal assistance for expansion of the Nation's airports and airways, and to amend the tax laws to provide financing for the much needed airport/airways expansion program. We owe a debt of gratitude to the Commerce Committees of the two bodies, and to the House Ways and Means Committee and Senate Finance Committee as well—and especially to the conferees from those committees. They worked long, patiently, and effectively to develop and finally concur on the provisions for authorizing and financing the vital expansion of the Nation's airport/airways system.

It should not be many days before final action will be taken on this act by Congress and by the President in signing it at the White House. There must follow compliance and months of perfecting implementation, mainly by the Federal Aviation Administration, the commercial airlines, units of general aviation, the airports, and the Treasury Department which will manage the airport/airways trust fund. Doubtless, there will be more frustrations and impatience during the early period of FAA administration and while the trust fund is being built up as a competent source of the main financing of expansion and maintenance of the airports and airways system. But, surely a much brighter and, hopefully, safe and happier future is ahead for that system and for the millions upon millions of Americans and travelers from foreign lands who use it.

The airport/airways program to be authorized in the new law will be a national program. It must not be keyed to the solution of the problems of the big jets and the metropolitan airports alone. The problems created by the jumbo jets in transcontinental and transoceanic service at major international airports must have attention—but so must there be solutions for the medium- and short-range airlifts, especially in the overcrowded eastern seaboard corridor, both as relate to commercial and general aviation.

Mr. President, I have been discussing in this forum and I have been encouraging here and throughout America for several years the better development—indeed, the perfection of a special or supplemental airport/airways system to accommodate both commercial and general aviation STOL aircraft.

Earlier, I mentioned Ben Kocivar's article for Parade magazine supplements to many of last Sunday's newspapers, headed: A Revolution in Air Travel: Let's Fly Downtown. He referred, of course, to STOL, meaning short takeoff and landing—a new breed of airliner which he predicts is just around the corner in spite of the fact that—

STOL AIRCRAFT BREAKTHROUGH

Supersize jets are getting all the publicity these days—but the STOLs will revolutionize air travel in their own way. All they need for takeoff is a 2000-foot strip and usually you don't have to go miles out of the city to find room. . . . Thanks to STOL, the airport will be available near the center of the city.

STOL is almost upon us. A Civil Aeronautics Board Examiner, after two years of consulting place makers, airlines and city groups, has decided it's necessary and possible to develop a new kind of air service in the Northeast. It will be called "Metroflight" and its first 8 cities may be Boston, Hartford, New York, Newark, Trenton, Philadelphia, Wilmington and Washington.

I am reminded, Mr. President, that I spoke in the Senate on September 27, 1967, of a speech made earlier by Arthur D. Lewis, then senior vice president of Eastern Airlines, in which he said that the airline industry will have to get behind new short-haul concepts. I pointed out that Mr. Lewis had declared:

The airline industry must move aggressively to develop STOL aircraft and STOL landing strips. . . . Ultimately, Eastern's shuttle and other similar short-haul operations must be performed by efficient STOL airplanes.

I also emphasized in that September 27, 1967, speech in this forum that the then Director of FAA Aircraft Development Activities had declared that STOL aircraft are both technically and economically practicable—those which, the FAA official declared:

Become airborne in less than 1,500 feet of runway, compared to more than 5,000 feet needed by jets; and those with design concepts for planes to carry up to 120 passengers, cruise at 500 miles per hour, and land at speeds as slow as 60 miles an hour.

On June 21, 1968, in reporting in this forum that STOL aircraft test flights over the Northeast Corridor were planned to begin the following August, I said:

The Washington Evening Star reported yesterday (June 20, 1968) that demonstration flights are to be conducted for test operation of STOL aircraft over the congested northeast corridor of the United States. The McDonnell Douglas Corp. has built the 188 STOL which reportedly can take off on 1,000 feet of runway and land on 500 feet on a standard day. This is a significant engineering achievement. I commend the manufacturer and Eastern Airlines for having moved with such progress as to be prepared to begin a 7-week demonstration.

In the September 9, 1968, issue of the RECORD, I had inserted as part of a further discussion of STOL developments the following from an August 14, 1968, editorial in the Seattle, Wash., Post-Intelligencer:

A 12-passenger commercial aircraft with short, stubby wings under the main wings and with extra large flaps rolls down the runway at 60 miles per hour and lifts off the ground only 10 seconds later after a 600-foot run. The scene is New York City's LaGuardia Airport and the occasion was the opening last week of the first short takeoff and landing strip for commercial airplanes in the United States. Such a strip is

called STOL—and in the run of years immediately ahead, hopefully, it will be called a major remedy for much of our critical airport congestion. The new airstrip at LaGuardia is 1,095 feet long as compared with 4,000 feet for the shortest regular runway at the airport. The STOL-plane, as it is called, lands and takes off at a speed of 60 to 70 mph, compared with 105 mph for other planes of its size. By taking off on its own short runway, a STOL-plane not only leaves a regular runway clear for conventional planes, but also provides more airspace because it flies out and in under a totally separate pattern. Airline officials predict . . . that within two years STOL-planes will be developed capable of carrying up to 100 passengers and cruising at speeds over 300 mph.

Furthermore, Mr. President, an article in the New York Times of Friday, September 6, 1968, underscores and, in fact, expands on the comments of the editor of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, the two leading paragraphs being as follows:

Plans to build a 32-to-36 passenger short-takeoff-and-landing (STOL) plane for service late in 1970 have been announced by General Aircraft Corporation of El Segunda, California.

The GAC-100 four-engine turboprop will be designed primarily to serve communities with airports too small for modern jets. It may also come in handy on high-density routes such as Boston-New York-Washington because it can operate from close-in air strips shorter than 2,000 feet, bypassing congested metropolitan airports and their access highways.

Speaking September 19, 1968, in the Senate, I again addressed the subject and noted that on the day before, Charles Yarborough, aviation specialist and staff writer for the Washington Star, undated events and demonstrated how much closer to reality is the STOL aircraft to scheduled airline service than was even dreamed of a year earlier. I quoted the following from his article:

An airplane that is up, off, turned and gone while a big jet is taxiing out to wait in line flew its own "road map" out of National Airport today (Sept. 18, 1968). It was a demonstration of what may be a big factor in solving today's problems of airport congestion and delay. The aircraft was a four-engine turboprop McDonnell Douglas 188, known in Europe as the French-built Breguet, probably the world's most advanced STOL—short takeoff and landing. Eastern Airlines, McDonnell, Douglas, and the Federal Aviation Administration are running evaluation tests with the airplane, simulating air shuttle scheduling.

On January 29, 1969, I reported:

Today, I am elated by one ray of hope for a potential major breakthrough—not a claimed total solution, but a development capable of generating a very real impact for good on congested airways and overcrowded airport landing areas. I refer to the report made yesterday by an Eastern Airlines executive to the Aero Club of Washington on a protracted experiment—which he termed an unqualified success. It was a report on the flying of short-take-off-and-landing aircraft equipped with modern navigation gear. Those tests in the super-saturated northeastern air traffic corridor, mainly over Eastern's shuttle route between Washington and New York, proved to the company's officials, according to vice president A. Scott Crossfield, that the STOL can relieve congested airways and increase airline revenues. He reported that his firm believes this potentiality is so real, in fact, that its engineers are already drawing up specifications for a STOL plane to be built for scheduled carrier service over segments of Eastern's franchise routes.

We have read much, and I have discussed on previous occasions in this forum, the fact that Eastern Airlines and the McDonnell-Douglas aircraft manufacturing organization used their version of the French-designed Breguet 941 STOL plane in the experiments. It is a 64-passenger craft that made more than 350 landings and takeoffs at Washington, New York, and Boston airports during the 7-week trial period. Takeoff required only approximately 500 feet of runway—and landings very little more, according to Mr. Crossfield's report.

Impressive were these additional important facts reported by the Eastern Airlines vice president:

The specifications for the new STOL which Eastern will order will include capacity for 125 passengers and flight speed of more than 250 miles an hour, to be maneuverable at speeds as low as 70 miles an hour.

Although a jet-powered DC-9 can make the trip from Washington to New York in 31 minutes of flying time, the airways have become so congested that the average trip time now is 70 minutes. Such wasted flying time cost the Eastern system up to $1 million a week last summer, Mr. Crossfield said. The experimental STOL plane used took 58 minutes to make the New York-Washington trip without wasting any flying time. The proposed new 125-passenger, 250-miles per hour or over STOL's would be expected to do even better.

If airports are properly developed to accommodate STOL aircraft on a permanent basis, and if navigational problems and landings can be worked out in the airways system, Eastern officials believe the new plane would be capable of leading to a doubling of the landing capacity of airports by utilizing taxiways and the ends of unused runways. But, as Mr. Crossfield pointed out, STOL could not alleviate congestion if it uses the same navigational equipment as other conventional aircraft and if it is forced to use the same air corridors as the conventional craft.

According to today's Washington Post account of Mr. Crossfield's report on the experimental STOL, it had an onboard computer-controlled system which indicated to the pilot where he was on a map. And the system was claimed to be accurate within 25 feet of altitude and 100 feet of latitude. By using the new device, in addition to existing navigational aids, the Eastern plane was able to make its own corridors, avoiding congested routes and reducing flying time.

The special computer-controlled system used in the STOL experiment is manufactured by Decca in England. Mr. Crossfield reported that it also was used in a DC-9 which made 1,500 runs off the regular air corridors and was so effective that Eastern is considering installing it on all shuttle flights. He indicated that there is evidence to support a belief that eventually a navigation system like or similar to the Decca equipment could make arrival times so accurate that a pilot could reserve his landing time through the airport tower with a 30 second or better accuracy.

It is heartening to read in the Washington Post account today that the navigational system and the same STOL plane currently are being tested by American Airlines and that both American and Eastern officials have indicated that it might be possible to offer scheduled STOL service by the mid-1970's.

This could have a very real and helpful impact on the fight against air traffic and airport takeoff and landing congestion—and could influence legislative solutions for the airport/airways crisis.

PARADE ARTICLE SIGNIFICANT

Mr. President, I believe the foregoing chronology of events makes more meaningful and understandable Mr. Kocivar's up-to-date and optimistic Parade article on the future of the STOL, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

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

[From Parade Magazine, Apr. 19, 1970]

A REVOLUTION IN AIR TRAVEL: LET'S FLY DOWNTOWN

(By Ben Kocivar)

A merchant in the heart of New York City will phone a customer in downtown Boston, 188 miles away, and tell him, "I'll be in your office in a little over an hour." An ardent young man in Portland, Ore., will call his fiancée in Seattle, 145 miles distant, in late afternoon to announce, "I'll pick you up for dinner at 6:30."

Fast traveling? Yes, and most of us are accustomed to it these days—but only while airborne. Time and again you suffer through long delays in traffic to get to the airport and in waiting for takeoff from overcrowded runways. Then, at a busy destination airport, there are often delays in landing, and in proceeding by taxi or limousine into the city.

ACCESSIBLE AIRPORTS

But cheer up. Soon, like the merchant in New York and the young Portland man, people in hundreds of U.S. cities will be able to count on a speedy arrival—because they won't have to put up with those ordeals at each end of a trip. Thanks to "STOL," the "airport" will be available near the center of the city.

STOL stands for "short takeoff and landing" and designates a new breed of airliner that's just around the corner. Supersize jets are getting all the publicity these days but the STOLS will revolutionize air travel in their own way. All they need for takeoff is a 2000-foot strip and usually you don't have to go miles out of the city to find room for one of those, as you do for the 10,000-foot strips the jets require.

STOL is almost upon us. A Civil Aeronautics Board examiner, after two years of consulting plane makers, airlines and city groups, has decided it's necessary and possible to develop a new kind of air service, in the Northeast. It will be called "Metroflight" and its first eight cities may be Boston, Hartford, New York, Newark, Trenton, Philadelphia, Wilmington and Washington.

IS IT REALLY NEW?

Doesn't this promise of fast, short-jump air service have the ring of something not so new? Haven't we had helicopters hopping from the top of the Pan Am Building in New York to various airports? Isn't there already a network of some 200 commuter airlines in the short-hop business all over the country?

The answer to both questions is, "Yes, but."

Helicopters are expensive to buy and operate. On the other hand, they can use smaller, cheaper landing pads than STOLs. And, commuter planes have to work in and out of many airports already jammed with big jet airliners. They help a passenger make plane connections faster than he could by car but if he wants to get downtown there's still that long drive from the airport.

The new promise lies in spotting the short STOL strips conveniently along the Hudson River in Manhattan and at downtown sites in other cities. In New York, this would put the downtown "airport" right handy to railroad, subway, bus terminal and the fast-moving West Side Highway.

New York is considered a kingpin in the new system, not only because of its size, but because when air traffic backs up at the three airports serving it the jam-up reaches all the way to Los Angeles, Paris and other far-off cities. Reasons? (1) A plane delayed in or

over New York can't meet its schedule at other airports. (2) A serious boxup in the air over New York keeps New York-bound planes from even taking off from St. Louis, Bermuda or Miami because there is no point in getting airborne if there is no place to land.

While New York is vital to make the metroflight service work in the Northeast, other cities are moving ahead. And even the Russians are developing STOL planes for faster service between big and small cities.

A number of cities already have downtown airports. Boston, Hartford, Washington, Chicago and Cleveland are among these. All they need are small strips in suburban areas to make the system feasible. Even at today's busy airports, the ability of the STOL plane to fly from short strips and to make quick turns in flight without using up lots of airspace makes it practical to build special STOL runways in unused areas of big airports. But the major benefit will come from downtown strips.

Noise? The new planes are quieter than conventional planes and helicopters, and tests flown along the Hudson River revealed that many people didn't know the plane was flying by unless they saw it.

Air pollution? The promise is that there will be less air pollution than from the comparable number of autos needed to move the same number of people.

COST AND SAFETY

Cost? About the same as downtown-to-downtown service by the combination of plane and cab. Less than it costs to drive and park a car from an outlying suburb to downtown. A big plus is the new freedom in hopping off to another place from downtown.

Safety? It will be at least as safe as other air travel, which is already safer than the same trip by auto.

The most significant saving is going to be time. Today, even with 500-mph jets in service it takes as long to go from downtown New York to downtown Washington as it did 20 years ago. Add a chunk of frustration to the trip as you often sit at the runway waiting for ten to 30 other planes to take off ahead of you.

Only tomorrow will prove the promise but the implications of this new Metroflight system are impressive.

The business advantages are obvious.

Socially, it means you will be able to hop into town to a concert or show from 100 miles away as casually as you now drive 20. It means technical experts and medical specialists will be able to spread their skills among more communities. Patients needing heart surgery or other critical care will be moved faster and more safely to specialized centers. Shoppers will be able to find a change of pace and fashion without taking a week to do it.

It also means that getting to your relaxing retreat in the country or the shore will no longer take a big chunk out of your time and energy.

It's going to take more than new planes and new short airstrips. It will also take a new system of air traffic control and new sophisticated area navigation guidance to keep all the airborne vehicles separated. Actually, this new traffic control is in the works and is part and parcel of the decision to go ahead with the system. Tests flown by Eastern and American airlines with a converted French military STOL indicate that the system can be made to work on a large scale in the next few years even though many problems must be resolved.

AIRLINES ARE EAGER

Meanwhile, the Federal Aviation Administration and Pan Am have urged that downtown-to-downtown service, even in a limited way, should be started immediately. And Pan American and a number of small commuter lines have offered to start as soon as they can get a go-ahead. There is much to be learned and more economically by starting in a small way than by waiting until 100- to 150-passenger STOL machines are ready.

The first planes used would probably be DeHavilland Twin-Otters. These are 18-passenger, conventional looking twin-engine turboprop planes. There are hundreds in use already around the world. There are some other small STOLs in use like the nine-passenger Britten-Norman that could also start now.

But the *big* breakthrough can come in three years when a new generation of planes and large, more economical helicopters could be available for this special service. They are already designed and the names of manufacturers and airlines interested in this next step read like the Who's Who of the aviation industry.

EXCITING DESIGNS

The machines are jet powered. The designs are way out. They include planes with special high-lift wings with giant flaps, planes with engines and wings that tilt up for takeoff and convertiplanes that go up straight and then fold their helicopter rotors and fly on small wings when they move forward.

What is it like to fly a STOL? I have flown several different ones and it is more fun and has more flying sensation than riding in a shiplike giant jet airliner. You fly low enough to see what's happening on the ground below and on short trips you don't have time to be bored. Present STOLs fly at about 150 mph; future ones will be pressurized and able to fly at over 400 mph and 20,000 feet high on longer trips.

So, fasten your seatbelts and get ready for Metroflight—the next big revolution in air travel.

## AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION ACT

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held hearings on April 16 to consider three bills which would amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act. The subcommittee will resume its hearings on Monday, April 27.

One of the bills under consideration by the subcommittee is S. 3603, a bill introduced by the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) for the purpose of allowing meat and meat food products produced under a State meat inspection system that has been certified by the Federal Government as "at least equal to" the Federal meat inspection system, to move in interstate commerce. I believe this bill would rectify a serious discriminatory situation that now exists, and one which will become increasingly discriminatory as more and more States upgrade their meat inspection programs and are certified by the Federal Government as the equal of the Federal meat inspection system.

Under present law, the States will have had—by December 15 of this year—3 years in which to bring their State meat inspection programs into compliance with Federal law and regulations. During the past 28 months, the activity on the part of the States in meeting their obligations under the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967 has been commendable, and such activity indicates that there is no lack of awareness on the part of the States of their responsibilities under the law. Already, three States—Maryland, Florida, and California—have been certified by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as being "at least equal to" the Federal standards of meat inspection. Forty-six States have been given to December 15 of this year to bring their systems and plants up to Federal standards. Only one State, North Dakota, has been unable to move as rapidly as the law requires, and has been taken over by the Federal authorities.

S. 3603 would, in my opinion, correct the discriminatory situation which I referred to a moment ago, in that it would allow a State, after becoming equal to the federal system, to enjoy the same privilege as those plants under the federal system—that privilege being the movement of product in interstate commerce. Under present law, plants operating under a State inspection program are deprived of moving their products in interstate commerce even after the State system and all the plants in that system have been approved by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as being "at least equal to" the Federal program. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has, in past years, supported this type of legislation, and such support has been documented by the distinguished Senator from Florida (Senator HOLLAND), CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 114, part 17, page 22523.

However, in testimony last week before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation, the witnesses for the Department of Agriculture stated that this legislation is "premature." I fail to understand the Department's reasoning here, in that it is the USDA which has the authority to certify a State inspection system as being "at least equal to" the federal system; should the Department, in its survey of the States for certification, determine that a State has not met the Federal standards, then it does not have to grant the State "at least equal to" certification. On the other hand, should the State system be certified as the equal of the federal system, why should not these States be allowed to move their meat and meat products produced in interstate commerce? The product would be wholesome, it would have been produced under strict standards of sanitation, it would be correctly labeled, and it would carry a State-Federal inspection legend that would give the necessary assurance of protection to the consumer.

I find the Department's policy of precluding the interstate shipment of this product difficult to justify when one realizes that more than 1 billion pounds of imported meat will reach our shores this year from foreign plants, which plants have not had the benefit of the close inspectional surveillance that our own State plants are subjected to.

It is my understanding that the USDA has 14 roving meat inspectors in approximately 40 foreign countries in which more than 1,100 plants are producing meat for export to this country. The USDA approves only the system under which these meat products are produced, and makes periodic checks at the plant level. This meat may be shipped

thousands of miles to reach our shores and then be allowed to travel in interstate commerce. I find it difficult to equate, in terms of consumer protection, that meat produced under a foreign system which does not have the benefit of our own inspection system, can be allowed the privilege of moving in interstate commerce whereas the meat produced in our own State inspected plants, which undergoes continuous inspection, cannot move across a State line.

To deprive our own plants and States of the privilege of selling their products across State lines after those plants and the States have met with the requirements of equality under Federal law is, in my opinion, an inequity of great magnitude.

## ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF THE VIETNAM WAR

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in recent months some of the most responsible and successful businessmen in our country have become deeply disturbed by the continuation of the war in Vietnam. These men who bear a great responsibility for the success of our private enterprise economy now recognize that the war in Vietnam is undermining and destroying the integrity of our private enterprise system, and they are demanding that the war be brought to a close.

We have had testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations by some of the leading businessmen and economists. A most important example of this concern by the business community is contained in the "Message From Management" of the First Security Corp. of Salt Lake City, Utah. The First Security Corp. consists of a system of banks serving Western States under the direction of Marriner S. Eccles, chairman of the board, and George S. Eccles, president and general manager. Many of my colleagues will remember Mr. Marriner S. Eccles, a longtime business leader of our Nation, and certainly one of the greatest.

The statement taken from the "Message From Management" reads as follows:

At this time, we feel that it is completely proper within our sphere of responsibility to point out the economic consequences of the Vietnam War. It distorts the American economy. It is the primary contributor to inflation. It draws on billions of resources which could be put to work solving the critical social and economic problems facing the nation. Our essential priorities are: end the Vietnam War, control inflation, begin to deal effectively with our very pressing domestic problems—poverty, hunger, crime, housing, education, pollution, transportation, etc. They are all interlocked and cannot be brought under control until the Vietnam War is ended. Until that time, the amount of money available to meet these numerous domestic problems will be inadequate. This makes the ending of the Vietnam War imperative at the earliest possible date.

## ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a "Memorandum on Environmental Control" which I feel might be helpful to some. The memorandum, without going into great detail, gives a rundown on some of the problems of pollution, what has already been done and is being done to combat them, what the Nixon administration has done and has proposed, and what further actions could be taken in the future.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL

(By U.S. Senator JAMES B. PEARSON)

"Everyone talks about the environment, but nobody does anything about it."

This is one way we might update that popular old complaint about the weather. But while such an expression might become timely and unpopular, it would hardly be true. *More is being done today than at any time in human history to understand our natural and man-made environments and bring man and nature into a more harmonious relationship.*

Millions of people—particularly the young—observed Earth Day in this country on April 22. The environmental programs were held on 2,500 campuses and in 10,000 high schools. This occasion could have great significance in mustering continued support for the national drive against air, water, and land pollution.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM?

For the most part, the damage done to our environment has not been the work of evil men, nor has it been the inevitable by-product either of advancing technology or of growing population. It results not so much from choices made, as from choices neglected—not from malign intention, but from failure to take into account the full consequences of our actions.

*Water pollution* has three principal sources: municipal, industrial and agricultural wastes. All three must eventually be controlled if we are to restore the purity of our lakes and rivers.

Of these three, the most troublesome to control are those from agricultural sources: animal wastes, eroded soil, fertilizers and pesticides. Effective control will take time, and will require action on many fronts: modified agricultural practices, greater care in the disposal of animal wastes, better soil conservation methods, new kinds of fertilizers, new chemical pesticides and more widespread use of pest control techniques.

*Air* is our most vital resource, and its *pollution* is our most serious environmental problem. Factories, furnaces, autos, burning dumps, power generating stations and many of our daily activities create air pollution. Every city of 50,000 (and many cities that are smaller)—whether they know it or not—have air pollution problems.

When air pollution is severe, it triggers illness and may bring premature death to thousands of people. Even "ordinary" levels of air pollution can make you cough, sneeze, wheeze and suffer. Short range discomfort may be followed by long range disease. Both emphysema and lung cancer are more prevalent in areas of high air contamination. Existing technology for the control of air pollution is less advanced than that for controlling water pollution, but there is a great deal we can do within the limits of existing technology—and more we can do to spur technological advance.

*"Solid wastes"* are the discarded leftovers of our advanced consumer society. Increasing in volume, they litter the landscape and strain the facilities of municipal governments. New packaging methods, using materials which do not degrade and cannot easily be burned, create difficult new disposal problems. Though many wastes are potentially re-usable, we often discard today what a generation ago we saved. Most bottles, for example, now are "non-returnable." We reprocess used paper less than we used to, not only adding to the burden on municipal sanitation services but also making wasteful use of scarce timberlands. Often the least expensive way to dispose of an old automobile is to abandon it—and millions of people do precisely that, creating eye-sores for millions of others.

Increasing population, increasing mobility, increasing incomes and increasing leisure will all combine in the years ahead to rank recreational facilities among the most vital of our public resources. Yet land suitable for such facilities, especially near heavily populated areas, is being rapidly swallowed up.

*What Has Been Done and What Is Being Done?*

My recognition of the problem concerning the pollution of our planet is not new.

When I first came to the United States Senate some nine years ago as a Member of the Government Operations Committee, I joined with another young Senator by the name of Edmund Muskie, and, together, as a Democrat and a Republican, we wrote the first clean air and pure water legislation. Since then we have passed many laws, and, as a result, many new arms of the Federal Government have been created to deal with this problem.

There are many Departments and agencies of the Federal Government which are working in the area of *water pollution*. I will mention only two most directly involved: In HEW, the Bureau of Water Hygiene establishes criteria and recommends standards of water quality for protection of the Nation's health, and develops and conducts a program of technical assistance to public and nonprofit institutions operating public water supply systems and use of water resources.

In the Interior Department, the Assistant Secretary for Water Quality and Research is responsible for carrying out the duties of the Secretary for the control, prevention, and abatement of water pollution. Also under Interior is the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, created by the first major piece of legislation dealing with water pollution, the Water Quality Act of 1965. Under this Act, which passed the Congress unanimously, all States, territories, and other affected jurisdictions were given the option of preparing water quality standards for their interstate streams, rivers, lakes, and coastal waters or of possibly having the Federal Government do it for them.

All 50 States and the other jurisdictions involved elected to draft their own water quality standards, which, under the law, were subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. Approvals of the standards by the Secretary are practically complete.

A standard package from a State contains three main elements: (1) The use to be made of a particular stretch of a river, lake, or coastal water, such as swimming, drinking water, industrial use, or a combination of these uses; (2) A scientific determination of the specific characteristics or criteria which would permit the appropriate uses agreed on by the State and the Federal Government. Limits on such pollutants as bacteria, toxic materials, and taste- and odor-producing substances in the water are set by the standards; and (3) A step-by-step plan for construction by cities and industries of waste-treatment facilities and use of other measures to meet the water quality requirements. Once standards submitted by a State have been approved by the Secretary of the Interior, they become Federal standards as well, and are therefore subject to Federal enforcement action.

In 1966, the Clean Waters Restoration Act was passed. But we failed to keep the promises of this act to ourselves. This act provided matching grants to local governments up to $1¼ billion in 1971 for treatment

plant construction. However, Federal appropriations for constructing municipal treatment plants have totaled only about ⅓ of authorizations. Municipalities themselves have faced increasing difficulty in selling bonds to finance their share of the construction costs.

The question of *air pollution* has been one that has required more research than that of water pollution. In July, 1955, the Congress passed legislation authorizing a Federal program of research in air pollution and technical assistance to State and and local governments. This legislation established the policy—still in effect—that State and local governments have a fundamental responsibility to deal with community air pollution problems, and the Federal Government has an obligation to provide leadership and support. Between 1955 and 1963, progress was made toward improving scientific knowledge about the nature and extent of the air pollution problem, including its impact on health, techniques for controlling large sources of pollution, and needs for better techniques in many cases.

In December, 1963, Congress passed the Clean Air Act to help States and local governments join with the Federal Government in a more vigorous attack on this problem. The Clean Air Act authorized two major Federal activities: (1) grants made directly to States and local agencies to assist them in working up, establishing, and improving control programs; and (2) Federal action to abate interstate air pollution, a situation obviously beyond the reach of individual States and cities. Amendments to the 1963 Act were passed in 1965, under which national standards for controlling motor vehicle pollution were promulgated for initial application in the 1968 motor vehicle model year. However, air pollution problems—despite the national and local effort—grew and worsened.

In 1967, the Air Quality Act was passed, calling for a coordinated attack on air pollution on a regional basis and giving something of a blueprint for action at all levels of government and industry. The Department of HEW was given the responsibility for carrying out the intentions of all these air pollution control Acts. In January, 1967, there was set up in HEW the National Center for Air Pollution Control, and it later became the National Air Pollution Control Administration. The mission of this Air Pollution Control Administration is to conduct a national program for the prevention and control of air pollution to promote the public health and welfare.

State and local governments are now spending approximately $50 million a year, including Federal funds, for air pollution control programs. This is in contrast with about $12 million spent annually prior to the enactment of the 1963 Clean Air Act. As of January, 1969, grant support from the Federal Government was going to about 175 State, regional, and local agencies, and many new agency applications for assistance have come in since that time.

It was in 1965 that the Government's attention was focused on the problem of *solid waste disposal* when, on October 20 of that year, the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965 became law. This law charged and authorized the Secretary of HEW to initiate and conduct a broad program in the solid wastes fields, including the following activities: (1) To promote the coordination of research and studies relating to the operation and financing of solid waste disposal programs; (2) to cooperate with and give financial assistance to public and private agencies in the conduct of such activities; (3) to make grants to States and interstate agencies for making surveys of this problem; and (4) to collect and make available the results of solid wastes research. After a reorganization of HEW in 1968, there is now a Bureau of Solid Waste Management under the Environmental Control Administration of HEW.

The Secretary of the Interior was given the same authorization as the Secretary of HEW under the Solid Waste Disposal Act "with respect to problems of solid waste resulting from the extraction, processing, or utilization of minerals or fossil fuels where the generation, production, or reuse of such waste is or may be controlled within the extraction, processing, or utilization facility or facilities and where such control is a feature of the technology or economy of the operation of such facility or facilities." A memorandum of understanding between the Departments of the Interior and HEW outlines the responsibility of the two agencies, defines and describes the principal areas of program interest, and clearly establishes a mutually-acceptable working relationship.

So, you can see that, while the public interest has only recently been captured by the question of environmental control, the Federal Government has not been sitting idly by.

Just last session of Congress, several major pieces of legislation were passed dealing with environmental quality and productivity.

P.L. 91–190, the National Environmental Policy Act, declared that it is the policy of the U.S. Government to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony. Also, it created in the Office of the President a permanent Council on Environmental Quality, the principal function of which is to recommend environmental policies to the President and to assist him in the preparation of an annual environmental report to be submitted to the Congress beginning in July of this year.

P.L. 91–137 amended the 1963 Clean Air Act, extending for one year research grants of $45 million in air pollution resulting from fuel combustion.

But the Nixon Administration has not been in any way pleased with the results that have been forthcoming from action and involvement in the problems of pollution by the Federal Government.

Therefore, when President Nixon made the salvation of the environment the central theme of his State of the Union Address in January of this year, he said:

"The great question of the seventies is, shall we surrender to our surroundings, or shall we make our peace with nature and begin to make reparations for the damage we have done to our air, our land, and our water?"

On February 10, the President followed this up by sending a major message to the Congress on environmental control. He requested several new laws be passed in this field, but he also announced what he had done by way of powers already vested in him.

He announced the following actions which he had already carried out or had ordered to be carried out:

(1) Phasing out the use of DDT and other hard pesticides;

(2) Federally assisted treatment plants will be required to meet prescribed design, operation, and maintenance standards, and to be operated only by State-certified operators;

(3) Municipalities receiving Federal assistance in constructing plants will be required to impose reasonable users' fees on industrial users sufficient to meet the costs of treating industrial wastes;

(4) Development of comprehensive river basin plans will be required at an early date, to ensure that Federally assisted treatment plants will, in fact, contribute to effective clean-up of entire river basin systems;

(5) Wherever feasible, communities will be strongly encouraged to cooperate in the construction of large regional treatment facilities, which provide economies of scale and give more efficient and more thorough waste treatment;

(6) The Secretary of HEW, on February 10, published a notice of new, considerably more stringent motor vehicle emission standards he intends to issue for 1973 and 1975 car models—including control of nitrogen oxides by 1973 and of particulate emissions by 1975;

(7) Ordered the start of an extensive Federal research and development program in unconventional vehicles, to be conducted under the general direction of the Council on Environmental Quality;

(8) As an incentive to private developers, ordered that the Federal Government should undertake the purchase of privately produced unconventional vehicles for testing and evaluation;

(9) Ordered a re-direction of research under the Solid Waste Disposal Act to place greater emphasis on techniques for re-cycling materials, and on development and use of packaging and other materials which will degrade after use—that is, which will become temporary rather than permanent wastes;

(10) Asked the Council on Environmental Quality to take the lead in producing a recommendation for a bounty payment or other system to promote the prompt scrapping of all junk automobiles;

(11) Asked the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality to work with the Cabinet Committee on the Environment (set up last year by the President), and with appropriate industry and consumer representatives, toward development of such incentives and regulations for submission to the Congress;

(12) By Executive Order, directed the heads of all Federal agencies and the Administrator of General Services to institute a review of all Federally-owned real properties that should be considered for other uses. Special emphasis will be placed on identifying properties that could appropriately be converted to parks and recreation areas, or sold, so that proceeds can be made available to provide additional park and recreation lands;

(13) Established a Property Review Board to review the GSA reports and recommend to the President what properties should be converted or sold;

(14) Will shortly ask a group of the Nation's principal industrial leaders to join in establishing a National Industrial Pollution Control Council; and

(15) Ordered the U.S. Patent Office to give special priority to the processing of applications for patents which could aid in curbing environmental abuses.

Also, the Nixon Administration has used a 70-year-old law to move against major polluters—including giant U.S. Steel—in the Chicago area. So far, 13 corporations have been indicted or charged with violation of the statute.

The Federal Aviation Agency, long at loggerheads with the airlines over jet engine pollution, has forced an agreement with the carriers on engine changes. Under the agreement the airlines will have to modify all jet engines to curb pollution.

Interior Secretary Walter J. Hickel has asked the Department of Justice to inquire into possibilities of legal action against oil companies involved in pollution off our coasts.

Also, the Administration refused permission to build a giant new jetport in Florida because of the probable damage to Everglades Park and its wildlife. Previous Administration had gone along with the project.

WHAT THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION PROPOSES

In addition to what the Administration has already done, in the February 10 environmental message, the President asked Congress for comprehensive legislation to carry forward the battle against pollution. A few days later, a series of seven Administration anti-pollution bills, of which I am one

of the cosponsors, was introduced into the Congress. Although there are many important elements in all of the proposals, I would like to highlight several of particular interest.

After a thorough study, taken at the President's direction, the Administration has recommended several significant amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1965, in order to achieve a more satisfactory operation of the Federal-State partnership set forth in that act. In four separate bills—S. 3468, S. 3470, S. 3471, and S. 3472—the President proposes (a) to modify the policy, abatement and enforcement provisions of the act; (b) to improve the Federal-State program development provisions of the act; (c) to accelerate and improve the municipal waste treatment grant provisions; and (d) to add a new and innovative Federal Environmental Financing Authority to assure the ability of States and local communities to construct proper waste treatment facilities.

A common thread runs through all of these water bills—to create a comprehensive and modern water quality program that recognizes the interrelationship of all water resources. In several areas the authorization and granting provisions of the bills are directed to achieving this broadened scope.

S. 3466 is the Nixon Administration bill to amend the Clean Air Act. The President has recognized that while the basic operative provisions of this Act were substantially modified in the Air Quality Act of 1967, several provisions of the existing Act are in need of revision. In addition, the program experience under this Act has revealed areas where new provisions are necessary. Among the many proposals, the President has proposed that the Secretary of HEW be given explicit authority to inspect assembly line vehicles for compliance with emission standards set by regulations under existing law.

Under this bill, in an attempt to decrease the time-consuming and procedural complexity involved in the setting of regional ambient air standards under the present law, the President has proposed that such standards setting be shortened by 6 months or more through the establishment, by the Secretary, of national ambient air quality standards for any pollutant or combination of pollutants which endanger the public health or welfare. The President has also asked for necessary adjustments in the general Federal enforcement provisions that include, among others, a provision that enables courts to assess penalties up to $10,000 per day for violations continuing after the expiration of the period set for compliance in the notice of the Secretary in the administrative abatement proceeding.

S. 3469 will be known as the Wastes Reclamation and Recycling Act of 1970. This bill authorizes the Council on Environmental Quality to conduct studies and make recommendations respecting the reclamation and recycling of material from solid wastes, and it extends the provisions of the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965.

S. 3467 amends the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide that the $200 million minimum which is now deposited in the Fund in each fiscal year (through fiscal year 1973) shall be increased by an amount equal to the net proceeds placed in the Fund from the sale of surplus real property and related personal property in excess of the presently-budgeted level of $54.7 million in any one year. Under present law there is deposited in the Fund each year revenues from the motorboat fuel tax, entrance and user fees from Federal recreation areas, and the sale of surplus real property and related personal property. This fund is used to promote outdoor recreational facilities and parks, and the bill would increase the amount in the fund.

On April 15, the President proposed to Congress the establishment of large "containment areas," into which the dredged pollutants in the Great Lakes would be pumped and allowed to dry. This will be one of the major tests of the President's anti-pollution campaign. After a time, the White House theory goes, the containment areas could be converted into parks, housing tracts, industrial sites or even airports. Under the President's plan, the cost of such a program—estimated at $70 million for the 35 most polluted harbors of the Great Lakes—would be shared equally by the Federal Government and the State and local governments.

His proposal for the Great Lakes would (1) discontinue disposal of polluted dredged materials into the Great Lakes by the Corps of Engineers and private interests as soon as disposal sites on land are available; (2) require the disposal of polluted dredged spoil in containment areas located at sites established by the Corps of Engineers and approved by the Secretary of the Interior; (3) require States and other nonfederal interests to provide half the cost of constructing containment areas and also provide needed lands and other rights; and (4) require the Secretary of the Army, after one year, to suspend dredging if local interests were not making reasonable progress in attaining disposal sites. The threat of suspension of dredging is seen by some authorities as a goad to local officials to act quickly to find containment areas. The alternative is the prospect of having harbors and rivers choked by debris.

WHAT MORE CAN BE DONE

In addition to what has already been accomplished by the Federal Government, by the Nixon Administration, and in addition to what the President has recommended be done, many other steps can be taken in the future. Some of these include the following:

(1) A constitutional amendment which will recognize and protect the inalienable right of every person to a decent environment;

(2) Phase out the internal combustion automobile engine by January 1, 1978, unless it can meet national emission standards by that time;

(3) Eliminate persistent, toxic pesticides—the "chlorinated hydrocarbons"—by 1972;

(4) Set strict anti-pollution standards on detergents, including a ban on their phosphorous "builders" that have contributed so much to the pollution of our lakes all across the Nation;

(5) to dramatically reduce pollution from jet aircraft, establish a deadline of December 1972, for the installation of smokeless combustors on their engines;

(6) Eliminate bottles, jars, and cans from the American landscape through a combination of effluent charges, development of reusable or degradable containers, and packaging standards;

(7) Establish and protect the right of every citizen to plan his family. The funds and coordination must be made available for conducting necessary research into population problems and providing family planning services;

(8) Involve the citizen in environmental decisionmaking through new mechanisms, including establishment of new channels and forums for public participation, creation of a citizen environmental advocate agency, and creation of an environmental overview committee in Congress;

(9) Launch a broad-scale effort to halt the pollution of our sea. Municipalities and industries could be required to halt their wholesale dumping of wastes into the ocean environment, and we could declare a moratorium on new leases or permits for oil production and other activities on the undersea Outer Continental Shelf until criteria are established for its protection;

(10) Establish an environmental education program which will make the environment and man's relationship to it a major interdisciplinary subject at every level of public education;

(11) Utilize the billions of dollars a year that could be made available on completion of the Interstate Highway System to provide new transportation alternatives, including mass transit, in our polluted, congested, highway-choked urban areas;

(12) Delineate and implement a national policy on land use that will halt the chaotic, unplanned combination of urban sprawl, industrial expansion, and air, water, land, and visual pollution;

(13) Establish a national minerals and resources policy; and

(14) Create a nonpartisan national environmental political action organization, with State and local organizations providing the foundation.

I feel that some of these steps could and should be taken immediately—such as the national environmental education program. Some others have already been introduced into the Congress as legislation; some others are a bit drastic, unless all else fails.

In addition to the Administration package of bills, there are at least 22 bills and resolutions pending in the Senate and over 100 bills and resolutions pending in the House of Representatives which deal with some aspect of environmental control.

I am extremely encouraged with the progress that is beginning to be made.

There are more people in the White House now working on the environment than on any single issue—and that includes Vietnam. Spending on the Vietnam War is at the rate of $25 billion annually, but the total spending on pollution control in the United States is almost that much—between $20 billion and $40 billion annually. Because national defense is solely the responsibility of the Federal Government, spending on the Vietnamese war is all Federal and can be pinpointed. Pollution abatement and improvement of environmental quality are a joint responsibility of State, local and Federal Government and industry. Therefore, actual spending in this area must be the total spent by the various levels of Government—State, local, and Federal—plus all the amounts spent by industry because of State or Federal law or local ordinances.

The United States has invested over $100 billion—almost as much as we've spent on foreign aid—for sewage lines and treatment plants alone, most of it since World War II. Since the early 1950's, almost every U.S. city has undertaken a major sewage construction program.

Administration officials attribute the Nixon Administration's commitment and sense of urgency to act on environmental pollution to the "public ken" and the Nation's youth. Because of this, I salute those who took part in the April 22 activity. One reason the Government has failed in the past is that it did not have the public so soundly behind it.

Billions of dollars and many years will be spent before this problem is controlled. But I believe it will be controlled and eventually eliminated. The doomsday prophets are in for a bitter disappointment.

We are not going to choke to death on soot;

We are not going to suffocate from lack of oxygen;

And we are not going to drown in a sea of rising beer cans.

We have now earnestly joined the fight—and we will win!

## THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE INVESTIGATORS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the General Accounting Office is one of the

most efficient agencies in our Government, and the one especially created to be of assistance to the Congress. Mr. Elmer B. Staats, the Comptroller General, is an experienced and efficient man, and all of us are in his debt. He has a fine staff of dedicated public servants, and they have done an especially good job in uncovering the questionable payments made to the members of the Philippine Government.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Causey's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 13, 1970]

GAO INVESTIGATORS OUTFOX AGENCIES

(By Mike Causey)

Smoke screen artists at the Pentagon and State Department are still baffled as to how the General Accounting Office came up with solid dollar figures on American government contributions for Philippine troops fighting in Vietnam.

The fact is that despite backstage string-pulling, and liberal use of the "secret" rubber stamp, State and Defense were outfoxed, royally, by the GAO, the watchdog agency that works for Congress.

Late last year, Sen. Stuart Symington (D-Mo.) began a probe into reports that the U.S. was making "quid pro quo" payments to the Republic of the Philippines, to help support that nation's Vietnam troop contingent, the Philippine Civic Action Group (PHILCAG), which had 2,200 officers and men in Vietnam.

The U.S. government grudgingly admitted the payments in secret testimony to a Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee. When the censored version came out, however, the Philippine government, facing a national election, denied "any kind" of U.S. support for its Vietnam contingent.

At that point, Symington ordered the hard-digging General Accounting Office into the act. GAO is, at least in theory, supposed to have access to all financial records of all federal agencies.

But both State and Defense, the two federal departments most directly involved in the affair, balked at the GAO investigation. Comptroller General Elmer B. Staats, who runs GAO, reported both used a "time-consuming screening process" to block information. They resorted to the old trick of delaying information, and of reluctantly giving only exactly what was asked for, rather than volunteering to help the congressional agency. Staats was so frustrated that he later told Symington "there is the possibility that the agencies may have withheld information which is pertinent to our study."

The breakthrough in the GAO vs. State-Defense investigation might never have come, had not Staats been a seasoned veteran of the bureaucracy. The U.S. government (after the Philippine denial) said it may have made some payments, but records could not be located. Everyone was very value about the whole thing.

Staats got to thinking. He reckoned that if this government had been paying another government, the checks must be floating around somewhere. The problem—since Uncle Sam pays a lot of people—was where.

Staats ordered his auditors to look in the basement of GAO's downtown office, where the Treasury Department maintains a small unit. Guess what they found?

You were right if you said cancelled checks, representing part of the $35 million for logistical support and another $3.6 million in direct payments. The checks were written by Defense and made payable to the Philippines' Secretary of National Defense. Most of them—written between October, 1966, and January, 1970—were deposited in the Philippine Veteran's Bank, Camp Aguinaldo branch.

Armed with the photostats of the checks, Symington confronted some very red-faced Defense and State Department officials.

Now he's asking why the payments were made, why no accounting of them was kept (because officials could not seem to lay their hands on the documents) and finally, why GAO had such a hard time getting at the truth?

GAO auditors turn up in the most unlikely places, and agencies that want to fool them had better do a little spring cleaning—with special attention to those unmarked boxes in the basement.

---

## "CIVILIZATION"—A BRITISH EXHIBITION AT NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in this day and age when only the sensational and the outrageous seem to command any type of attention, it is most heartening to see that there does appear to be a place in our national life style for a discussion of values, the study of history, quiet contemplation of beauty, and the understanding that man does not simply pollute his planet but also brings to it ideas and artifacts of excellence which please the mind and eye.

We have in our own Capital many museums and galleries which greatly enhance our quest for meaningful leisure. A simple listing of these institutions would indicate that their spheres of interest are wide. What is more important is that they are widely patronized, whether for the review of mechanical creations or the contemplation of the art of yesterday and tomorrow.

I specifically call to the attention of the Senate the phenomenal success which is now being experienced by the National Gallery of Art which is sponsoring the exhibition of a British film series, originally created for television, entitled "Civilization." This film is not a stale compendium of facts or straight photographs of old masters, but rather a lively journey through Western culture utilizing color, music, and some very erudite and witty commentary by Sir Kenneth Clark of Saltwood, England.

Interestingly enough, this program was originally offered to the national commercial television networks, but was passed up with the thought that such a series would not be economically feasible. Nevertheless, the National Gallery of Art took what in the vernacular would be called a flyer and decided to present "Civilization." The rest is, as they say, history. The gallery was besieged by requests for tickets—on the first Sunday approximately 10,000 people queued up for 300 seats—and had to schedule many more showings than they had anticipated. Indeed, the screening was so successful, with 150,000 people attending, that a second full series was scheduled and is now in progress. And to make this success story a real fairy tale the commercial value of this program was at last recognized and it is my understanding that "Civilization" will now be shown by one of the major networks.

The success of "Civilization," besides being a personal one for the National Gallery and its brilliant young director, J. Carter Brown, of Rhode Island, it also enhances my belief that there is a place in our country for truly enlightening cultural activity; that there is a hunger for visual and aural experience which does not bombard the senses and that the quest for knowledge is one which is held by many throughout the land. The cultural level of our populace has been denigrated ad nauseam—the experience with "Civilization" gives the lie to this type of downgrading.

Mr. President, many newspaper articles and editorials have spoken with praise about this film. I ask unanimous consent that a sampling of them be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sampling was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Vogue, Jan. 15, 1970]

PEOPLE ARE TALKING ABOUT LORD CLARK OF SALTWOOD AND "CIVILIZATION"

With mock humility and profound erudition, Lord Clark invented what he calls an "intellectual soap opera" for television: his thirteen-part series, *Civilization*, a magnificant traipse through Western Civilization in colour and with music that was written never more than ten years before or after the scene it accompanies. Amusing and deliberate, Lord Clark talks throughout the programs making small jokes, great generalizations, and entertaining his audiences with scholarly observations. After its run on BBC–TV last year, *Civilization* has been the hot free ticket given out by the Metropolitan Museum of Art and New York University in New York and by the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C. By now CBS–TV may have bought it, perhaps to make up for *The Secret Storm*. While in New York recently, Lord Clark received an honorary Doctor of Fine Arts degree from New York University at a special convocation. A life peer, Kenneth Clark has had a succession of high posts which included Keeper at the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford, from which he was graduated, Director of the National Gallery in London, and Surveyor of the King's Pictures. At Saltwood in Kent, where he was photographed for Vogue in front of his castle, he has kept on with his writing, there wrote part of the commentary for *Civilization*. Lord Clark said that the BBC asked him to lunch and while they were eating smoked salmon, someone said the word "civilization," and he immediately felt a call. The BBC expected him to say "no" to another proposition: he said "no" to it but said he would do a series on civilization, which rather put the BBC out. For the next two years he travelled with two producers and a crew photographing art and architecture from the Dark Ages to the Impressionist period, but leaving out Spain, its Moors, and the German Romantics. Almost everything else, however, is on film, marvelous, chatty, a window opened by a man whose mind is an orchard of plums.

---

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 2, 1969]

OUR CIVILIZATION UNDER THE GLASS

(By Meryle Secrest)

"His biographer once asked the Duke of Urbino what is necessary to rule a kingdom. The Duke replied, 'Essere umano; to be human.'"

So says Sir Kenneth Clark in an intensely human, immensely informed discourse on Western man. "Civilisation," a 13-part series of one-hour films narrated by Clark and originally made for British TV, will be shown Sundays at the National Gallery of Art, beginning today.

At one point, the narrator discusses what the term civilization means to him:

"I have tried throughout this series to de-

fine civilization in terms of creative power and the enlargement of human faculties; and from that point of view, slavery is abominable. So, for that matter, is abject poverty."

The series, when shown in Britain, attracted a wide following and universal admiration; not only for its grandeur of sweep but the erudition, clarity, imagination and wit with which it has been carried out by its author and chief narrator, Sir Kenneth Clark.

Clark begins with the thesis that one can learn most about a civilization through its arts: "If I had to say which was telling the truth about society, a speech by a Minister of Housing or the actual buildings put up in his time, I should believe the buildings."

Through a highly effective combination of art, architecture, the filming of locations all over Europe, newsreels, political satire, music, poetry and history, Sir Kenneth develops a panoramic view of the history of Western man that takes one, in its 13th and final sequence, up to the present day.

Beyond this point, Clark refuses to speculate. However, the novelist J. B. Priestley, who wrote an otherwise favorable review of the series, suggested that Sir Kenneth could have concluded with a 14th program on the dehumanizing aspects of present-day society.

"He might have added that there seem to be among us now . . . creatures from other planets . . . They want to put an end to the human race. So they are building larger and larger . . . intricate machines, ready to take us over soon. At the same time they are working hard to persuade us that we are machines and second-rate at that."

Priestley believes that the series is in itself a contribution to civilization.

"It represented a bold step in civilizing television itself," he writes.

An ironic note is that "Civilisation" has not yet come to the American television screen, although one of the commercial networks is said to be interested in it.

So, in this country, what was designed to be shown on the color TV screen has to be presented as a film; as a public service by a cultural institution.

The National Gallery of Art is showing the series without charge on Sundays at 5:30 p.m. through Dec. 14. The opening film will be seen today at 5:30 p.m., 6:30 p.m. and 7:30 p.m. and again at 2:30 p.m. on Saturday, Nov. 8. On succeeding Sundays, two films will be seen and performances will be repeated on demand.

Credit for the fact that Washington is seeing this series (similar showings are being held concurrently in New York) goes to J. Carter Brown, director of the National Gallery, who is intensely interested in films about art. His own film, "The American Vision," made a few years ago, is a brilliant example of the genre.

Credit also goes to the gallery's new assistant administrator, Howard Adams.

"I had the good fortune to be having dinner one evening with Mary Lasker," he said. "She had just returned from London and was talking about this fantastic series she had seen. So I got in touch with the BBC next day."

The National Gallery of Art knew of the existence of the series, since it had supplied color transparencies to the BBC for the films. The National Gallery is interested in developing its own series, modeled on "Civilisation" but less grand in scope. It would focus on individual artists.

"We would like to find a way to create a series of smaller vignettes of film interpretation of the great artists which could become part of a great film library on the arts," Adams says.

In narrating "Civilisation," Clark's great gift is that he is not only enormously well read, but also can knit together disparate elements to make a coherent whole. He can look at a carving in the nave of Chartres cathedral and make you see how it personifies the spirit of an age.

He pulls out a few sentences from the dazzling storehouse of his mind and makes the listener immediately curious to know more about the subject.

His lectures are of the kind one would hope to find in a graduate seminar. Yet his thesis is so winningly illustrated and clearly and persuasively developed that the viewer does not need special knowledge to be challenged by the ideas.

In an age of specialization, when most people seem to be focusing on a narrow and narrower fragment of the whole, Sir Kenneth Clark proves that it is still possible to see the history of civilization in terms of a single, unifying vision.

If one has any quarrel with the series at all, it is that painting, sculpture, architecture, music, philosophy and even poetry do very well as sources of references. But literature seems to get the short end of the stick.

But perhaps this is the weakness of the television medium itself; it cannot project what is seen by the inner eye.

Priestley is perhaps right in pointing out that Clark has not taken into account the enormous strides man has made into the exploration of inner space; that is to say, what has been learned about the unconscious in the last 100 years.

And there are some aspects of our visual heritage whose absence from the series is inexplicable: Venice and the court at Versailles, under Louis XIV, for instance.

Clark, who was knighted by Queen Elizabeth, is the son of a well-to-do thread manufacturer who was brought up with the idea that "to look at pictures and admire them was a reasonable activity."

At Oxford, he wrote a book on Gothic revival in his last year. His wife relates: "He told me about it when we were walking out. I didn't like to admit I didn't know what Gothic revival was in case I lost my place in the queue."

Clark began by wanting to be an artist. But in an interview printed in The Listener, the BBC magazine, he states that he gave it up because "I'd just this much sense: if an Englishman can write a bit and paint a bit, if he has any sense he'll be a writer, because that's our medium."

At the age of 30, he was made director of London's National Gallery. Twelve years later he retired to become Slade Professor at Oxford University.

In 1953, he became chairman of the Independent Television Authority and when he retired as chairman in 1957, he lectured on art for the next eight years for the ITV.

He is an authority on the Italian Renaissance and has written a book on the subject. He has another on Ruskin and a book on the nude in art that has become a classic.

This book arose out of a series of lectures he gave at the National Gallery of Art in Washington in 1953.

People like to remind Sir Kenneth Clark that, about three years ago, he expressed the gloomy view that television was likely "to exclude solemn topics, that can only be stated in measured terms."

He then thought that television tended "to cut off its audience from some of the greatest achievements of the human spirit."

It is fitting that he has magnificently disproved his own theories. As a great humanist, he led us to contemplate those values upon which a civilization worthy of the name has to depend. In his concluding film, "Heroic Materialism and the Awakened Conscience," Clark says:

"At this point I reveal myself in my true colors, as a stick-in-the-mud. I hold a number of beliefs that have been repudiated by the liveliest intellects of our time.

"I believe that order is better than chaos, creation better than destruction . . . On the whole I think that knowledge is preferable to ignorance and I am sure that human sympathy is more valuable than ideology.

". . . And I think we should remember that we are part of a great whole, which for convenience we call nature. All living things are our brothers and sisters. Above all, I believe in the God-given genius of certain individuals, and I value a society that makes their existence possible."

---

[From the National Observer, Dec. 22, 1969]

ART FILM AT NATIONAL GALLERY DRAWS LARGEST CROWD SINCE "MONA LISA"

WASHINGTON, D.C.—An educational film originally made for British television has turned into the sleeper of the year in two U.S. museums.

When officials of the National Gallery of Art here scheduled the 13-part film, Civilisation, for a seven-week run, two parts at a time, they modestly hoped it would fill the gallery's 300-seat auditorium on Sunday afternoons. The first afternoon, 24,000 people showed up, thousands of them waiting outside in the rain for hours. Officials quickly decided to show the film one segment a week on an expanded five-times-a-day, seven-day-a-week schedule.

Now in its seventh week Civilisation continues to draw the largest crowds to the gallery since the Mona Lisa was here six years ago. Among the 14,000 a week to queue up have been Government workers on their lunch breaks and peace marchers in town for the Nov. 14 mobilization. Museum officials are at a loss to explain the series' popularity except to ascribe it to word-of-mouth advertising and "the power of a very fine cultural film."

Civilisation features gorgeous footage of some of the greatest works of art in the Western world. But its real attraction is the running commentary delivered from the banks of the Seine, from Ravenna, from Monticello, and from dozens of other locations in 11 countries by art historian Sir Kenneth Clark. A humanist as well as scholar, Sir Kenneth argues in the film that the race has taken giant steps toward civilization in periods when men have striven for "something extra," whether the all-embracing love preached by St. Francis of Assisi or the intellectual order worshipped by the Eighteenth Century rationalists.

Each segment of the series takes up one period—the Renaissance, the Reformation, the Romantic Era—and explores it in terms of its artistic accomplishments, which Sir Kenneth regards as more trustworthy than the pronouncements of its statesmen.

The National Gallery obtained the film after a friend of director J. Carter Brown saw the series on the BBC. Because Sir Kenneth had delivered a series of lectures at the gallery in 1953, the BBC readily agreed to make the film available. Under the sponsorship of the Metropolitan Museum of Art and New York University, the film is also being shown in New York City, where four extra showings a week have been added.

So far there are no plans to show civilisation anywhere else in the United States. But one major television network is investigating the possibility of putting it on the air.

In the meantime the National Gallery will continue to pack them in, but a spokesman admits that, in a nice sort of way, the film has become something of a nuisance.

With the series here one-half complete, gallery officials last week expressed the hope that the audience may soon begin to dwindle. "After all," one spokesman said, "even Hair can't go on drawing huge crowds forever."

---

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 4, 1969]

CIVILISATION

(By Phil Casey)

The National Gallery of Art, which apparently figured it had a nice, quiet cultural festival on its hands, was wrong as it could be.

About 10,000 extra persons showed up and wanted to sit down in the gallery's 303-seat auditorium Sunday night to watch showings of the first program in a 13-part series of films and narration called "Civilisation".

J. Carter Brown, director of the National Gallery, noting immediately that he had a popular hit on his hands, decreed there shall be frequent showings of each of the films daily and Sunday, so that some of the thousands who want to see the series can see it.

Brown, who is getting the series free from the BBC, wishes that TV, either educational or network, would buy the series and show it to all of the people who apparently are eager to see it.

He has no control over that, but he can show the films as frequently as possible, and he is doing that, ever since he came face to face with what happened Sunday night.

"Civilisation" is a series of 13 one-hour films narrated by Sir Kenneth Clark and made originally for British TV. The plan had been to show the series only on Sundays and Saturdays, but Brown has given up that dream and he's glad Civilisation is such a hit.

This week, through Friday, the first program will be shown daily at 10:30 a.m. and 2:30 p.m. Then, on Saturday, the program will be shown at 10:30 a.m. 12:30 p.m. and 2:30 p.m.

On Sunday, programs two and three in the 13-part series will be shown together. Each show consists of two one-hour films. The shows begin at 12:30 p.m., 5:30 p.m. and 7:30 p.m.

These programs will be shown through the following week: at 10:30 a.m. and 2:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, and at 10:30 a.m. 12:30 p.m. and 2:30 p.m. on Saturday, Nov. 15.

The gallery will advertise a schedule of all programs and showings from now on. There is no charge. Free numbered tickets will be available in the gallery each day for the shows that day.

Last Sunday was an astounding day at the gallery. Normally, for a Sunday at this time of year, about 8,000 persons are counted visiting the gallery. On this occasion there were 22,000 persons, and Brown has a deep impression that about half of them wanted to go to the movie.

---

[From Newsweek, Dec. 15, 1969]

THE GRAND TOUR

"One has to face it," said British art historian Sir Kenneth Clark not long ago. "TV is an entertainment medium. I heartily sympathize with the viewers. I always switch off very serious programs." The next thing anyone knew, Sir Kenneth had produced and narrated for BBC television a series of thirteen 50-minute films on the history of Western civilization from the fall of the Roman Empire through the nineteenth century, ordinarily a very sober subject indeed. But in Clark's able hands, his basically serious subject was transmitted into high entertainment so smoothly that some 1.5 million fascinated English families tuned in the series week after week.

Now Clark's films—all in color—are being shown to jam-packed audiences in New York City's Town Hall and Washington's National Gallery, and there is a good prospect that one of the big U.S. commercial networks—which seemed to evince little interest in the series at first—may be showing it early next year. "It's the hottest show in town," says Carter Brown, director of the gallery, who was nearly bowled over when thousands of people queued up for the 300 seats in the museum's theater one Sunday afternoon. "It's even beating out 'I Am Curious (Yellow)'."

Chatty: Much of the reason for the series' box-office success is the 66-year-old Clark himself. He not only planned and wrote the scripts for all of the films, but also stars in each one as a witty, chatty and grandly intelligent tour guide with a sure dramatic touch. In the opening film, "The Skin of Our Teeth," the camera leads the viewer to the top of Skellig Michael, a jagged rock with the wind whistling around it that rises out of the sea off the coast of Ireland. There, Clark explains, a handful of Celtic Christians huddled in their stone huts through the Dark Ages, and civilization itself seemed to hang on by its fingertips. But Clark has a profound sense of humanity, its grandeur and its ironies. "Charlemagne never learned to write," he notes dryly after crediting the great conqueror with saving Western civilization. "He just never got the hang of it."

Some further observations from Clark's film history:

"In the nineteenth century people used to think of the invention of printing as the lynchpin in the history of civilization. Well, fifth-century Greece and twelfth-century Chartres and fifteenth-century Florence got on very well without it . . . Still, on balance, I suppose that printing has done more good than harm."

"New York . . . took almost the same time to reach its present condition as it did to complete the gothic cathedrals. At which point a very obvious reflection crosses one's mind; that the cathedrals were built to the glory of God, New York was built to the glory of mammon; money, gain, the new God of the nineteenth century."

The idea for the series came first from David Attenborough, head of BBC–TV, three years ago, as the BBC was preparing to start transmitting in color. "My simple ambition," says Attenborough, "was to set on the screen the loveliest things to look at and to hear." The BBC approached Clark, who had already prepared 60 programs for them. "In the course of the conversation," Clark recalls, "They used the word 'civilization.' When I heard that word, it seemed to me that that might be worth trying. That's all there was to it."

The BBC assigned Clark two producers and a three-man camera crew to make the series. For two years they traveled 80,000 miles in eleven countries, filming paintings, sculptures, churches, palaces and landscapes. By coincidence, the crew arrived in Paris in May of 1968 when hundreds of Sorbonne students went to the barricades. "It made it very interesting," says Clark, "being there shooting a piece on the French Revolution while a real revolution was going on."

What the series adds up to is a wide-angle view of Western civilization accompanied by Clark's personal, witty and ever trenchant commentary. "I suddenly realized when I was writing," he explained last week, "that these were the things that I have always believed, but was too timid to say out loud. One of the nice things about growing older is that you gain the courage of your convictions."

Now the courage is spreading to U.S. TV. "It's an extraordinary effort, and Clark emerges as a major television personality, a cross between Maurice Evans and Alistair Cooke," says Mike Dann, senior vice president in charge of programing for CBS. "We're looking for a place to put it on Sunday afternoons." After the pro football season, of course.

SOME COMMENTS FROM "CIVILIZATION" BY SIR KENNETH CLARK

The Middle Ages: "The old idea that he [Charlemagne] saved civilization isn't so far wrong because it was through him that the Atlantic world reestablished contact with the ancient culture of the Mediterranean world."

The Renaissance: "Well, it is certainly correct to say that we are more graceful than other animals, and we don't feel much like immortal gods at the moment. But in 1400 the Florentines did."

The enlightenment: "The smile or reason may seem to betray a certain incomprehension of the deeper human emotions; but it didn't preclude some strongly held beliefs—belief in natural law, belief in justice, in toleration, in humanitarianism. Not bad."

---

[From the Staten Island Advance, Nov. 2, 1969]

CIVILIZATION PARADES FOR FILM MAKER

(By Barry Leo Delaney, curator of art, Staten Island Museum)

Something to watch for in the near future is a new film series written and narrated by Kenneth Clark (Lord Clark of Saltwood) entitled "Civilization." Although the art of the film is normally outside the scope of this column, this particular group of 13 filmed programs from the British Broadcasting Corp. is, I believe, an important exception.

The subject that Lord Clark has chosen to treat in this series is nothing less than the last 1,600 years of Western European civilization, together with its colonial expansion and development in the Americas over nearly five centuries. The forces and events that have shaped our present-day society are analyzed in these films through an examination of the great artistic achievements of the past.

The concepts presented are modestly described by Lord Clark as "a personal view." In addition to being one of the world's foremost art historians, Lord Clark has had extensive experience in the fields of film and television. Between 1934 and 1941 he was the director, and later chancellor, of the film division, house publicity, in the British Ministry of Information.

He was also chairman of the Independent Television Authority in Great Britain from 1954 to 1957. For nearly 40 years he has held numerous important museum posts in England, including that of director of the National Gallery in London during the decade between 1934 to 1945. He has also been the author of several books on the history of art.

This impressive background has now been brought to bear on what is surely one of the most outstanding series of educational films that has ever been produced. "Civilization" was first shown on the BBC television last spring and is now being previewed in the United States at New York University's Town Hall in midtown Manhattan. The film showings are being jointly sponsored here under the auspices of NYU and the Metropolitan Museum of Art, through the benefaction of Charles B. Wrightsman—a trustee of both institutions—and with the cooperation of Time-Life Films, distributors in this country for the BBC.

The present audience is an invited one, consisting primarily of members and patrons of the Metropolitan and the faculty, students and alumni of the university. The demand for the free tickets was so overwhelming that extra showings have had to be scheduled. Even so, virtually all of the seats for the six screenings each week on successive Tuesdays and Wednesdays through Dec. 9 have now been promised.

There seems little doubt, however, that these films are ultimately destined for some more widespread public distribution, perhaps on one of the major television networks, and probably within the next year or so. Furthermore, the series will almost certainly be made available to high schools and colleges. It is likely that everyone will have some opportunity to see these films eventually. A companion volume is also already on the presses.

To make the series Lord Clark traveled some 80,000 miles in Europe and America with a team of technicians, shooting thousands of examples of architecture, sculpture, painting, and allied arts. The production team wandered from Istanbul in Turkey to our own state of Virginia, recording the greatest artistic achievements of our civilization. All of this was accomplished within two years.

The first 50-minute film is entitled "The Skin of our Teeth." It picks up the thread of western history where it was broken off after the decline of Greco-Roman civilization, starting in the 4th century A.D. In this picture the precarious survival of our western civilization after the fall of the Roman Empire is traced until its stabilization under Charlemagne (742–814), king of the Franks, and first of the so-called Holy Roman emperors. The title was suggested by the contention that civilized man survived during this period only just by the skin of his teeth.

In the narration Kenneth Clark proposes that there is a decided difference between a culture and a civilization. He contrasts the energy and will of the barbarian invaders from the north with the original stability and permanence of the old Roman Empire. He touches lightly upon how confidence in the seemingly solid, but actually very fragile, Roman civilization was gradually undermined. Finally, as we all know, it crumbled and fell.

The result was four centuries of chaos. The Vikings, for example, may have had a unique culture, but it is questionable whether they ever had a civilization. Under Charlemagne the Atlantic world re-established contact with the ancient civilizations of the Mediterranean region, and western civilization began anew.

The remaining 12 films examine this civilization. In the end, there will doubtlessly be many nagging implications for our time. In the middle of the 20th century we are asking ourselves, "Can Man survive?" let alone his civilization. Can we learn to control our own technology or will it destroy us?

Art may not be able to provide the answer to these questions, but it is often able to diagnose some of the ills. One is reminded of the work of the late Edward Hopper (1882–1967) where man's loneliness and isolation from his fellow men is so frequently a theme. The painting "Western Motel" of 1957 is characteristic. (It is now on loan from the Yale University Art Gallery to the Metropolitan for the exhibition "New York Painting and Sculpture: 1940–70.")

The boredom and despair of the lone central figure in the anonymous motel room is an indictment against the transitory and unsettled nature of much of modern Western civilization.

---

[From the Washington Star, Nov. 13, 1969]

BOUQUETS AND BRICKBATS

One of the characteristics differentiating man from beast is an intelligent interest in the past.

Accordingly, the National Gallery of Art is to be applauded for making it possible for Washingtonians to see the British Broadcasting Corporation's excellent thirteen-part documentary, "Civilisation," which charts the cultural accomplishments of man over the past two millennia.

By the same token, it is some sort of commentary on the three major networks and their sponsors that Sir Kenneth Clark's production, which was considered eminently suitable for general audiences in Britain, should be regarded over here as not America's cup of tea.

The implication, of course, is that the series is too high-brow—or that Americans are too low-brow—to make such a long series either interesting or commercially feasible. The television moguls, of course, may be correct.

But the 10,000 people who showed up Sunday in quest of the 303 seats available obviously disagree. The crush was so great that the gallery, which had planned free Sunday showings through December 14, has decided to provide multiple daily screenings through that date.

Get on down there. It beats "Laugh-In."

[From The Washington Star, Nov. 13, 1969]

THE RAMBLER PONDERS "CIVILIZATION"

(By John Sherwood)

*"If I had to say which was telling the truth about society, a speech by a minister of housing or the actual buildings put up in his time, I should believe the buildings."—Sir Kenneth Clark.*

With the above in mind, the Rambler passed by the Rayburn Building with head bowed and one eye closed because his thoughts were on a visit to Chartres Cathedral, and sights like the grand House Office Building are very bad indeed for visions like Chartres.

He was going to see an hour-long movie, and it was free. But it was being shown in the National Gallery of Art, which meant that culture might be involved, and since the Rambler doesn't generally go for public culture he walked in feeling a little uncomfortable.

The color film was the second in a 13-part series produced by the British Broadcasting Corp., and it seems it is the biggest smash hit here since Mona Lisa came to town. Entitled "Civilisation," it takes on one immense subject and the Rambler wondered how much different he would come out from the man who went in.

"We thought that we would show maybe one of the films, or perhaps at the most two," explained the Gallery's Bill Morrison. "But the response has been unbelievable. "We're on No. 2 now, showing it several times throughout the day, and expect to be showing the whole thing into 1970. If only it could somehow be shown on TV."

Sitting down in the 300-seat theater the Rambler was taken right into a cathedral of the Middle Ages in the No. 2 program, called "The Great Thaw." Soon a man appeared on the screen talking about the 11th century's "outpouring of energy" and describing it as "a Russian spring."

It was Sir Kenneth Clark, narrator and writer of the mammoth documentary that dares to cover the trek from the bleak Dark Ages of Europe to the New York cathedral skyscrapers built "to the glory of Mammon—money, gain, the new god of the 19th century."

The Rambler liked the man on the spot and immediately agreed with a written description of him: "He is the perfect intellectual pin-up—subtly suited in autumn colors, tie carefully chosen to go with the silk handkerchief—his rosy complexion and silver hair are those of some endearing though awe-inspiring uncle. He is shrewd, sarcastic and witty; he is also kind . . ."

There was a point he made, going from one great Gothic cathedral to another, that the Rambler thought was especially fine because it was the kind of thing that separated the brilliant production from one of those TV features on the royal palaces.

He showed a figure of a saint who had been martyred because she refused to worship idols. Now, alas, he said, here she was a saintly relic turned into an idol herself.

Charting the ideas and events that have led Western civilization from the collapse of Greece and Rome to our own century, Clark, in this episode, which is being shown through this week, was taken most by Chartres Cathedral.

There was no fancy camera work, but the eye looked lovingly upon the carvings and the stained glass as chants illuminated the narrative. The buildings were put up by man to God, but it seemed to the Rambler as if God had a hand in the creation. Certainly no man could do the same today.

The packed theater was suspended in the glory of Chartres. There was no talking. No fussing about. No chomping of popcorn and sticky candy. The gentle voice of Clark carried them through as if they were special guests on a very special, magical mystery tour.

Most of the priceless objects that adorned Chartres in the 12th century are gone now, but Morrison piped up to tell the Rambler that the Gallery had a French Romanesque chalice that was used at Chartres by four generations of French kings.

It was in the Widener Collection, and the Rambler asked to see it. Morrison led the way to a remote room on the lower level and there, behind a glass case, sat one of the finest chalices in the world. It is priceless and it is something to watch for a very long time.

Commissioned about 1140, it was first used by Abbot Suger, the most powerful political figure in France at the time. It has a fluted bowl, a single piece of carved sardonyx which dates back to ancient Rome. On the base of it are gold-embossed medallions.

The Rambler was aware of his heavy breathing while looking at the chalice, and the film he had just seen had brought it all the more to life.

* * * * *

Unable to leave the Gallery without stopping by to visit an old friend who wears a halo over his head, the Rambler headed for the self-portrait of French impressionist Paul Gauguin and thought of the legend behind those sullen eyes and longed for a thatched hut in the South Pacific.

The walk down the steps of the Gallery was slippery in the soft rain and, once outside, the Rambler looked around in vain, with his mind still swimming among the towers of Chartres.

He tried to avoid the Rayburn House Office Building on his return voyage, but something drew him there.

My God, it's so awful.

It is a checkered vest with popped buttons and a fat, stale cigar with the paper band still on. God does not figure in it at all.

---

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 10, 1969]

AROUND TOWN—"CIVILIZATION"

If there is one thing the National Gallery of Art needs less than another, it is probably an enlargement of the line already waiting for tickets to see the British Broadcasting Corporation film called "Civilisation." We have no wish to add to the Gallery's problems, yet we cannot refrain from telling readers they ought to run, not walk, to the nearest Gallery entrance. "Civilisation" is a series of 13 one-hour motion pictures in color narrated by Sir Kenneth Clark and made originally for British TV. This first of that series, shown last week three times a day, gratis, in the gallery's lecture hall, is nothing less than superb in every respect.

The photography of classical and medieval works of art and architecture is almost flawless in its brilliance and beauty. And Sir Kenneth Clark's commentary on the tissue margin by which the civilization responsible for those glorious achievements escaped extinction must be characterized as supremely civilized—or, as he no doubt would prefer it, supremely civilised. He takes his hearers gently by the hand and leads them through a creative evolution in a manner that is at once scholarly and simple.

The National Gallery is, of course, a thoroughly appropriate place for the showing of these films. We cannot help wishing, however, that they could be shown as well on television networks so that people all over the country could view them and glimpse the wonders of which man has proved himself capable. In this time when so many—and so many of the young in particular—are experiencing a sense of despair about Western culture and the values of civilization, and are so recklessly ready to tear down all that has been built up in the past, this record of man's accomplishments, of man's

limitless reach for beauty and for creativity, has something to say of immense significance.

"Civilisation," Sir Kenneth Clark says, rests upon a "sense of permanence." The past affords a lamp for the future. If it is wise for men to be dissatisfied, it is folly for them to lose hope.

---

[From the Mamaroneck (N.Y.) Daily Times Nov. 3, 1969]

"CIVILIZATION" FILM SERIES TO GO ON VIEW

Thomas P. F. Hoving, director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and James M. Hester, president of New York University have announced special showing in New York of one of the most distinguished color-film series ever produced, on Tuesdays and Wednesdays, as of tomorrow, through Dec. 10. Admission is free.

The series, entitled "Civilization," was written and narrated by Kenneth Clark (Lord Clark of Saltwood) and prepared for British Broadcasting Corporation television.

The films will be shown under joint auspices of the Museum and the University at Town Hall, NYU's midtown cultural arts center, to an invited audience consisting principally of friends and patrons of the Museum, and faculty, students and alumni of the University. Special showings have also been scheduled at Town Hall for metropolitan area high school students.

The demand for tickets has been so great that extra showings of the series have been added to the two showings originally scheduled. More than 11,000 recipients of invitations have responded with requests for more than 40,000 tickets.

Lord Clark, the renowned art historian, presents in the series a personal view of the forces and events that have shaped present-day Western civilization as seen in the artistic achievements of the past 16 centuries. On Tuesday, Nov. 18, he will speak in person at the 5:30 and 8:30 p.m. showings.

To make the film, Lord Clark and a team of technicians devoted two years and traveled some 80,000 miles in Europe and America to shoot thousands of examples of sculpture and architecture, theater and paintings, books and artifacts. The production team traveled from the Hebrides to the Mediterranean, from Istanbul in the east to Virginia in the west, to film such significant artistic achievements as the interior of Chartres Cathedral and the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel.

---

## ILLEGAL WORK STOPPAGES

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, millions of Americans have watched over the past few weeks as illegal work stoppages occurred in two essential services of the Federal Government. I refer to the postal workers strike and the so-called sick out of the air traffic controllers. This has been a time of trial, and I applaud those who have brought our country through this period. I am hopeful that methods have been developed to deal effectively with crises of a similar nature should they arise in the future.

During the 3-week period of March 25 to April 17, the Nation's air traffic control system was seriously disrupted by an illegal strike called by the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Association. As a result, air commerce was seriously disrupted; business suffered economic losses; military training, a vital part of national defense, was hindered; and the personal travel plans of countless Americans were rudely shattered.

It is to the credit of the U.S. Government that it stood firm in this critical period. The issue was clear: An illegal strike against our Government. Both John A. Volpe, the Secretary of Transportation, and John H. Shaffer, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, were steadfast in their determination to uphold the law. The Nation should be grateful for men of this caliber who are courageous in the face of adversity and who were able to act decisively and responsibly in this unprecedented crisis.

The Nation also owes a great debt of gratitude to the "silent majority" of the Federal Aviation Administration's air traffic controllers. Eighty percent of these men stayed at their posts throughout the strike. These controllers, along with their dedicated and skilled colleagues who maintain the ATC electronic equipment, kept the system operating safely with remarkable efficiency and established an impressive record of safety. The National Transportation Safety Board noted that there were no reports of near collisions or unsafe air traffic control practices. Fortunately, the Federal Aviation Administration had the foresight to establish a central flow control facility in Washington which acted as a nerve center for handling understaffed air traffic control facilities.

There are others who also deserve commendation for their cooperation in softening the impact of this illegal strike. The airlines, for example, canceled some 50 percent of their passenger flights during one period in the busy Chicago, New York, Washington triangle. There were extensive delays to flights in all parts of the country although the South and Southwest were the least affected. It is not possible at this time to assess the total impact on the airlines, but, unquestionably the financial loss was enormous. Nevertheless, the scheduled air carriers unhesitatingly canceled flights in order to relieve the impact on the air traffic control system.

The military services also were extremely helpful in easing the impact of the strike. During 1 week the Air Force canceled some 30 percent of their normal training flights. Throughout all the military command nonessential training was canceled in an all-out effort to cooperate with the FAA.

The largest segment of aviation, general aviation, representing such diverse private flying as corporate, business, personal, air taxi, and so forth, also lent an important helping hand. Many of their flights were rerouted so as to avoid congested areas.

Mr. President, the most regrettable thing about this whole matter is that it was precipitated without justifiable reason. We all recognize the vitally important role occupied by the air traffic controller in our Nation's aviation industry. I am especially cognizant of this fact because of the location of the FAA Aeronautical Center in Oklahoma City, where controllers are trained, not only to serve the airports of this country but for many other countries as well.

Congress certainly recognizes this role and has acted accordingly. After a 5-year period without an increase in the air traffic controllers work force, Congress authorized an additional 1,500 controllers beginning with the 1968 fiscal year. Another 2,000 were authorized for fiscal year 1969, and an additional 3,800 for fiscal year 1970. If the fiscal 1971 request is approved, by the end of that fiscal year the FAA will have added more than 9,500 controllers, which means that the work force will have been doubled since the beginning of fiscal year 1968.

The Department of Transportation and the FAA, mindful of the intent of Congress, have been making a special effort to lighten the burdens of air traffic controllers and to improve their working conditions.

The additional controllers are being placed into the system as rapidly as they can be trained and assigned. The FAA also has been undertaking to reduce the amount of overtime required of air traffic controllers. During a 4-week period in January, for example, 67 percent of the work force worked less than 41 hours per week, 4.5 percent worked 41 to 44 hours, 28 percent 45 to 49 hours, and only .5 percent 50 to 54 hours.

Also, in order to increase compensation for about half of the journeyman controllers, the FAA last year obtained Civil Service Commission approval to increase them one grade in the Federal pay scale. After this increase the pay of controllers in the top grade ranged from $15,812 to $20,555, plus premium pay for night, holiday and Sunday work.

Another sign of progress is the fact that the FAA is engaged in the greatest program of equipment improvement and modernization in the history of aviation. The agency is now proceeding with the implementation of a computer-based semiautomated air traffic control system and expects to have it fully operational in all of the domestic air route traffic control centers and the 60 busiest towers by 1974.

Additional improvements will be forthcoming from the implementation of the recommendations of the Corson committee, appointed by Secretary Volpe to assess the needs for establishment of a fully adequate and smoothly functioning air traffic control system.

Mr. President, Secretary Volpe and FAA Administrator Shaffer are to be complimented for their sincere desire to provide this system with the necessary manpower, equipment, training and supportive services to insure the safe, efficient operation of our Nation's airports.

These officials deserve the support of Members of Congress in their continuing efforts to achieve these goals. We also should direct our thinking to the steps that must be taken to avoid the recurrence of the serious situation that prevailed only a few weeks ago. We must practice better planning for the location and construction of new airports, so that potential air traffic jams can be prevented. Perhaps we need to begin to disperse some of the traffic at existing terminals, in order to relieve some of the crush at New York, Chicago, and other busy airports. We should give careful consideration to legislation which is designed to assist air traffic controllers in the difficult job they have to do.

Mr. President, I am confident that

with as much traveling as we have to do, the Congress will be sympathetic to these needs and will work actively to bring about a safe and stable air control system for our growing Nation.

## PRESERVATION OF BOSTON LANDMARKS

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, attachment to historic sites is deeply engrained in the human experience. But nowhere, it seems, is the urge to preserve more actively pursued than among the good people of Boston. Where else could a copper teakettle win a victory over urban renewal?

The growth of history and tradition, the creation of national legends, continue to fascinate us all. But I believe that the effort to preserve our landmarks and our customs can prove to be equally fascinating. For this reason I ask unanimous consent that two brief articles pertaining to the preservation of historic Boston landmarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

IF YOU CAN'T SAVE A LANDMARK, MOVE IT

BOSTON, MASS., April 10, 1970.—Remember the mouse that roared? He's alive and well in Boston, where he owns a tiny quick lunch place known as the Oriental Tea Company.

His name is Nathan Sharaf, and his roar still echoes through the offices of the Boston Redevelopment Authority which not long ago tried to bulldoze Nate from his beloved turf in back of the old City Hall. The reason it didn't was that Sharaf used his noodles: instead of invoking images of a big, cold and indifferent bureaucracy driving small business out of an area marked for urban renewal, he played the BRA's civic conscience like an instrument. Drive me out, he seemed to say, and you will have to answer to the historians.

At issue was not Sharaf's trade of hungry pols and bankers but his old store's giant, steaming copperplated kettle hanging over the sidewalk of Court Street. The kettle, valued at $10,000, is the oldest animated trade sign in the U.S. It is so big that, in 1873, the City Recorder wouldn't quite accept the claim that its water contents were "227 gallons, 2 quarts, 1 pint and 2 gills." He did, however, record that it had a proven capacity to hold eight young boys and a 6 ft. tall man.

In 1965, when plans were activated to turn Boston's seedy old Scollay Square district into what is now the 61 acre, $230 million Government Center, Sharaf's Oriental Tea Company was told to move. Its property, on the periphery of the sprawling Government Center complex, was taken by the BRA into public domain and was to be assigned to a private developer, City Bank & Trust Co. But seeing as how the restaurant had been at the spot for 97 years, the BRA promised Sharaf "just and proper compensation" as well as assistance in finding a new spot elsewhere in town.

Sharaf, who had purchased the Oriental Tea Company in 1945, wasn't interested. He insisted that if he couldn't stay at 57 Court St., he'd insist on staying within the perimeter. Until then, he wouldn't budge.

While he was gearing to do battle with the bureaucracy, the bureaucracy was itself having problems. Midway between the soon-to-be-demolished Tea Company and the historic, brick Sears Crescent, the well-spring of the pre-Civil War Abolitionist Movement, stood a sliver of a building dating back to 1835. Actually, to be more precise, a building *facade*, behind which lay a roofless, cut-up ruin filled with a useless collection of junk. This building was the so-called "Sears Block" which also had been scheduled for demolition.

Then, BRA project director Esther Maletz remembered Nate Sharaf, holding the bulldozers at bay with his sandwich board.

Before Miss Maletz approached the restaurateur, she spoke with architect John P. Bennett of the firm Stahl/Bennett Inc., which had been engaged by a group of private investors to rehabilitate the Crescent. The land on which the Crescent, the Sears Block *and* the Oriental Tea Company stood bore the designation of Parcel 10, and since the BRA, as policy, preferred to have the same architects handle entire land parcels at a time, why not introduce Bennett, etc. et al. to Sharaf?

Although Stahl/Bennett and the Crescent developers later parted company the architects were retained by City Bank & Trust, and this gave John Bennett the inspired idea of treating the Sears Block as a continuation of the proposed bank's facade; steam-cleaning the sooty granite blocks of the corner "building" to blend into the pre-cast concrete panels of the abutting bank project.

Nate Sharaf, who by now already could see his beloved kettle hanging 30 ft. up the street, was delighted. But then, Bennett and a fellow architect, Franklin B. Mead, took a good hard look behind the facade and just about threw up their hands in despair. "It was unbelievable," Bennett recalls. "We knew we'd have to gut the interior and start from scratch."

Sharaf, of course, was willing. He would even make do with less, figuring to abandon the coffee shop concept for a jiffy-stand-up bar operation—without seats, grills, steam-tables, sinks, etc.—using only plastic and paperware, pre-wrapped sandwiches and the like.

"The notion of a 600 sq. ft. restaurant excited us," Mead says. "But what none of us figured on at the time were the fire laws." Following the 1943 Cocoanut Grove holocaust in which hundreds perished, Boston enacted the country's toughest fire regulations. Among them, a place the size of Sharaf's vest-pocket luncheonette would need at least two fire exits and, considering the three stories above, two stairwells.

"The only trouble here was that the stairwells alone would chew up 600 sq. ft.," Bennett says.

At this point, Stahl/Bennett decided to apply a little political muscle to the BRA. They suggested to Miss Maletz that if the agency were really as concerned about landmark preservation as its speech-making officials claimed to be, then certainly it could "arrange" to have the Sears Crescent developers give up a 10-foot strip of property and thus give Sharaf one of his two stairwells. The second stairwell, reasoned Mead, actually already existed next door, in the proposed bank building. The BRA, by now caught up with something approaching patriotic fervor, went along on both scores. They made an "arrangement" with the Crescent owners and agreed to let the bank's fire egress be shared by Sharaf—through the simple expedient or adding a door leading into the mini-restaurant.

Now came the crunch. Sharaf was willing to ante up $80,000. But to do the job right, figured Stahl/Bennett, would take at least $180,000. Even so, that estimate proved to be unduly optimistic. Contractors, called in to bid on the job, wouldn't touch it for less than $250,000. "They were obviously petrified of what had to be done," remembers Bennett. "They clearly lacked confidence."

So, back to the drawing board; and out went the elevator—temporarily—and many other refinements, and in came Kirkland Construction Co. of Cambridge. They agreed to do the work on a time and materials basis rather than for a lump sum. "But then Nate started asking for so many improvements," Mead points out, "that the budget climbed right back up to $180,000."

It ended up costing Sharaf $200,000.

Does he have any regrets? "None," he says, now that the giant kettle is blasting away again. Business is fabulous: jammed into those 600 sq. ft., some 2,100 downtown Bostonians are gobbling up over $750 worth of food a day—"at least $300 more than we had any right to expect." Upstairs, he's planning to build a private dining club for footsore businessmen who prefer not to gulp their way through a stand-up quickly, and above the club, he intends to build office suites for those who want a clear and unobstructed view of Boston's stunning new City Hall.

Sharaf, whose other cafeteria-type restaurants in Back Bay and on Beacon Hill serve some of the most honest portions in town, continues to play it straight. "Of course," he says, "when we're ready to rent I'll have to tell prospective tenants that their windows might get a bit steamed up when the wind blows the wrong way."

---

LANDMARKS

Since 1941, the number of U.S. cities enacting so-called "Landmark Laws" in an effort to slow down the urban renewal bulldozer have gone from two to nearly 70. Most of these laws were passed too late because there was too little left.

By 1969, nearly half of America's 6,400 "important" landmarks had been dispatched in the name of progress. And in their place rose much of today's ubiquitous, characterless downtown construction.

Uncounted are the many thousands of lesser-known historic buildings that nobody knew about. They either failed to draw the attention of the many Landmark Commissions that were being formed in various towns and cities or they lay well outside those sections that were subsequently designated by Congress as historic districts. Or, more inexcusably, they simply failed to fit what architectural gadfly Ada Louise Huxtable of the *New York Times* likes to call "the predictable core development formula for profitable urban blight."

Gone are such reminders of America's architectural past as H. H. Richardson's Marshall Field store in Chicago, Frank Lloyd Wright's Larkin Building in Buffalo, McKim, Meade & White's Pennsylvania Station in New York, and the entire St. Louis riverfront.

It was to thwart such a tragedy in America's oldest major city that Boston's Mayor Kevin H. White on November 25, 1968, announced a plan to save from extinction the city's Quincy Market District. This six-acre area is better known to tourists as the Faneuil Hall Markets due to the close proximity of that well-known "Crade of Liberty" (see below).

What made the announcement important was not the sheer size of the project—currently the largest restoration project under way in the country—but the bold unorthodoxy of snatching from the jaws of limbo 428,000 sq. ft. of usable and productive space. The men responsible for the project don't talk of "historic preservation." They speak of "urban retrieval," of plugging into the 20th Century scene an entire section of a city that, to all intents and purposes, had long ceased to be relevant to a mechanized society. And just so that there would be no mistaking his backing as mere municipal altruism or sheer politicking (the Mayor aspires to be governor in 1970) White presented his plan as a pragmatic business proposition. He implied that whoever would be chosen to develop the property would make money—lots of it—and to make the job more attractive, the city would be willing to arrange for special leases and tax shelters.

Behind White's announcement lay over two years of intensive planning and research. It began, as these things usually do, with a

phone call between two prime movers—architect Frederick A. Stahl and preservationists Roger S. Webb. (Although Stahl/Bennett Inc. works extensively in modern high-rise office building development, its 39-year-old president is heavily committed to the past glories of U.S. architecture: he lives in a refurbished Victorian house on the far side of Beacon Hill and serves as a "working trustee" of the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities. Webb, an MBA from Harvard, heads Architectural Heritage Inc., a non-profit group of consultants whose horizons extend well beyond the New England scene.)

Both were struck by the same notion at more or less the same time. To what extent, they wondered, was the Boston Redevelopment Authority concerned with that small parcel of now-seedy market buildings midway between its two most ambitious undertakings, the $230-million Government Center and the $125-million Waterfront Redevelopment Project? The answer: BRA was concerned but, without funds or plans, powerless to do more than arrest the decay that was overtaking the public areas of the market district—once regarded as the very model of 19th Century urban planning.

Stahl, Webb and a number of other interested parties next collared Edward J. Logue, then BRA's controversial administrator (and now head of New York State's powerful $6 billion Urban Developmnet Corporation). Logue, intrigued by the notion of private sector involvement and with the support of then-Mayor John F. Collins, quietly commissioned Architectural Heritage and SPNEA to study the potential for private redevelopment of property jointly owned by the City and the BRA. It provided partial ($30,000) funding, with Webb's people raising the remaining $20,000 needed to complete the massive (5-volume) study. By the time the research had been completed, both Logue and Collins were out of office. But the impetus withstood partisan politics, and early in 1968, Collins' successor, Kevin White, and his first BRA administrator, Hale Champion, made the first of what would be several pilgrimages to the fount of federal funding, the Department of Housing & Urban Development. They would successfully plead the project's case by citing Title I of the liberalized Housing Act of 1949 and a document bearing the imprimatur of Lyndon Johnson's Great Society—the 1966 Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act.

Interestingly, the money came through during the last four days of the Johnson Administration, courtesy Sen. Edward M. Kennedy and House Speaker John McCormack. So far the BRA has received two separate grants totaling $2.1 million—closing the gap between the appraised value of a refurbished, rentable market complex ($8.5 million) and the estimated restoration cost ($10.6 million). More may be needed. Soaring construction rates since the study was completed could well force the planners to revise their estimates by adding another $1.9 million.

In responding as it did back in 1966, the BRA was merely acknowledging a cross-current in urban renewal which surfaced during the Kennedy years but did not actually make itself felt until President Johnson invoked "Creative Federalism." There was a feeling among enlightened city dwellers throughout the country that not everything old was necessarily bad; that all the stainless steel and glass of the new cityscape could and should be contrasted with more durable and therefore older architecture; and that if preservation had to rate low on the urban priority list, then perhaps government would be willing to play silent partner to energetic private interests. What these people were after was not just money but an urban coalition of private and public sectors, a "creative bureaucracy" that could change on a do-it-ourselves and pay-as-we-go basis.

In one way or another, the coalition gambit could be made to work. In San Francisco, it ripped out a rotting section of the waterfront and produced Ghirardelli Square and The Cannery, a $10 million private rehab that has since served as the prototype for similar mercantile projects in other cities. In Chicago, there is now Piper's Alley; in St. Louis, Gaslight Square; in Pittsburgh, Shadyside; and in Denver, Larimer Square. The coalition has even gone subterranean as in Underground Atlanta. And in New York the coalition is now planning the most ambitious proposal yet—a $40 million effort to retrieve Lower Manhattan's South Street Seaport.

In all of these projects as in Faneuil, there is nothing remotely resembling the Rockefeller grandiosity of Colonial Williamsburg where—according to critic Ada Louise Huxtable—"the art of scholarly self-delusion reaches the extravagantly, $79 million sublime." What bothers Mrs. Huxtable isn't so much the abundance of money as the total lack of perspective. "What preservation is all about," she says in scornful reference to those cities that would seek to package the past in Saran-wrapped museum-districts, is "the retention and active relationship of the buildings of the past to the community's functioning present. You don't erase history to get history," she says. "A city's character and quality are products of continuity. It is not recaptured in quarantine."

Historian Lewis Mumford puts it another way. To arrest municipal decay, you don't unleash the bulldozer. You practice what he calls Conservative Surgery—the "removal of dead urban tissue with the smallest possible injury to the rest of the organism, and then resorting to a blood transfusion of new enterprises both economic and social, conceived on a human scale and directed to clearly defined human needs."

That's what the Stahl, Webb et al. proposal is all about. And it will first become evident in the spring and summer of 1970 when workers will start refacing the handsome granite walls of the principal market buildings—the initial step to a project that may take up to $12.5 million and four years to complete. Of the project, architect Stahl says "it will again prove that urban retrieval and commercial development can coexist—at a profit."

For ground plans, Stahl's consulting architects are going back 146 years to the original work by architect Alexander Parris (1780–1852) who first produced the entire district for his patron, Boston Mayor Josiah Quincy (thus the appellation of "Quincy Markets"). According to project architect James Howland Ballou, "we'll be restoring the district to its 1824 grandeur, or as close to it as we can possibly come." Ballou explains that while the 535-ft.-long, two-story granite Greek Revival market house is fully intact, the two flanking rows of granite-faced, slate-roofed four-story buildings are not. "Originally, there were 47 of these buildings. Now there are 45 left."

Interior work will not begin until the present occupants, the produce markets, have been relocated to a new market district in nearby Chelsea, by which time a developer will have been selected. However, Ballou's staff is already working up detailed plans for converting the existing space. Says project manager Roger P. Lang, "The warehouse block concept is ideally adaptable to a great many contemporary uses without disfiguring history or ignoring basic tenant needs. The adjacent building units function like a horizontal skyscraper. Parris has made our job really quite simple!"

"The use concept," according to Webb, "involves more than just businessmen looking for attractively-priced office space. We envision a diverse area composed of retail, office and residential tenants, living and working alongside the relocated pushcart market, with its street vendors who have long given the area a distinct Old World character." Thus the automobile will be banished from the streets that will be repaved with cobblestones and red brick, and pedestrians, an almost extinct species of city dweller, will be welcomed back.

Meanwhile, Stahl's architects and Webb's technical consultants are, in the words of Roger Lang, "trying everything in sight of reason, and beyond, to restore Alexander Parris' vision within the limits of contemporary materials, techniques, unions and inflation." Among the techniques Lang lists "field measurements, archival research and occasional seances with Mr. Parris." Adding to the planners' difficulty of retrieving the past is the knowledge that they are working with more than a commercially hot property. They are entrusted with one of the nation's most valuable historic assets.

Here is where it all began—1776 and all that. Actually, it began in 1742 when a French Huguenot merchant named Peter Faneuil (name which Bostonians today insist rhymes with "flannel") offered to build for his adopted town "at his own cost and charge a noble and compleat edifise for a market."

Though it falls outside of the legal purview of the planners, Faneuil Hall is clearly the crown jewel, the magnet that will insure a brisk pedestrian traffic flow. Here, in the hall that bears the distinct hand of an even more famous architect, Charles Bulfinch, John Adams his fellow colonists into revolution against the Crown. A scant block away, Adams' followers brewed the Boston Tea Party. Two blocks away was to be the scene of the equally infamous Boston Massacre.

Still, no real estate developer—especially in this tight money market—is going to commit upwards of $10 million to indulge the city's historic whims or the aesthetic passions of a handful of preservationists. What developers will want to know is what will it cost and how big will be the return?

For that reason, much of the painstaking historic research that characterizes the study is apt to be skimmed over. As a breed, developers don't care much for redeeming social significance. Instead, they're apt to be poring over the fourth and fifth volumes of the study, in which the development strategy is carefully spelled out in terms of "preferred procedure." The BRA is to select the developer on the basis of submissions to be received late this fall. The developer then enters into a simultaneous net lease for a 40 or 60 year period, with the City of Boston Real Properties Board for the dominant market building and the BRA for the two flanking rows. The lease stipulation gives the joint lessors maximum control over the development process.

Once completed, the project will pay the City an established annual minimum tax payment (in lieu of real estate taxes) plus a percentage of the developer's profits. Roger Webb explains that the percentage payment may be based on a sliding scale so that the developer will pay less to the City during the early formative stages than he would later when the project is well established and capable of supporting a larger burden. This arrangement allows the lessors to share the wealth with the developer.

As an alternative or fall-back proposition, should no takers present themselves, the City and the BRA are prepared to invoke Chapter 121A of the Housing Act and set up a tax shelter. This would mean the developer would have to operate as a limited dividend partnership (in which earnings are limited to a 6% return or equity) or as a non-profit corporation. "But we don't expect it will ever have to come to that," says architect Stahl.

He figures conversion costs at $15–22 a square foot, which is highly competitive with new office construction in Boston. Rental, he believes, will also be competitive ($7–10 a square foot).

"We won't lack for tenants," he says confidently. "There are hundreds of businessmen who will prefer to work in the unique spaces here." For businessmen tired of conventional high-rise towers, "unique" means timber ceilings, exposed brick walls, a vibrant pedestrian mall seen through small-paned glass windows—and all the convenience of modern office environment.

The BRA will start taking applications this summer and intends to name its developer by November 1. Construction of interiors will start early in 1971 for a mid-1973 occupancy.

## THE NEED FOR UNIFORM COST ACCOUNTING STANDARDS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Committee on Banking and Currency has recently completed hearings on S. 3302, which would require defense contractors to follow uniform cost accounting standards on Government contracts in excess of $100,000. Admiral Rickover has testified before the subcommittee that the adoption of uniform cost accounting standards could save the Federal Government as much as $2 billion a year in lower procurement costs. Admiral Rickover is a noted expert on defense procurement and has been right many times in the past.

The hearings held by the subcommittee were in response to an excellent report issued by the General Accounting Office on the feasibility of uniform cost accounting standards. The GAO concluded that uniform cost accounting standards were both feasible and desirable and that the Government would save substantial sums of money if they were put into effect. Most of the professional accounting groups supported the GAO findings.

Additional support on the need for uniform cost accounting standards may be found in an excellent article by Robert N. Anthony in the May–June issue of the Harvard Business Review. Mr. Anthony brings a life time of expertise and special knowledge to the subject. He was formerly the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Comptroller, from 1965 to 1968. He has an extensive background in accounting, and his book entitled "Management Accounting: Text in Cases" is the definitive work in the field. He is presently serving as a professor of management control at the Harvard Business School.

Mr. Anthony has written a lucid and closely reasoned article on the need for uniform cost accounting standards. He argues that the lack of meaningful cost accounting standards gives defense contractors too much flexibility in determining or estimating their costs on Government contracts. I recommend a close reading of the article to anyone interested in the subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

### WHAT SHOULD "COST" MEAN?

(By Robert N. Anthony)

(NOTE.—The Comptroller General of the United States recently produced a report which accepted the feasibility of developing cost concepts and standards, and the matter is now before Congress. The author of this article maintains that the time is ripe to end the confusion over what "cost" means in business situations. This is especially important in contractual arrangements where costs of materials or services are a factor. The author gives his ideas on what the bases of the standards should be, how the task should be approached, and how the undertaking should be organized.

(Mr. Anthony has long been concerned with problems of cost, as a teacher, government executive, member of professional groups, and consultant. He is Ross Graham Walker Professor of Management Control at the Harvard Business School, and was Assistant Secretary of Defense, Comptroller, from 1965 to 1968. As a consultant, he advises many companies and trade associations, as well as the General Accounting Office. His many books include *Management Accounting: Text and Cases*, now in its fourth edition and in several translations.)

Suppose the president of a widget company says, "Last year our cost of manufacturing widgets was $1.80 each." The ordinary person may think he has learned a concrete piece of information from this statement.

Anyone who understands the vagaries of cost accounting knows differently. He knows that "cost" in this context has no generally accepted meaning, that two manufacturers of physically identical widgets who use different, but acceptable, methods of measuring cost could differ in their reported costs of making widgets by 100% or more. The informed person therefore realizes that he cannot understand a number that purports to be the cost of a widget unless he knows a great deal about the particular cost accounting system from which it was derived.

Some persons say this situation is inevitable, in view of the complicated nature of business. Others say it is desirable: manufacturers should be encouraged to exercise their own best judgment in measuring cost. Still others, including me, find it neither inevitable nor desirable. They find it deplorable.

The increasing number of responsible persons who find it deplorable has generated activity on several fronts to develop cost standards. The activity involves accounting groups, the General Accounting Office, and the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, which plans hearings on the subject. (I shall have some suggestions as to how cost concepts can best be formulated.)

#### CORRECTION OF INADEQUACIES

For reasons discussed in the next section, I shall limit myself here to the meaning of "cost" in this situation:

Two parties facing each other across a table are negotiating a contract. Mr. A has agreed to manufacture some articles or perform some services for Mr. B. They have agreed on the specifications and delivery schedule of the articles or services. They also have agreed that the purchaser (B) will pay the supplier (A) for the cost of manufacturing the articles or providing the services, plus a profit. The problem is: What should "cost" mean in this situation?

There are several conceivable ways of answering this question, but in most situations only one way is both fair and practical. Let us look at the possibilities:

1. The parties could leave "cost" undefined, in the belief that there exists a body of generally accepted cost accounting principles defining it. They would be wrong.

2. At the opposite extreme, they could try to imagine all the cost accounting problems that might arise in the course of manufacturing the articles or providing the services, and agree on how each of them is to be resolved. The end product of such an approach would be a cost accounting manual.

But it is not generally practical to write a manual for a specific contract, except for a very simple job; the circumstances, and the possible ways of treating each circumstance, are too numerous. Moreover, the negotiations would be extraordinarily time-consuming.

3. The buyer could permit the manufacturer to define cost to mean what the manufacturer says it means, no more and no less. Even Alice would not accept this White Queen approach, and it is preposterous to expect that a hardheaded buyer would agree to it.

It is, nevertheless, an approach advocated by a number of people for contracts in which they sit on one side of the negotiating table and a government representative sits on the other side, as indicated by this excerpt from a letter written to the General Accounting Office by a trade association representative: "We do not believe that the adoption of Uniform Cost Accounting Standards would be practical for government or industry. Each industry already has developed, and is utilizing, the most appropriate accounting systems and procedures for its needs."

4. They could negotiate de novo a set of standards that would provide at least the general direction of solutions that arose in measuring the cost of the contract. This would be very inefficient. Since most problems that arise in measuring costs have arisen thousands of times before, working out solutions from scratch for each new contract is a waste of everyone's time.

5. They could agree to use a set of standards that has been developed by someone else for contracts of the type being negotiated, or perhaps a set of standards for contracts in general. This is the only fair and practical solution. Neither the first nor the third alternative is fair to the purchaser, and neither the second nor the fourth is practical.

An agreed-on definition of cost that is applicable to a number of situations is what is meant by the term "cost standards." (Incidentally, the phrase "cost standards" should not be confused with "standard costs." Standard costs are a device used for internal control, which is intended to express what costs *should be*, not what they *are*.

Several such definitions already exist. Section XV of the Armed Services Procurement Regulations (ASPR) is one; it helps to define cost in negotiations when one of the participants is the government. Many trade associations have developed standards for defining costs applicable to their industries.

But these existing sets of standards have serious deficiencies, and the time has come to attempt the construction of a set of standards that will define cost whenever one party to a contract agrees to pay to the other party an amount based on the cost of performing the contract.

The time is propitious because of the interest in this problem that has been generated by a study conducted by the General Accounting Office (GAO) as required by Public Law 370 of the 90th Congress. This law only required the GAO to report on the "feasibility" of applying "uniform cost accounting standards" to negotiated defense contracts. (In the quoted phrase, "uniform" is clearly redundant, and I shall omit it henceforth. Can anyone give an example of a nonuniform cost standard?)

The Comptroller General made his report on January 19, 1970. He stated that it is feasible to develop and use cost standards for defense contracts. He could scarcely have concluded otherwise, for it is inconceivable that the two parties to a contract could communicate with one another in the absence of such standards. They communicate now, and have for years, using the previously mentioned ASPR standards.

But these standards are inadequate. The Comptroller General summarized their inadequacies this way: (a) in some crucial matters, ASPR instructs the parties to use

"generally accepted accounting principles," whereas relevant principles do not exist; (b) in other matters, ASPR is silent or vague as to which of several possible cost constructions may be used in a given set of circumstances.

Admittedly, some persons oppose any effort to develop better cost standards. Analysis of their arguments shows that they are not questioning the desirability of standards per se. What they are really worried about is that the standards may be *bad* standards; that is, that the group responsible for developing them will not do a good job.

This, it seems to me, is an untenable position, for such a possibility exists in any proposal to change the status quo. Instead of merely expressing opposition, these critics could make a constructive contribution if they focused their energies on ensuring that the effort to develop standards is well conceived, well organized, and well manned.

HOW BROAD THE STANDARDS?

The first question to be resolved is how broad the standards should be. There are two extremes:

They could define "cost" in whatever context it is used.

They could define cost as used in "all negotiated prime contract and subcontract defense procurements of $100,000 or more," which is the language of P.L. 90-370.

In my view, one extreme is unmanageably broad and the other is unnecessarily narrow. That is why the question at the beginning of this article was framed in such a way that it applies to all negotiated contracts where the payment is in part based on cost, but only to such contracts.

PROBLEM CATEGORIES

If the group concerned set out to develop all-inclusive cost standards, it would have to cover at least these five contexts:

1. There is the situation I described, where the problem is to measure the total (i.e., "full") costs incurred in performing a contract.

2. There is the problem of defining the costs that company management should weigh in deciding between proposed alternative courses of action. These are often labeled "decision making" costs. In contrast with the first type, these are not incurred costs, but estimates, of future costs. Neither are they necessarily full costs, but differential or incremental costs.

3. There are the costs considered in setting selling prices for other than cost-type contracts. Some persons regard pricing as one type of decision-making problem, while others regard it as a special case in the measurement of costs incurred. In view of this disagreement it would be arbitrary to classify the costs relevant for pricing as coming within either the costs-incurred or the decision-making categories.

4. There are the costs involved in measuring inventory amounts on the balance sheet and cost of sales on the income statement. Perhaps the principles governing measurement of costs for financial statements are so similar to those in the first category that this is not really a separate category. Such a conclusion is, however, premature.

5. There are the costs used as a basis for influencing the actions of managers and measuring their performance. They may be called "management control" costs. They properly involve motivational considerations, so they differ in some respects from those in the other categories. As with the previous category, further analysis may show that these differences are not significant enough to warrant the creation of a separate category.

To summarize this list, there are at least two quite different kinds of costs: total, incurred costs and differential, future costs. There may also be other important categories, depending on whether the principles relevant to costs for pricing, costs for financial statements, and costs for management control are essentially the same as those in one or the other of the categories listed.

Some very broad comments about cost can be made that apply to all these categories. This, for example, is the approach taken in William J. Vatter's *Standards of Cost Analysis*.[1] A study of this excellent report shows, however, that statements made at this level of generality provide only what Vatter himself describes as "first steps" in approaching any of the classes of problems I described.

The cost concepts study sponsored by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, AICPA—and described in the February 1969 issue of *The Journal of Accountancy*—appears to take the same broad approach as does Vatter.

CHOOSING A CATEGORY

If the contexts in which cost is used are too diverse to allow tackling them simultaneously, which one should be selected as the focus for a program to develop standards? Of the two main categories—a focus on total costs that have been incurred versus a focus on estimates of differential costs *to be* incurred—the former is clearly the more desirable.

In internal decision making, company management can specify the definition of cost it thinks best. Some cost constructions are more useful than others, and management should welcome advice on what constructions are most useful for purposes of decision making. But it should be free to accept or reject this advice; there is no compelling reason why some outside agency should impose its views on the company in the guise of a set of standards.

On the other hand, A and B, the negotiators in the episode at the beginning of this article, *must* have some standards. Without them, A and B have no practicable way of reaching a meeting of minds as to what the contract means by the word "cost," once the parties have agreed that reimbursement is to be based in part on cost. This area is the one on which the standards-development effort should be focused.

The effort should not be limited to developing cost standards for defense contracts. Those responsible will render a greater service to the business community if they view their job as relating to all cost-type contracts. For what difference is there, in principle, between costs that are relevant to a defense contract and those relevant to a nondefense contract? The defense establishment consumes 8% of our gross national product, and its contracts cover nearly every conceivable kind of product and service.

Defense contracts do, however, have a few peculiarities. DOD has rules for reimbursing contractors for some items that may not fit within a general definition of costs incurred on a contract—principally those known as "independent research and development costs" and "bid and proposal costs." Provision in the standard for such items, if they indeed turn out to be exceptions (and it would be premature to so classify them before cost standards have been developed), could easily be treated as special cases, applying only to defense.

A set of standards is useful in most contracts involving payments based on cost. The standards would in no way prevent the parties, whether or not it is a government negotiation, from defining cost in a different way if they mutually agree to do so.

Many construction contracts, for instance, specify the use of 2" × 2" lumber. There is a standard for 2" × 4" lumber which, among other characteristics, defines it as having dimensions of at least 1½" × 3½" under certain circumstances and at least 9/16" × 9/16" under other circumstances. It is normally not done, but the parties can, if they wish, change this definition and require that the lumber actually measure 2" × 4", or any other dimension they specify.

The problem of defining cost obviously is vastly more complicated than that of defining the dimensions of lumber. Cost standards would therefore not be anywhere near as specific as those for lumber or those for similar criteria worked out by the U.S.A. Standard Institute. I stress this point because many persons have a mistaken impression about it.

*Parameters of analysis:* The question posed in the "A and B negotiate" episode was worded so as to restrict the analysis in certain dimensions. For one, it is deliberately limited to the problem of reimbursable costs.

Costs are used for other purposes, in connection with contract work, such as measuring performance while the work is going on. But performance measurement involves several problems that need not be faced in measuring the costs to be reimbursed. For example, in the Defense Department a controversy currently goes on as to the proper timing of material charges for performance measurement purposes: Should they be reported when material is acquired or when it is consumed? This question of timing does not even arise in the cost reimbursement area; if an item of material is used on a contract, it is unquestionably a cost of that contract, regardless of when it is acquired or used.

The question early in the article was stated so as to exclude also the problem of developing standards for cost estimates that are often used by negotiating parties in deciding on the work to be done under a contract. They are important in negotiated fixed-price contracts as well as cost-type contracts.

These cost estimates should be influenced by the standards in the sense that the buyer ought to insist that the cost constructions used in the estimates are consistent with the standards applicable to the measurement of costs incurred. The job of making the estimates, however, involves certain considerations (some of them quite complicated) that are not present in the measurement of costs incurred.

For example, the standards for measuring costs incurred should indicate what kind of effort constitutes direct labor, and what, if any, fringe benefits should be included in the price of each hour of direct labor. *Estimates* of this labor cost should ordinarily be constructed in the same terms; but the estimator must also make certain assumptions about future wage rates, future labor productivity, and the number of hours required to produce the article. It does not appear feasible, as a part of the initial effort to develop standards, to work out standards governing the choice of these assumptions.

The contracting parties may also be involved in change orders, repricing formulas, renegotiation provisions, termination costs, and similar complications. All involve the measurement of costs actually incurred, as distinguished from estimates of costs to be incurred, and therefore the standards should apply to them.

For these reasons, then, the approach suggested at the beginning of this article seems to be the most feasible and the most useful. By limiting the focus to developing standards for costs incurred, we can avoid the complications involved in developing standards for other kinds of cost. By broadening it from defense contracts to all negotiated contracts, we gain in breadth of coverage with no significant increase in effort.

FIRST THINGS FIRST

The formulation of cost standards resembles the efforts of the Accounting Principles

[1] Report to the Comptroller General of the United States (Washington, General Accounting Office, August 1969).

Board (APB) of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants to develop standards for financial accounting. Its experience teaches an important lesson; namely, that the undertaking should consist of two sequential stages:

The development of a few underlying, basic concepts.

The development of standards based on those concepts.

(A third possible stage, the development of detailed rules and procedures, is not property a part of the effort, of course.)

When the APB began its work in 1959, it decided that its opinions should rest on a foundation of broad principles. It therefore encouraged research that could be used as a basis for formulating principles. The work culminated in "A Tentative Set of Broad Accounting Principles for Business Enterprises."[2]

The APB did not accept the principles proposed in that study, but neither could its members agree on any alternative set of principles. So the APB proceeded to formulate standards for specific topics, without the conceptual underpinning that a statement of broad principles would have provided. There was some justification for this approach; certain problems required immediate resolution, and it may not have been feasible to hold up action on them until an agreement on broad principles could be reached.

Whatever justification there was at the time, we know by hindsight that the subsequent APB opinions, and the discussions leading to them, have suffered greatly from the absence of an agreed-on conceptual foundation. As a leading practitioner comments:

"The APB . . . has been so busy 'putting out fires' and dealing with a large and ever-increasing backlog of current problems that it has never established an adequate basis upon which to build. This deficiency results not only in the waste of a great deal of time in debating each subject on a more-or-less isolated basis but also in makeshift conclusions which could in the end defeat the entire effort to improve accounting principles. . . . This approach can be compared to building a room for a house without having either a foundation or plans for the house."[3]

In 1968, the APB began another effort to decide on broad concepts, so the importance of doing so is still recognized. In the meantime, whoever is responsible for developing cost accounting standards can learn from the experience. The individual standards must be derived from a conceptual foundation, and the first task is to build it.

BUILDING THE FOUNDATION

What should the conceptual foundation look like? Its general nature is, I believe, quite easy to sketch out. Cost measures the use of resources. To return to my original example:

When B agrees to pay A an amount based on cost incurred, he has in mind that A will use certain resources in the time period covered by the contract, and that this use will be measured by a dollar amount known as cost.

Some of this use of resources can be directly related to the contract, and B expects to pay the cost of these resources. Some are used jointly for contract work and noncontract work, and B expects to pay a "fair share" of the cost of these resources. The sum of these two elements he regards as the cost of performing the contract. (He may specify that he will pay for these costs only to the extent that they are reasonable.)

This suggests that the conceptual foundation should spell out in broad terms the answers to two questions:

1. What are the total costs incurred by an organization in an accounting period?

2. How should this total be divided among the several cost objectives of that period? (A cost objective is anything to which costs are assigned. We are here interested in a contract as one cost objective.)

COSTS INCURRED IN A PERIOD

The concepts governing measurement of the total costs incurred in an accounting period are financial accounting concepts. If the APB had adopted a complete and acceptable set of broad principles, the cost accounting effort would require no further work with respect to this question. It seems highly unlikely that the APB will answer this question in the near future. If it does not, the new group must develop these concepts.

This job involves wrestling with only a relatively few topics. A measure of agreement already exists on at least some of them, and the task is therefore to find words to express the concepts unambiguously. There is general agreement, for example, that the accrual concept should govern measurement of costs, but no generally accepted unambiguous statement exists on what should be meant by the accrual concept. For writing such a statement, the literature can be used as a basis for discussion.[4]

The principal aspects of the main question to be considered are:

The types of resources that are properly included in the costs of an accounting period.

How these resources should be priced.

In regard to resources that provide services to more than one accounting period, how the amount applicable to a single period should be measured.

In addition, attention should be given to the terms "materiality" and "consistency." Moreover, since most cost-type contracts contemplate that reimbursement will be limited to "reasonable" cost, rather than cost in an unqualified sense, "reasonable" needs to be defined.

There is, finally, the special problem of the cost of capital. Although capital has a cost, it is not recognized as such under currently accepted financial accounting principles. Interest, which is the cost of *debt* capital, is recognized for some purposes, but there is no formal recognition in the accounts of the cost of *equity* capital.

This situation has led to confusion and inequity in contract costing. Under ASPR (paragraph 15-305.17), interest is an unallowable cost. If, however, a contractor leases an asset, the lease payment generally includes an allowance for the cost of capital—both debt capital and equity capital—and such a lease payment is often an allowable cost.

The cost of a building constructed by a contractor's own work force may include an allowance for interest, but it rarely includes an allowance for the cost of equity capital. If a third party constructed the building for the contractor's account, the cost would normally include the cost of capital.

It is inappropriate here to suggest a solution to this problem, but it surely is one to which special attention must be given.

ASSIGNMENT OF COSTS

The second question, the assignment of total costs to cost objectives, is the province of cost accounting. In this area APB opinions give no substantial guidance. The closest authoritative precedent is ASPR, and this is useful in providing a structure for the conceptual problem. In rough outline this structure is:

Costs are divided into direct costs and indirect costs.

Direct costs are assigned to cost objectives.

Each cost objective is assigned a "fair share" of the indirect costs.

This structure suggests two main considerations, investigation of which can provide the conceptual foundation necessary for the construction of individual standards:

The *first* consideration has to do with how direct costs should be defined. The definition should, I believe, encompass more costs than those that clearly can be traced to a cost objective, because they exclude most kinds of fringe benefits, overtime, labor that is closely but not unequivocally related to a cost objective, many aspects of material cost, and many services.

Some of these cost elements should be included within the definition of direct costs, leaving the indirect cost category as small as possible, for the more costs that reasonably can be assigned directly, the more confidence that the total costs are indeed equitable. So the answer to this question is by no means as simple as it may appear.

The way to approach this problem, I believe, is to break it into: (a) What physical inputs should be costed as direct? (b) How are these inputs to be priced?

The latter is the more difficult. Consider, for example, two pieces of timber of identical size which required an identical amount of effort to grow, harvest, and transport to where they are to be used. Log X is in some significant sense "better" than Log Y; it has fewer defects or a better grain. If Log X is used on Contract A and Log Y, on Contract B, it seems reasonable to some persons that more than half the cost of the two logs should be assigned to Contract A. Others believe that the same amount of cost should be assigned to each contract.

This is a basic conceptual disagreement that must be resolved. The treatment of overtime and material waste and spoilage are other topics that have this same characteristic.

The *second* consideration has to do with the concepts governing the assignment of indirect costs to contracts. Although some persons find the idea of "fair share" or "equity" a less than satisfactory basis for approaching this question, no one, as far as I know, has proposed a better one.

If those responsible cannot come up with a better approach (and I doubt that they can), they will presumably use the foundation that is already familiar to cost accountants: costs are initially collected in relatively homogeneous pools, and the total of each of these pools is then divided among the cost objectives on some equitable basis. So there needs to be one set of criteria for specifying what is meant by a "homogeneous pool" and another set for deciding among the possible ways of allocating the total of each pool to cost objectives.

In the report to the Comptroller General which I mentioned, Vatter classifies cost pools as people-oriented, payroll-oriented, materials-oriented, machine-oriented, or uncorrelated with any of the others. This classification provides a good starting point in approaching the question of homogeneity. It should not be difficult to frame a general concept of the meaning of homogeneity, together with a *de minimis* qualification that limits the creation of separate pools in situations where the effort to do so is not worthwhile.

A decision on the concepts governing the method of allocating the total cost accumulated in a pool to the relevant cost objectives is much more difficult to reach. The literature suggests a number of alternatives,

---

[2] Robert T. Sprouse and Maurice Moonitz, *Accounting Research Study No. 3* (1962).

[3] George R. Catlett, "Better Objectives Needed to Improve Accounting Principles," *The Journal of Accountancy*, October 1969, p. 62.

[4] See W. A. Paton and A. C. Littleton, *An Introduction to Corporate Accounting Standards* (Madison, American Accounting Association, 1940); the Sprouse-Moonitz study, op. cit.; and the subsequent study for the APB by Paul Grady, *Accounting Research Study No. 7* (1965).

including benefits received, correlation with individual input elements, correlation with total input cost, correlation with outputs, relative use of facilities, and degree of control by cost objective. These must in some way be sorted out.

There are several possible ways of doing this. One is to arrange the methods of allocation in a hierarchy according to their conceptual desirability and specify that a particular method should be used only when a more desirable one is not feasible.

The concept might state, for example, that the costs in a pool should be allocated to cost objectives in proportion to the benefits received, if it is feasible to do so. If this is not feasible, another criterion should govern, then another, until one is left with a pool of costs for which no logical basis for allocation exists. (Such a pool would contain at least part of the element often labeled "general and administrative costs.")

In the absence of a logical basis for allocating such costs, the method of allocation is necessarily arbitrary. The relevant concept is therefore also arbitrary. But this is nothing to be concealed or be ashamed of; it is simply inherent in the situation.

The set of basic concepts emerging from this analysis should be relatively brief, a few thousand words at most (which is much shorter than Section XV of ASPR). There will nevertheless be much sweat, some tears, and possibly even some blood shed by members of the group responsible for this effort. The job of selecting the best ideas is a formidable exercise in logic tempered by the realities of practice, and the job of expressing those ideas in unambiguous language is almost as difficult.

But unless this job is completed before the work of setting standards on individual elements of cost begins, the undertaking is likely to be a patchwork of loosely related, sometimes conflicting, statements, which is one of the troubles with the present state of affairs.

APPROACH TO PROCEDURE

This is what I have in mind by the term "concepts": they are broad, they are few in number, and they govern the standards to be developed for individual elements of cost—but they do not themselves deal with those elements. Once these concepts have been agreed to, the task of developing cost standards can begin. Probably this work could be divided according to the principal elements of cost, although other methods of breaking it down may turn out to be preferable.

Whatever the basis for selecting topics, the research and analysis leading to a recommendation on each topic should seek to:

Define alternative circumstances that warrant different methods of cost assignment.

State the method (or methods) that is appropriate under each of these circumstances.

Take one of the most difficult problems as an example: the amount of depreciation cost assigned to an accounting period can be determined on a straight-line basis, a units-of-production basis, an accelerated basis, or an annuity basis. The standard on depreciation should spell out either the circumstances under which each of these methods is appropriate, or, as a minimum, the circumstances under which each is inappropriate.

At best, cost accounting standards are guides to practice; they cannot provide detailed solutions to all problems. They can and must narrow the choice of alternatives, but they cannot eliminate the necessity for making judgments among alternatives according to the circumstances in a specific situation. The real world is too complicated for that.

ORGANIZING FOR THE TASK

Next, there is the question of how to go about it. In other words, what organization should be responsible, and what procedures should it follow? Here are some considerations bearing on these questions:

The organization must be a continuing one, for the formidable task has no foreseeable end. While results in development of the broad cost concepts can be produced in two years or so, devising standards consistent with those concepts is a much more time-consuming job. It has no foreseeable end because any set of standards will doubtless require modification as circumstances change.

One organization should be responsible for both aspects of the undertaking. Otherwise, human nature is such that the standards-setting group would probably start by a re-examination of the cost concepts, which might well take as much time as the concepts formulation in the first place.

The organization must be authoritative Experience has demonstrated that recommendations of an individual or an ad hoc committee, however brilliant or logical they may be, have little practical impact. Authority can be derived either from legislative fiat or from the prestige of the organization, although each of these sources of authority offers disadvantages.

Authority, incidentally, is a necessary, but not a sufficient, condition. A poor set of standards is unlikely to gain permanent acceptance even though it is promulgated with substantial authority.

Standards can be developed for contracts in general, in which case they could be applied to government contracts as a special case, or to defense contracts as an even more special case. Alternatively, standards can be developed for defense contracts, or for government contracts, and then extended to other types of contracts.

I have given the argument for the first approach: essentially the same standards should apply to most contracts, and it is therefore artificial to select a special category for attention. The argument for the second approach is the practical one that Congressional interest, and hence public interest, is aroused about the problem of defense contracts, and this interest might dissipate if the problem were tackled in broader terms.

With respect to defense contracts, there is a basic conflict of interest between the parties. The contractor wants the standards to be few and general, giving him the maximum amount of latitude in choosing the most advantageous cost alternative in a particular circumstance. The government, on the other hand, wants the standards to be specific in order to minimize the judgments required in auditing cost reimbursements.

(Some, by the way, deny the existence of this conflict. They assert that a contractor, even in the absence of standards, will voluntarily measure costs according to what is fair, even when this is inconsistent with his interests. This is a naive point of view, and it is surprising that knowledgeable men appear to expect that other knowledgeable men will give credence to it.)

The task of devising standards is expensive. Counting the work done in the public accounting firms and the salaries of those who spend a substantial amount of time on the effort, the work of the APB costs more than a million dollars a year. The cost concepts effort should be even more expensive per year than that unless it is strung out over an unacceptably long period of time.

The organization must be able to attract competent people. The task requires experts who have a profound understanding not only of accounting, but also of the realities of business—plus an ability to think conceptually and write precisely. Such people are scarce and are well paid in their current jobs. Much thought needs to be given to the inducements that would lead them to undertake this novel and potentially frustrating effort.

If the job of developing standards is carried out under the aegis of a professional organization, it may take a long time. The standard for 2" × 4" lumber I mentioned took 7 years to develop.[5] The APB has issued only 15 opinions in the 10 years of its existence. Some of them supersede others, and it has not yet covered all the important topics even once.

Some persons fear that standards developed unilaterally by a government agency might be more restrictive than the situation warrants. The accounting standards developed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Power Commission, and the state public utility regulatory agencies are examples of overly restrictive standards. On the other hand, those of the Securities and Exchange Commission are by no means too restrictive; and the regulations of the Internal Revenue Service, though restrictive, are in my view not overly restrictive. This concern is therefore not necessarily justified.

PRIVATE OR PUBLIC

With these considerations in mind, we are in a better position to weigh the decision whether the work should be carried out under private or public auspices.

*A private-sector effort:* The business community undoubtedly would like to see this effort undertaken by a group in the private sector analogous to the APB. But the considerations of authoritativeness, permanence, and financing lead me to the reluctant conclusion that such an approach is unlikely to succeed.

The APB, in its work on financial accounting principles, has had two great advantages that no other private organization seems likely to match in developing cost accounting standards:

1. The APB is authoritative. It can enforce its pronouncements through sanctions applicable to all members of the AICPA. The other leading organizations—the National Association of Accountants, the Financial Executives Institute, and the American Accounting Association—have no way whatsoever of ensuring compliance with their pronouncements.

2. The APB can raise substantial sums of money from the profession, since the development of financial accounting standards is now recognized by the public accounting firms to be very much in their own interest. No other private group has corresponding sources of support for the development of cost concepts and standards.

As for the AICPA itself, it is unlikely that it could succeed in this endeavor. It would have no way of obtaining adherence to cost standards comparable to the sanctions it can apply to information on published financial statements, and it has no obvious new source of financial support that would at least double the money it now raises.

Congress, moreover, which will undoubtedly have the final say on how the job gets done, would be unwilling to rely on a private organization unless it was convinced that the group would be permanent, well financed, and authoritative; that it adequately represented the interests of both government and business; and that it had safeguards against dilatory tactics.

I cannot visualize a private-sector effort that would satisfy these conditions. Indeed, the generally negative testimony of trade association representatives before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in 1968 and negative responses to the General Accounting Office's request for comments on the feasibility of cost standards indicate that substantial segments of the business com-

[5] According to *The Wall Street Journal*, December 2, 1969.

munity are unwilling to meet these conditions.

*A government effort:* It seems likely, therefore, that the organization will be set up within the framework of the federal government. This can be done in either of two ways:

1. Congress could direct the Comptroller General to undertake the task. (The Bureau of the Budget, the other possibility among existing organizations, has not been as close to the problem, nor does it have the nucleus of a staff.) The Comptroller General might then set up a cost standards board, similar to the APB. He probably would obtain nominations for membership on this board from the accounting profession, business organizations, government organizations, and the academic community.

The board would specify the research that should be undertaken, and it would eventually make recommendations on cost concepts and standards to the Comptroller General. The ground rule might be that the Comptroller General would normally accept these recommendations, but he could modify or reject them for substantial cause.

2. An independent organization could be created, consisting of a small group of commissioners supported by an appropriate staff.[6] It would be appointed by the President (probably in consultation with the Comptroller General as the representative of the legislative branch in these matters) and financed with appropriated funds. Its pronouncements on standards would be authoritative since they presumably would be binding for government contracts, and might well be made applicable to the cost-measurement systems prescribed by various regulatory agencies.

Such a body could easily evolve into the "accounting court" which Leonard Spacek, Chairman of Arthur Andersen & Company, has long advocated.[7] After cost standards are developed, questions of interpretation will arise, and the board would provide a logical mechanism for resolving such questions. With such a procedure, there would also be a greater likelihood that the standards are kept in tune with changing circumstances.

The choice between these alternatives is by no means clearcut. An independent commission would give greater status to the effort, and it also would be more acceptable to those segments of the business community that are worried about the impartiality of an effort lodged within the General Accounting Office.

On the other hand, a commission is an unknown quantity. With appointees of the right caliber, it could do a better job than an existing organization, but if its members are second-rate, nothing useful would happen. It will not be easy to find high-salaried men who are willing to risk their careers in a much lower-paying job. Perhaps a part-time commission is the answer, though this device is rarely used in the federal government.

However established, the organization needs an adequate staff both to undertake research and to arrange for outside parties to do research. Such a staff would also operate the mechanism for circulating drafts of proposed concepts and standards for comment, and it would analyze and summarize the comments for the board or commission.

[6] This commission would function in a manner similar to the board proposed by Robert M. Trueblood to replace the APB; see his article, "Ten Years of the APB; Trueblood One Practitioner's Appraisal," *The Journal of Accountancy*, January 1970, p. 6.

[7] See, for example, his *A Search for Fairness in Financial Reporting to the Public* [Chicago, Arthur Andersen & Company, 1969], pp. 27–38.

CONCLUDING NOTE

Too often, as I have tried to show, the word "cost" has a vague and ill-defined meaning, which can be troublesome particularly in contracts where cost is part of the reimbursement. An increasing number of persons for whom the meaning of cost is important have come to realize that standardization of meanings is a feasible goal.

These persons—in the business sector, in government agencies, and in Congress—understand that what must be done is to establish an authoritative, well-financed group which is charged with development of cost concepts and standards. So far the activity is just talk, but in the not-distant future the creation by the mutually interested parties of such a body may become a reality.

Inaction would be very disadvantageous to business. Congress might be persuaded to take no action, either on the false premise that there is no problem or on the promise that the business community will do the job in some unspecified way.

If Congress does not act, and if the subsequent voluntary effort is half-hearted and dilatory, in a few years the problem will make the headlines once more, and we will then almost surely see a unilateral government effort, probably with only insignificant participation by business.

## APRIL 22—QUEEN ISABELLA DAY—EARTH DAY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the month of April continues to add days and dates immortal in the history of America. In this month of challenging space and conserving the earth—we might well harken back to our beginnings.

It is only natural that Americans—hanging on the fate of Apollo 13 and the peril of the astronauts—should think back to another daring exploration—the discovery of America itself.

April 17, 1970, will forever be cherished as the day of happy recovery of our space explorers—in answer to the prayers of the entire world.

And April 17 happens to be the anniversary of the contract of exploration between Christopher Columbus and Queen Isabella of Spain.

For it was on that very day and date in the year 1492 that the royal agreements were signed and sealed—and Columbus could begin to assemble his fleet of three ships and his crew of 88.

It was his reward for his years of persistence in "selling" his idea that the earth was round—that the East could be reached by sailing West—and that untold riches awaited those with courage to sail the uncharted seas.

It was sort of a birthday gift, for within a week, on April 22, 1492, Isabella would celebrate her 41st birthday.

Historians have called Isabella "the godmother of America"—and there is a growing movement that her part in the discovery of America should be recognized in a general observance of her birthday.

Among such items of observance is a proclamation of the Honorable Joseph A. Doorley, Jr., Mayor of the city of Providence, so designating April 22 as Queen Isabella Day "so that schools and citizens should appropriately observe this significant event in the history of the world."

I ask unanimous consent that the mayor's proclamation be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, we find that history has a tendency to repeat itself—as we recall the trials and triumphs of the Great Discoverer—succeeding in his quest beyond all mishap and even mutiny.

It is a centuries-old document of human courage—justifying Columbus' faith in himself and Isabella's faith in Columbus—to risk the then princely—or queenly—sum of $8,000 in an adventure that has so affected the destiny of mankind.

It will pose again the question whether the discovered continents were not a liability rather than a profit for Spain as she poured her manpower into immigration and development of the distant lands—Spain was gradually sapping her inner strength and losing her dominance in the world.

There might be a lesson for America to conserve her own strengths—her manpower and material resources—against a day of reckoning in a competitive world.

It will help us to understand the problems that beset the head of government in a world that grows too close for comfort even as it grows greater—and faces new dangers as its destiny takes on new dimensions of space—new dimensions of survival.

It is a good omen that survival and conservation bestir America on Queen Isabella's anniversary—that her birthday is also Earth Day.

It means America's solemn resolution that, looking back over these 500 post-Columbus years, we are determined to conserve the glorious promise of the past—that America shall have an imperishable tomorrow of beauty, liberty, opportunity, sanity, equity, and security.

EXHIBIT 1

CITY OF PROVIDENCE,
*Providence, R.I.*

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, April 22, 1970 marks the 519th anniversary of the birth of Queen Isabella, dynamic Castillian queen, who through her faith and confidence in Christopher Columbus, gave the civilized world a new dimension, and

Whereas, Queen Isabella, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon, by her support of Columbus in his plans for exploration, earned for herself a unique place in the history of Western civilization, and

Whereas, in her own time, Isabella was a queen noted for her clear intellect, energy, virtue and patriotism, and

Whereas, the qualities of confidence in the future, spirit of adventure with a purpose and sacrifice in the cause of human progress exhibited by Queen Isabella are characteristics worthy of emulation in our twentieth century era of exploration.

Now, therefore, I, Joseph A. Doorley, Jr., Mayor of the City of Providence, do hereby proclaim April 22, 1970 as Queen Isabella Day in Providence and urge that all citizens, schools, historical and other interested organizations suitably observe this significant event in the history of the world.

In witness whereof, I, Joseph A. Doorley,

Jr., hereunto set my hand and caused my seal to be affixed this 15th day of April 1970.

JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, JR.

## NATIONAL SECRETARIES WEEK

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. President, April 19 through April 25 is National Secretaries Week. Yesterday, April 22, was Secretaries Day. The purpose of setting aside this specific week and day is to draw attention to the role which professional secretaries play as management's good right arm. In business, in industry, in education, in the professions, and certainly in government, secretaries provide invaluable and absolutely essential assistance. I am certain that my colleagues here in the Senate could not function even for a day without the splendid, unselfish, and extremely skillful assistance which their secretaries provide daily.

No longer is a secretary simply a clerk or a stenographer. She has become a true professional, trained and required to think, as well as have at her command a wide range of office skills. With the development of new and complicated office machinery, a secretary is often required to be a mechanical technician as well as a stenographer and typist. Perhaps the best definition of a secretary is an executive assistant with mature office skills who assumes responsibility without direct supervision, exercises initiative and judgment, and, perhaps most importantly makes meaningful decisions within the scope of her defined authority.

Over the years, a very distinct improvement in the standards of secretarial assistance has been evident to all of us. By improving the working environment and raising salaries, secretaries in the past 10 years have risen in stature to where now, according to the National Secretaries Association, the average secretary has 13 years of formal education. By 1980, it is expected that this will rise to 14 years, and an associate degree in secretary science will be commonplace.

For all the people of Illinois and all the Nation, I extend to our secretaries our deepest thanks and congratulations for a job well done.

## QUEEN ISABELLA DAY

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, Governor Kenneth M. Curtis of Maine recently proclaimed April 22 as Queen Isabella Day in honor of the 519th anniversary of the birth of Queen Isabella of Spain. I ask unanimous consent that the Governor's Proclamation be reprinted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MAINE.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, April 22, 1970, marks the 519th anniversary of the birth of Queen Isabella, dynamic Castillian queen, who through her faith and confidence in Christopher Columbus, gave the civilized world a new dimension; and

Whereas, Queen Isabella, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon, by her support of Columbus in his plans for exploration, earned for herself a unique place in the history of Western civilization; and

Whereas, in her own time, Isabella was a queen noted for clear intellect, energy, virtue and patriotism; and

Whereas, the qualities of confidence in the future, spirit of adventure with a purpose and sacrifice in the cause of human progress exhibited by Queen Isabella are characteristics worthy of emulation in our twentieth century era of exploration;

Now, therefore, I, Kenneth M. Curtis, Governor of the State of Maine, do hereby proclaim Wednesday, April 22, 1970, as Queen Isabella Day in the State of Maine, and urge all citizens, schools, historical and other interested organizations suitably observe this significant event in the history of the world.

Given at the office of the Governor at Augusta, and sealed with the Great Seal of the State of Maine, this Ninth day of April, in the Year of Our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Seventy, and of the Independence of the United States of America, the One Hundred and Ninety-fourth.

KENNETH M. CURTIS.

## POLLS OF ATTITUDES OF VIETNAMESE PEOPLE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, during a hearing on March 19, when the Committee on Foreign Relations heard testimony from Mr. Edward Nickel, Director of the Joint United States Public Affairs Office in Vietnam, questions were raised concerning the taking of polls of attitudes of the Vietnamese people. Mr. Nickel was under instructions not to discuss this subject, but I have since received from the U.S. Information Agency copies of the polls that have been taken from 1965 to 1970. Unfortunately, they are classified and cannot be made available to the general public. I see no reason for classifying them and have asked the Director of the USIA to review this entire question.

In view of the general interest in this subject, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an exchange of correspondence between myself and Mr. Shakespeare. I hope that future USIA polls in Vietnam will be made available to the public.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 31, 1970.

Mr. FRANK J. SHAKESPEARE, JR.,
*Director, U.S. Information Agency,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SHAKESPEARE: As you know, there was considerable discussion during the Committee's recent meeting to hear Mr. Edward J. Nickel concerning U.S.I.A. or other government sponsored polls taken in Vietnam and elsewhere. I hope that your Agency will supply the Committee with the polls which were requested prior to and during the course of the hearing.

The March 20 issue of the Baltimore Sun, copy of which is attached, reports that the chief information officer for the U.S.I.A. stated that there was an agreement between the U.S.I.A. and the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information of the Government Operations Committee concerning the public release of polls. If there is such an agreement, I would appreciate your providing this Committee with the details and also information on whether or not the Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs were consulted prior to the time that agreement was reached.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
*Chairman.*

USIA AIDE REFUSES SENATE DATA ON VIET OPINION POLL

(By Gene Oishi)

Washington, March 19—The United States Information Agency refused today to give the Senate Foreign Relations Committee any information on public opinion polls it has taken in Vietnam.

Edward J. Nickel, director of the USIA's joint United States public-affairs office in Saigon, said he had been forbidden by his superiors to give information on polls because of "the possible security involved."

APPLIES LEVERAGE

Senator J. William Fulbright (D. Ark.), committee chairman, pointedly reminded Mr. Nickel that his committee has the authority to hold up the USIA's budget, then went on to assail the USIA for supporting the South Vietnamese effort to "indoctrinate and brainwash" the Vietnamese people.

Mr. Nickel testified that he runs a $10.8 million-a-year operation in Vietnam, with much of his office's effort going toward giving technical and financial assistance to the South Vietnamese Ministry of Information.

His own salary is $45,473, not including a car and housing, he said.

USIA's operation in Vietnam—which includes radio and television broadcasts, airdrops of leaflets and publication of newspapers and magazines—is in addition to the propaganda operations of the United States military, Mr. Nickel testified.

GREATEST ANNOYANCE

Senator Fulbright was mostly angered, however, by Mr. Nickel's refusal to provide information on the poll in an open hearing.

"You don't consider the USIA a sensitive operation as the CIA, do you?" Mr. Fulbright asked. "You have no authority to engage in any covert operations, do you?"

The witness answered, "No, sir," to both questions, but still declined to give any further information.

Eugene Rosenfield, chief public information officer for the USIA, when reached by telephone at USIA headquarters, said that Mr. Nickel had acted in accordance with an agreement reached in 1962 between the agency and Representative John E. Moss (D., Calif.), chairman of the subcommittee on foreign operations and government information.

IN PRIVATE ONLY

According to the agreement, the USIA is to provide all polling information to appropriate committees—including the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—but only in executive sessions, Mr. Rosenfeld said.

Under USIA policy, he said, poll results are made public two years after they are taken, but only if national security is not involved.

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY,
*Washington, D.C., April 6, 1970.*

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,*
*U.S. Senate.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your letters of March 10 and 31, 1970 requesting the results of our research into the attitudes of the Vietnamese people.

I am enclosing classified copies of the surveys conducted in Viet-Nam from 1965 to 1970. Interviewing and data processing were handled by the Center for Vietnamese Studies, the Saigon associate of Gallup International, Inc. USIA American personnel assigned to the Joint U.S. Public Affairs Office (JUSPAO) analyzed the data provided by the Center.

These studies are made for our specialized operational needs. The survey findings are interpreted in the light of the inevitable bias associated with any effort to poll attitudes in war-time Viet-Nam. Interviews can only be conducted in relatively secure areas and respondents are likely to avoid candid

replies to certain questions. Nevertheless, the surveys do provide some parts of a pattern of public opinion to guide us in our programs. But public disclosure of these findings would give a distorted picture to someone not familiar with the entire operation.

I am also enclosing for your information an explanation of USIA policy concerning the availability of its foreign public opinion surveys and supplemental information. This Agency reached an understanding in 1963 with Representative John E. Moss, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information of the Committee on Government Operations, regarding the classification of our surveys and release of polling data to Committees of the Congress. This was an outgrowth of the unauthorized release of classified USIA polls which became a major factor in the 1960 Presidential campaign.

I find no definite indication that the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Foreign Affairs were consulted prior to the formalization of this understanding. However, our General Counsel, Charles D. Ablard, discussed the matter with Mr. Stanley Plesent, who was the General Counsel at the time of that understanding with Representative Moss, who says it is his recollection that there were discussions with staffs and members of both Committees. In any event, since 1963 both Committees have been provided public opinion poll data and there has been no breach of security on information provided the Congress about these surveys.

I must emphasize both the limited application of the Vietnamese surveys and their classified nature. Unauthorized release of this material would seriously compromise national security.

I hope this letter and the enclosed material are responsive to your questions. Please do not hesitate, however, to call on my office if you would like to have any further information.

Sincerely,

FRANK SHAPESPEARE.

---

ATTACHMENT A.—USIA POLICY CONCERNING AVAILABILITY OF ITS FOREIGN PUBLIC OPINION POLLS

In 1963 the Agency reached an understanding with Representative John E. Moss, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information of the Committee on Government Operations, concerning the availability and classification of such surveys. This was an outgrowth of the release of classified USIA polls during the 1960 campaign which became a major factor in the election. Below is the statement of the policy adopted in 1963 which remains in effect today.

1. Foreign public opinion polls bearing the classification "Confidential" and the contracts under which such polls were taken will, upon request by the Chairman of the appropriate Committees or Subcommittees of the Congress, be made available to the requesting Chairman and the ranking Minority Member of such Committees or Subcommittees. This availability will be made with the understanding that the material furnished will not appear in the records of the Committees or Subcommittees nor in any way be made public.

2. Polls bearing the classification "Confidential" will be declassified automatically two years after their completion unless at that time the interests of national security require them to remain classified. The declassified polls will be available at any time upon request of Members of Congress or the Press.

3. Polls bearing the designation "Official Use Only" will, upon request by the Chairman of the appropriate Committees or Subcommittees of the Congress, be made available to the Members of such Committees or Subcommittees. This availability will be made with the understanding that the material furnished will not appear in the records of the Committees or Subcommittees nor in any way be made public. One year from the completion of these polls, they will be available at any time upon request of Members of Congress or the Press.

4. Since USIA lacks authority to disseminate classified material originating in other Agencies of Government, documents in which such classified material is integrated with our polls will not be made available. The polls contained in such documents will be isolated from the other classified material and treated in accordance with points 1, 2 and 3 above.

ATTACHMENT B. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. The sampling pattern used by the Center for Vietnamese Studies has varied depending on the study's design. This in turn has been dictated by the individual study's purposes. Both sampling plan and study purposes are described in each of our reports.

2. You will note from the reports that our study specifications have not enabled us to report the data according to a District and Provincial pattern.

3. In view of certain inevitable biases associated with any effort to poll attitudes in wartime Viet-Nam, it could be highly misleading to accept the results of any single question taken by itself as a precise reflection of the thinking of the entire public being sampled. Patterns of responses should be taken into account.

4. We do not have in our files in separate form the questionnaires with which the Center worked. Please note, however, that the tables which accompany our reports do indicate every question which was asked.

5. CORDS also conducts a program to measure attitudes related particularly to the pacification and development program in the Provinces; however, JUSPAO has no responsibility for, nor substantive involvement in these studies.

6. Attitudinal surveys such as those attached are presently being fielded in Viet-Nam as part of a continuing program to assist operating officials to measure the attitudes of the South Vietnamese people.

7. Public opinion surveys as conducted by USIA have two primary purposes: (1) Agency programming and policy officers require accurate information on certain aspects of the climate of opinion in the countries in which our program are fielded, and (2) the Agency also requires accurate readings of foreign attitudes over a broad range of subjects to fulfill its function as psychological advisor to the Executive.

8. The current cost per interview in a survey of 40 questions, taken of a modified probability sample of the general population in some key capital cities, is as follows: Manila, $10 . . . Bangkok, $16 . . . Tokyo, $5.50 . . . New York, $18 . . . London, $11 . . . Saigon, $9.50 . . . Danang/Hue, $15.

---

U.S. SENATE,
*Washington, D.C.*

Mr. FRANK SHAKESPEARE,
*Director,*
*U.S. Information Agency,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SHAKESPEARE: I have your letter of April 6 concerning the U.S.I.A. polls that have been taken in Vietnam. I appreciate your cooperation in providing the Committee with the polls that have been taken in Vietnam, as well as the background information enclosed with your letter.

After reviewing these polls, I am still unable to see any need for putting a security classification on them. For an agency which is supposedly devoted to promoting the free and open exchange of ideas and information, the suppression of polls not relating to military operations or similar matters seems most unusual and uncalled for. I hope that this entire question will be reviewed.

As to the matter of an agreement with the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information of the House Committee on Government Operations, I wish to make it clear that this Committee is not in any way bound by such an agreement. I might add that the members of the Committee staff who were here at that time have stated that they are not aware of any consultations with either members, or the staff, of this Committee about the matter.

You may recall that during the hearing on March 19 I also raised the question about U.S.I.A. polls in other countries concerning United States Vietnam policy. I would appreciate your furnishing the Committee with any analyses made during the last three years concerning foreign attitudes about our policy in Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
*Chairman.*

---

## MONTGOMERY COUNTY CITIZENS OPPOSE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIME BILL

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have on several occasions expressed my strong opposition to H.R. 16196, the District of Columbia omnibus crime bill, now pending before a Senate-House conference committee. In my judgment, this legislation contains many unconstitutional and unwise provisions.

I am gratified to know that a number of citizens and groups of citizens, both in the District of Columbia and throughout the country, are expressing their opposition to this kind of legislation. An example of this increasing public opposition is a resolution recently adopted by a group of Montgomery County citizens. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the president of the Alliance for Democratic Reform of Montgomery County, Md., and an accompanying resolution opposing H.R. 16196 adopted by that group be printed in the RECORD.

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

ROCKVILLE, MD.,
*April 15, 1970.*

HON. SAMUEL J. ERVIN,
*Old Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR ERVIN: The Alliance for Democratic Reform of Montgomery County, Maryland, a reform Democratic club of over 300 members, has passed the attached resolution. We share your concern that the House version of the District of Columbia Crime Bill is indeed a blue-print for a police state.

We are all concerned with ways to effectively eliminate crime from our society. You, however, are particularly to be commended for your efforts to insure that Congressional action in this area does not erode the basic Constitutional rights of American citizens.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND E. VICKERY, Jr.,
*President, Alliance for Democratic Reform.*

---

ALLIANCE FOR DEMOCRATIC REFORM RESOLUTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIME BILL

Be it resolved that the Alliance for Democratic Reform (ADR) wishes to make known its opposition to certain provisions contained in the proposed District of Columbia Crime Bill now before the Senate House Conference Committee. Although ADR favors in principle any proposal which conclusively attacks

the crime problem locally and/or nationally, it believes that any bill to that end must be drawn so as to prevent incursions from being made into the constitutional liberties guaranteed our citizens. Specifically, the ADR objects to such provisions as "no-knock," wire-tapping, and preventive detention provisions or any broad grants of sweeping police power to Government that tend to weaken in any way the presumptions of innocence upon which our system of justice is founded. ADR believes that unless the views previously outlined by Senator Ervin of North Carolina on the District of Columbia Crime Bill prevail in conference, the Bill should be defeated.

## TARIFF PREFERENCES FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on February 26, the Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations of the Department of State wrote to me and other Members of Congress summarizing the status of the U.S. tariff preferences proposal designed to grant generalized tariff preferences for all developing countries including Latin America. Earlier, I had conferred with Under Secretary Samuels and other responsible officials of the State Department regarding the administration's thinking on this subject.

The State Department's briefing paper of February 26 did not address itself to some of the questions that have been troubling me. As a result, I requested the State Department to provide additional information particularly as it relates to the economic value of the American proposal to the developing world. The State Department has now responded to my inquiry and I believe that Members of Congress will be interested in this reply.

I ask unanimous consent that the State Department's letter of April 15 to me and its earlier briefing paper of February 28 be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
*Washington, D.C., April 15, 1970.*

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Thank you for your letter of April 2, 1970 concerning generalized tariff preferences for the developing countries.

As you know, on October 31 President Nixon announced that the United States would press in world trade forums for the establishment of a liberal system of generalized tariff preferences for all developing countries including Latin America. Shortly thereafter, we submitted to the OECD and to UNCTAD a paper describing the type of preference system the US would like to see adopted by the prospective preference granting countries. We have made clear to the other developed countries and to the potential beneficiary countries that the President's decision was made after long and careful consideration of all the factors involved. We have also made clear, of course, that extension of preferences by the United States would require Congressional action.

We have emphasized to both the potential preference granting countries and the potential preference receiving countries that we seek a genuinely progressive and meaningful system, one which will help developing countries to increase their export earnings and thus contribute to balanced development and economic growth and one which will go as far as possible in eliminating the discrimination arising from existing selective preferential trading arrangements. We propose to reduce our duties to zero on manufactured and semi-manufactured products, excepting only textiles, shoes, and petroleum and petroleum products, and on a selective list of agricultural products. We propose to use the standard escape clause and adjustment assistance as safeguards for domestic industries and workers.

We have conducted some internal computer studies in an effort to estimate the economic value of our proposal to the developing countries and the impact of preferences on US trade and the domestic economy. Any study of this kind has obvious limitations. It involves the application of static analysis to a dynamic problem and simplifying assumptions concerning, for example, trade coverage and import and price elasticities of demand. Nor can it take fully into account the most recent trade trends since the latest available data are about two years old. The state of the US economy is, of course, another key variable. While we hope to be able to improve our studies, I can give you a brief summary of our preliminary conclusions.

In most general terms, assuming a meaningful system such as the one the United States has proposed is implemented and that dependent areas are not eligible as beneficiaries, our studies suggest that within a period of about three years imports from developing countries of manufactures and semi-manufactures (excepting textiles, shoes, petroleum and petroleum products) into the United States might increase by as much as $350–400 million. Of this amount about 60 to 65 percent would represent imports formerly supplied by developed countries, and about 35 or 40 percent would be new trade. In other words, the amount of additional imports resulting from a generalized preference system should be less than one half of one percent of total US imports.

At the same time, since the United States, provides about 30 percent of total world exports of manufactures and semi-manufactures to developing countries, we could expect those countries to spend a great deal of their new foreign exchange earnings on US products. Given this "feed-back," the net effect of preferences on our balance of payments should be quite small. There would, of course, be other effects, many of them positive. Preferential imports should, for example, result in lower prices to the consumer and, through competition, to a more efficient allocation of resources. The precise effect on domestic employment would be difficult to assess. As noted above, the standard escape clause and adjustment assistance would be available to protect domestic workers and industries. Furthermore, the President has proposed in the Trade Bill for 1970 that the escape clause and adjustment assistance provisions be modified to make them more effective.

As noted above, we are interested in establishing a preference system which is meaningful for the developing countries, and it was for this reason the President announced his determination to press for the adoption by all industrialized countries of a liberal system of generalized preferences. While the effect on our economy should be very small, especially when viewed in the context of a GNP of over $900 billion, the benefits to the developing countries should be considerable. Our preliminary studies indicate that additional annual imports from all developing countries into all 18 potential donor countries could amount to $1 billion or more within the first three years. While this certainly would not solve all of the developmental problems of the LDCs, it should be a healthy first step toward promoting industrial diversification and self-help which is so important in economic development.

I hope that this information is helpful. Should you have any additional questions, please feel free to call me or Mr. Philip H. Trezise, Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs.

Sincerely,

H. G. TORBERT, Jr.,
*Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.*

---

BRIEFING MEMORANDUM—GENERALIZED TARIFF PREFERENCES FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (LDC's)

Our proposal to extend generalized tariff preferences to the LDCs, based on the President's decision of October 31, has been disseminated to all interested Governments by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). It has been explained to foreign government officials by our Embassies, our Missions in Paris, Brussels, and Geneva, and by Department officers. In keeping with the President's decision we are seeking agreement on a common scheme of generalized tariff preferences for all LDCs which incorporates the main elements of our proposal. We have, of course, made it clear that our action will require enabling legislation by Congress.

We have been discussing intensively with the other major developed countries (DCs) a common preference scheme along the lines of our proposal. The European Communities (EC) have indicated a willingness to explore ways of bringing their scheme closer to ours on the key question of the safeguard (escape clause) mechanism. The LDCs are generally favorable to our scheme but are reluctant to take sides publicly. Their attitude seems to be that the various proposals are generally responsive to their repeated demands for preferences and that early implementation is the most important objective. Some have suggested that efforts be made to harmonize the schemes *after* they have been in operation for some time and their relative effectiveness tested.

COMMON ELEMENTS

There are certain elements in the various proposals which are, or are close to being, identical. These are:

(1) *Beneficiaries.*—There is general agreement among the DCs that the lists of beneficiary countries should be as uniform as possible, although it is recognized that complete uniformity is not possible or necessary.

(2) *Zero duties.*—In general, there is agreement that duties on all manufactured and semi-manufactured products, other than those items specifically excepted, would go to zero. Tariff reductions on selected agricultural and fishery products would vary but since these items are few in number and would have a very limited trade significance, this departure from the zero duty rule is not of great consequence. (The selected agricultural and fishery products on which the United States would grant preferences were shown on a Positive List attached to the U.S. preferences proposal. We recently submitted a supplement to our Positive List, Attachment One, to the OECD.)

(3) *Duration.*—All are agreed that the scheme will run initially for ten years.

(4) *Special Preferences* which now are granted to certain LDCs by the EC and the UK would automatically cease to exist for products covered by the generalized preference scheme since duties on these items would go to zero.

DISSIMILAR ELEMENTS

(1) The main difference in the schemes relates to the question of *safeguard procedures.* We intend to use our standard escape clause procedures and the UK, Scandinavia, and probably Canada would employ similar systems. Japan would use a tariff quota system as would the EC. EC represent-

atives say they would enforce the tariff quota limits only on certain sensitive items and would permit imports of other items at preferential rates beyond the limits unless problems affecting domestic industry arise. The so-called sensitive items would be roughly equivalent to our exceptions list with the important exception that under the EC scheme all imports, including imports of sensitive items, would come in duty-free within the quota limits whereas under our scheme no concessions would be afforded items on our exceptions list. If the EC could *de jure* commit itself to a test of injury for the non-sensitive items (similar to our escape clause procedures) the EC and US schemes would be close to uniformity on this important point.

(2) The US *exceptions list* covers three sensitive product categories—textiles, shoes, and petroleum and petroleum products. This covers over 40% of dutiable imports from the LDCs in manufactured and semi-manufactured goods. The British have proposed an exceptions list somewhat similar to ours in content but less comprehensive than ours. The Scandinavian proposal has no exceptions list. The EC and Japan also have no exceptions lists but would limit preferential imports by tariff quotas. Attached is a list of the US tariff item numbers, with summary descriptions, for the footwear and textile products which would be excepted from preferences (Attachment Two). Identification of the petroleum and petroleum products to be excepted has not yet been completed.

(3) With respect to *reverse preferences* now granted by certain LDCs to the EC and the UK, we have taken the position that the DCs concerned should volunteer to forego these preferences since the LDCs might hesitate to take the initiative to renounce them for fear of retaliation by the DCs. The EC disagrees with this, and argues that under the Yaounde Convention the LDCs have the clear option of cancelling reverse preferences, but the Community does not. The UK also has shown no disposition to announce a willingness to forego all reverse preferences. We consider it important that these reverse preferences be eliminated since they discriminate against our exports as well as exports of other countries, including Latin America.

NEXT STEPS

While there is substantial common ground in the various proposals, we have not yet achieved our goal of a common scheme. Consequently, we intend to intensify our efforts to persuade other DCs to adopt our scheme and, concurrently, to seek more active support from the LDCs. This would involve another round of high-level representations both here and abroad, probably before the next UNCTAD meeting on preferences scheduled for March 31–April 17. After such representations and after the LDC reactions from the March UNCTAD meeting are evaluated, we should be better able to decide what modifications, if any, are required in our approach.

## KEEPING PROMISES TO AMERICA'S CHILDREN

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, for a quarter of a century we have been promising food to America's schoolchildren.

Last Christmas Eve, the White House promised that each needy child would be receiving free or reduced price lunches in school by Thanksgiving, 1970.

Rodney E. Leonard, former administrator of these food programs, has written an article, "Keeping Promises," that indicates just how difficult it will be to fulfill that pledge. The article, published in the March issue of P.I.C. News, spells out the size of the job that must be done by Federal, State, and local governments between now and November. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

KEEPING PROMISES

(By Rodney E. Leonard)

(NOTE.—Mr. Leonard is the former Administrator for Consumer and Marketing Services, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and author of a recently published report, "Why Child Nutrition Programs Fail.")

The White House's Christmas gift to the nation was the promise of a school lunch for all needy children by Thanksgiving of 1970.

It was the latest in 24 years of promises to hungry children.

Jean Mayer, the President's advisor on Nutrition, said the United States has 6.6 million needy children. The latest government figures available, supplied by the President's Commission on Income Maintenance, estimate 8.6 million.

But, never mind. Those interested in providing food for children waited for the fiscal 1971 budget to see if the gift was real.

It is and it isn't. The something in the package is an I.O.U.

A detailed analysis of the budget, which the President presented on February 2, indicates that unless the states or the Congress cough up an additional $200–$400 million there will be nearly as many empty plates next Thanksgiving as there were this past November.

The new budget projects an increase of 2.8 million in the number of children participating in the National School Lunch Program over those participating in fiscal 1970.

The cost in fiscal 1970, including federal and state contributions, children's payments and local revenues, will amount to $2.3 billion. This figure assumes an average per lunch cost of 60 cents and an average of 21.6 million children served each day.

The cost in fiscal 1971 will be more than $2.6 billion, assuming an average daily participation rate of 24.4 million children to account for the 2.8 million more children to be covered. It also assumes there will be no increase in program costs because of inflation—although wholesale food costs are rising at an annual rate of about 6 percent.

Since the 2.8 million more children are supposed to be those from needy families, little or none of the additional cost of providing those lunches will be made up from fees paid by the children for their meals. All of the additional $300 million required for fiscal 1971 must be obtained from federal, or state, or local government sources.

The Administration's budget appears to propose an increase of only $11.4 million for the child feeding programs; fortunately, the funding of lunches served free or at reduced prices to needy children actually is raised by about $94 million.

However, $94 million is not nearly enough. If 2.8 million more needy children are to be supplied lunches free or at reduced prices, the projected increase in program costs will be $300 million. Some of this may be trimmed by new developments which will lower production costs, although the escalating costs of food, labor and equipment will make it difficult to achieve net savings.

It is the deficit between the Administration's $94 million and the actual cost of $300 million which must be supplied by the Congress, or the states, or local governments, if the Christmas promise is to become edible.

The gap may be even larger than $206 million. The fiscal 1971 budget estimates the special assistance program will reach 5.5 million children a day. This program is budgeted for $200 million in fiscal 1971, or an average federal reimbursement of 20 cents per meal. Assuming the U.S. Department of Agriculture will provide seven cents in commodities for fiscal 1971 just as it did in fiscal 1970, the total federal contribution for these 5.5 million daily lunches next school year will be 27 cents, leaving a total of 33 cents per meal to be provided by state and local governments. This will cost $299 million that must be provided from sources other than the children.

If the number of free and reduced price lunches is increased to 6.6 million—still too few—as pledged by the White House on Christmas eve, the additional cost to state and local governments will be $392 million.

For almost one quarter of a century, the country has been on record with a pledge to "safeguard the health and well-being of the nation's children" through the school lunch program. We went even farther. We promised to provide lunches free or at reduced prices without discrimination to all children "who are determined by local school authorities to be unable to pay the full price." The quotations are from the National School Lunch Act of 1946.

The Congress is moving to help the President carry out his pledge. In the week following Washington's birthday, the Senate passed a bill proposed by Senator Herman Talmadge, with amendments submitted by Senators McGovern, Javits and Kennedy. The legislation, which now goes to the House, shifts most of the cost for free lunches to the federal government, makes these lunches available to children whose parents earn less than $4,000 a year, and requires a plan to be developed and sent to Congress for extending food service to all children in schools. The legislation stands a good chance in the House, which last year passed a bill submitted by Representative Carl Perkins containing similar proposals. It will face a far better chance with a push from the White House.

The White House has moved us onto an even higher level—orally. This is not a small matter because it places the President's word and prestige on the line. Clearly, if he puts the full power of his office behind a national, state and local drive, the promise can be kept.

## DISCLOSURE OF KEY FOREIGN POLICY ACTIVITIES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, frank disclosure by the executive branch to Congress of key foreign policy activities—in executive session if necessary—is one basic necessity for the continued functioning of our form of democratic government.

Among the several important issues raised in the recently released Laos transcript of the Symington subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee is that of the questionable nature of that disclosure when it came to U.S. activities in Laos.

This issue was discussed on Tuesday, April 21, by two perceptive Washington journalists, Murrey Marder, of the Washington Post, and Tom Wicker, of the New York Times.

I recommend both articles to Senators for the problem they discuss is as applicable to facts developed or held by the administration on ABM capabilities as it is to our military adversaries' activities in Laos.

It also is particularly pertinent today to any present or planned military assistance activities the United States may undertake in Cambodia.

I would remind the administration that the Foreign Relations Committee

expects to be consulted before this Government takes that first step—however small it seems.

The history of Vietnam and the recently disclosed story of Laos reveals a pattern of constantly escalating involvements which grew uncontrolled from small steps first taken without full public debate of future consequences.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 21, 1970]

DECEPTION IN LAOS A DELIBERATE ONE

(By Murrey Marder)

For more than six years, the Symington Subcommittee's report on Laos shows, the United States practiced a policy of official deception about its extremely extensive military operations in Laos.

It did not do so idly or haphazardly. The policy of official deception was carried out deliberately and systematically, for what officials at the highest levels of government were convinced were sound reasons of national security. Many of those officials are still just as convinced that the reasons for deception were and are fully justified, and that U.S. operations in Laos are a "model" of an efficient, successful, relatively low-cost, effectively clandestine, counter-guerrilla operation.

On the last count, the officials may be right—the Laos operations may be a model of a successful, secret operation against tough odds. But that by no means answers the real question which is whether a handful of counter-insurgency zealots should have the right to define our national interests for us in this fashion, and then involve us in a dangerous and entangling mission without the public knowing anything about it. This is the critical moral issue raised by the Laos hearings and toward the end of the censored transcript Sen. Stuart Symington, who is anything but anti-military, and who knew from visits to Laos as much as any Senator did about the U.S. role there, raises the matter in blunt terms:

"We incur hundreds of thousands of U.S. casualties because we are opposed to a closed society. We say we are an open society, and the enemy is a closed society.

"Accepting that premise, it would appear logical for them not to tell their people (what they are doing); but it is sort of a twist on our basic philosophy about the importance of containing communism.

"Here we are telling Americans they must fight and die to maintain an open society, but not telling our people what we are doing. That would seem the characteristic of a closed society."

The situation recalls a comment made in private, by a Western European friend who is extremely pro-American and who was troubled by the international moralistic consequences of the American military intervention in the Dominican Republic in April, 1965. When the Johnson administration was caught lying about its original rationale for the intervention ("to save American lives"), this man remarked in dismay:

"This will secretly please a lot of Europeans."

"Because," he answered, "they always have resented the holier-than-thou American attitude about intervention, about imperialism, about your claim to a 'higher morality.' Now you are down in the gutter with us. The U–2 (spy-plane flights over the Soviet Union) affair was the first blow to American 'virginity'; this is the second. Now we are all moral prostitutes."

Later that year came the major American slide into Vietnam, then afterward, increasing unofficial disclosure of the clandestine American involvement in Laos.

Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee hearings on Laos showed how Congress itself is misled by artful or deliberately technical official replies to questions.

In 1968, the Laos transcript reveals the parent committee was informed that: ". . . We do not have a military training and advisory organization in Laos." The Laos inquiry confirmed that there are hundreds of U.S. "advisers" in Laos and at training bases for Laotian forces in Thailand. The Symington Subcommittee demanded an explanation.

There is no inconsistency, government witnesses responded; in military parlance, "an advisory group's" sole mission is "to provide advice . . . down to lower unit levels," came the explanation. U.S. military personnel in Laos provide "advice," but officially do not constitute "an advisory group."

His committee, Sen. Fulbright protested, was victimized by "semantics."

It is argued by many officials, members of Congress—and even newsmen as well—that nothing vitally new has been disclosed about U.S. operations in Laos that was not, or should not have been, known to any careful reader of his daily newspaper.

This is basically correct. But there is a fundamental difference in a nation that claims a standard of "higher morality" between admitting its actions officially, and having knowledge of them seep out.

In fact, this is precisely the case that the United States government argued for maintaining officially secrecy for six years, as the testimony shows: to take "official cognizance" of what it was doing in Laos carried a whole range of possible international repercussions.

Newspaper accounts can be disavowed; a report that is inaccurate even fractionally—as accounts of secret operations are very likely to be—can be officially dismissed as containing "innumerable inaccuracies." This often has been the official response to enterprising news reports about Laos—or Vietnam, or Cambodia. It is hardly a satisfactory answer to the national moral questions raised by such clandestine military operations, therefore, to counter that "everyone" knew about them anyhow, so there was no real deception.

Nor is it any moral "out," as Sen. Symington noted, to shift blame to the Central Intelligence Agency for operational activities it was directed to perform by the nation's leadership. The moral responsibility is government-wide.

Those who express bafflement about why a younger generation loses faith in the words of its leaders will find some answers in the Laos transcript.

---

[From the New York Times, Apr. 21, 1970]

IN THE NATION: THE—NOT QUITE—OPEN SOCIETY

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, April 20.—Much more now is known about the secret war in Laos because of the official testimony forced by the Symington subcommittee last fall and published Monday after a lengthy struggle with the State Department over "security" clearance. The testimony also was eloquent as to how even the Senate was misled for years about the extent of the Laotian involvement.

When Senator J. W. Fulbright criticized the secrecy, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State William H. Sullivan, once Ambassador to Laos, justified it by saying that the United States had sought "to preserve, even though it may be pretty badly torn, preserve the substance of the 1962 (Geneva) agreements so that eventually we could have a reversion to the conditions which made those agreements possible."

NO OFFICIAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The North Vietnamese, Mr. Sullivan said, had "violated strenuously" the agreements, forcing the United States to do the same thing in response. But American officials had felt the agreements might be more easily reestablished if the war resulting from the violations was not officially acknowledged.

This elicited from Senator Stuart Symington something of an outburst. "Here we are telling Americans they must fight and die to maintain an open society, but not telling our people what we are doing. That would seem the characteristic of a closed society. We are fighting a big war in Laos, even if we do not have ground troops there."

Mr. Sullivan: I must say, Mr. Chairman, that I consider these hearings as a very sincere token of an open society. In other words, that we are telling the representatives of the people . . .

Mr. Symington: You would not go so far as to say we were holding them because the State Department has been urging us to hold them, would you?

Senator Fulbright then quoted Mr. Sullivan's 1968 testimony, in a secret session of the Foreign Relations Committee, that the United States "does not have a military training and advisory organization in Laos." Col. E. W. Duskin, the American military attaché in Vientiane, was then asked to describe the activities in Laos of American military personnel.

Senator Fulbright: But they do not ever give them advice?

Colonel Duskin: I did not say that.

Senator Fulbright: I am asking you, do they or don't they?

Colonel Duskin: My personnel at regional level do provide advice, yes.

Senator Fulbright: Then what is an advisory group?

ADVISORY GROUP DEFINED

Colonel Duskin: An advisory group, sir, is an organization that is constituted for the sole mission to provide advice to include it down to lower unit levels.

Senator Fulbright: . . . We are getting so technical with your semantics it is impossible for us to understand.

The Arkansas Senator also read portions of Mr. Sullivan's secret 1968 testimony, which mentioned bombing only by the Lao and not by the American Air Force, although the latter had been active since 1964.

Senator Fulbright: That very clearly leaves the impression that the Lao air force, not the U.S. Air Force, is doing what is being done. In going through this hearing in 1968, there was tentative probing on our part to see what we were doing, and I would think it is a fair interpretation of this whole record that you indicated we were not doing much, if anything, directly.

Mr. Sullivan (a little later): But if there were any direct questions asked of me about U.S. air operations—

Senator Fulbright: You see, we did not know enough to ask those direct questions, and this is what I meant about quibbling about whether the U.S. role in Laos is exclusively advisory. . . . There is no way for us to ask you questions about things we don't know you are doing.

SUBCOMMITTEE METHOD

There is one way, of course, which the Symington subcommittee ultimately had to adopt. It sent its own agents to the field in the Philippines, Thailand, Korea, Laos, and recently to Europe; on the scene, they developed the kind of first-hand information with which the Senators finally were able to get the State Department to admit most of the facts about the secret Laotian war.

So, as Senator Fulbright observed, there does not seem all that much "to brag about on the openness of the society."

## NICHOLAS DE B. KATZENBACH OPPOSES DIRECT ELECTION BUT FAVORS REFORM

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in the course of the Judiciary Committee's recent hearings on electoral college reform, former Attorney General Nicholas De B. Katzenbach submitted a most illuminating statement on the subject.

I could not agree more strongly with Mr. Katzenbach's approach to reforming such a fundamental part of our political process as the method by which we elect our President. He cautions that—

> On a matter so basic to the confidence and structure of the country, we ought not to abandon the familiar and workable for the new and untried without the clearest demonstration of need.

He adds:

> In my judgment, no such demonstration has been made.

The former Attorney General particularly emphasized the important part the present electoral system has played in maintaining our two-party tradition. He said:

> The unit rule—requiring that the total of a state's electoral votes go to the winner of the popular vote in the state, no matter how close the vote—has been one of the principal guarantees of the two-party system. Accordingly, it has been one of the crucial supports for this nation's extraordinary political stability. I strongly believe—and surely the vast majority of Americans would agree—that this is not the time to cast aside the heritage of national unity that the two-party system has historically promoted?

Mr. President, while opposing such a drastic change as direct election, it was Mr. Katzenbach who first advocated the type of electoral college reform which is incorporated in my current resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 191. Of this proposal, he says:

> S.J. Res. 191 is precise; it is sound; it is necessary. I urge you and the Congress to give it speedy and favorable consideration.

Having studied this particular proposal and the entire subject of electoral reform in considerable detail, Mr. Katzenbach is uniquely qualified to address himself to this important matter. I am certain that his statement will be of great interest to every Senator. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF NICHOLAS DE B. KATZENBACH

Mr. Chairman: I welcome the opportunity to make a statement on the subject of electoral reform.

Over the past ten years, I have had several opportunities to appear or make statements before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of this Committee on the subject of electoral reform (June 28, 1961; June 4, 1963; March 8, 1966). This statement draws upon my testimony and statements at these prior hearings in support of the view which I have consistently advocated.

The need for change in our electoral system has been long clear. No one argues that point any longer. Since the adoption of the Constitution, more than 500 proposals have been submitted to Congress to change the method of selecting a President. It is time we acted upon the issue.

### SENATE JOURNAL RESOLUTION 191

The manner of selecting the President gave the framers of the Constitution much difficulty. Direct election by the people, it was feared, would promote confusion and deprive the smaller states of an effective voice. Election either by the Congress or by the state legislatures, on the other hand, was opposed because it would deprive the President of independence.

The resulting compromise provided for election of the President by an independent body of electors, appointed in each state to serve that one function only.

The fears of the smaller states were allayed by giving each state, regardless of size, an extra two electors, and the independence of the President was to be assured by the transience of the electing body.

Each of these considerations has proved important to the working of our government. Yet the framers did not foresee what was perhaps the most valuable development of that electoral structure: the two-party system.

It had been hoped, as Hamilton noted, that in one way or another distinguished citizens would be chosen as electors. They, in turn, would exercise informed and independent judgment, free from the stress of a political campaign, to select a person well qualified for the office.

In practice, of course, the electoral college system never operated that way. Few voters knew or cared who the electors were, and the electors seldom were selected in a manner inspiring confidence in the superiority of their judgment.

Instead, national parties arose and the electors become figureheads pledged to cast their votes for the party nominees on whose ticket they ran.

The unit rule—requiring that the total of a state's electoral votes go to the winner of the popular vote in the state, no matter how close the vote—has been one of the principal guarantees of the two-party system. Accordingly, it has been one of the crucial supports for this nation's extraordinary political stability.

The fact that a party must win a popular majority in a state in order to secure any electoral votes for a President has been the most effective control on splinter parties and a decisive contribution to our national unity.

I strongly believe—and surely the vast majority of Americans would agree—that this is not the time to cast aside the heritage of national unity that the two-party system has historically promoted.

Therefore, the changes embodied in S.J. Res. 191 would seek—wisely, I believe—only to give Constitutional recognition to the actual, historical development of our system.

I believe that the more fundamental alterations of the electoral system that have been proposed would undermine the two-party system; dilute the identity of the states in a Presidential election; discourage, in many cases, political participation; and encourage divisive elements.

The changes that S.J. Res. 191 would make are not radical, but they are important. The danger of trying to preserve the present working electoral system without Constitutional sanction is not imaginary.

In 1948, a Tennessee elector, running on both the Democratic and States Rights tickets, voted for the States Rights candidate even though the Democratic candidate won a substantial plurality in the state. In 1960, Alabama and Mississippi selected 14 unpledged electors who then voted for a person who was not even a Presidential candidate. So did an Oklahoma elector, elected on the Republican ticket.

To be sure, these aberrations have been rare. But as long as electors can run unpledged or can ignore their pledge, they *can* use their present independence to block a major candidate in a close race or purposely throw an election into the House of Representatives. There is no adequate reason—even including the difficulty of decision—for tolerating these dangerous aberrations.

S.J. Res. 191 would eliminate that possibility by abolishing the office of elector and requiring the electoral votes of each state to be cast automatically for the candidates winning the popular state majority.

In short, S.J. Res. 191 would write into the Constitution the system that now exists in practice but has no Constitutional protection. The need for this reform is almost universally conceded.

Over the years, there have been three other basic plans embodied in the various proposals submitted to Congress.

The "proportional" plan, though overwhelmingly defeated in the House, passed the Senate in 1950. This plan would eliminate the unit rule binding state electors, and apportion the electoral votes of any state according to the different candidates' shares of the popular vote.

The "district" plan would also preserve electoral votes, but award only two on the basis of the statewide results and the rest on the basis of results in Congressional districts.

The "national election" or direct popular vote plan would eliminate electoral votes and the role of the state entirely and award the Presidency to the winner of a national plebiscite.

### DIRECT POPULAR VOTE PLAN

This has also been referred to as the "national election" plan. Of the three new electoral plans, this is probably the simplest and the most familiar, although it has not always been as popular as it is now. As you will recall, the Senate defeated a national election plan almost 15 years ago by a vote of 66 to 17.

On first look, the national election is the most democratic proposal. Yet under this over-simplified rallying cry, it would eliminate a number of subtle balances that have made the American system an envied model:

*First*, and most significant, by eliminating the requirement that, to be counted at all, a party win at least one state's popular majority, the national election plan would invite splinter minorities to vote their own candidates and to seek to block the election of major candidates.

*Second*, in an urban age, the influence of urban voters will be reduced. Where the vote is going to be predictably close, there are going to be very few votes to be gained by major parties campaigning extensively in urban areas, or even in appealing to urban voters as a group. There is no sense to going backward in times where dealing with the problems of large metropolitan areas is a crucial challenge of the present and future. The urban vote—which today includes much of the minority vote—has long been too ignored. Whatever influence the metropolitan vote now has in national elections (resulting in greater recognition by the Federal Government) should not be reduced.

### CONCLUSION

There is little wisdom in abandoning what we know for what we do not know because of abstract principle without real substance. Our political system is under sufficient strain today without adding new practices. We can ill afford the Balkanization of political parties, the dilution of minority influence through the adjustment of two-party politics or the predictable weakening of the influence of voters in our great metropolitan areas. A popularly elected President will feel little incentive to be more than a television personality. Our political system should not—without urgent and compelling reason—be put under pressure to diversify when we need unity, or to promote blandness when we need substance and reality.

And so, as I have said before, I strongly feel that on a matter so basic to the con-

fidence and structure of the country, we ought not to abandon the familiar and workable for the new and untried without the clearest demonstration of need. In my judgment, no such demonstration has been made. We should not substitute untried democratic dogma for proven democratic experience. And this is no time to tinker with success.

S.J. Res. 191 is precise; it is sound; it is necessary. I urge you and the Congress to give it speedy and favorable consideration.

## STEUBEN SOCIETY AWARD TO VICE ADMIRAL RICKOVER

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on Saturday, April 11, the Steuben Society of America bestowed upon Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover, of the U.S. Navy, the fifth Steuben Society Award.

Admiral Rickover, pioneer in nuclear research and father of the nuclear submarine, thus joins the previous illustrious recipients of the award—the late President Herbert Hoover—1945—the late General of the Army Douglas MacArthur—1956—J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—1965—and the late beloved Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen—1967.

The award was presented upon the occasion of the Steuben Society's 51st founders' day banquet. It might be appropriate to remind the Senate that the Steuben Sociey was founded to carry on the principles of Gen. Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben, a native of Prussia who came to our shores in 1777 to offer his heart and hand in assistance in our struggle for independence.

General von Steuben joined General Washington at Valley Forge and immediately bolstered Washington's forces. He distinguished himself at Monmouth and Yorktown, was instrumental in promulgating drill, order, and discipline regulations for U.S. troops as adopted by Congress in 1779, and he is historically credited with the fundamental idea of establishing the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.

It is most fitting, it seems to me, that the recipient of the Steuben Society Award upon its 51st Founders' Day observance, was like General von Steuben a man of persevering courage and crusading zeal. Admiral Rickover, whose vast store of energy belies his age of 70, has devoted 48 years to serving and improving the Navy he loves so much.

Holder of innumerable citations and awards, Admiral Rickover became a self-taught expert on nuclear matters and literally pioneered nuclear power in the Navy.

In 1964, with his role in American history already firmly established, he faced mandatory retirement, but President Johnson immediately reassigned him to active duty as Director of Naval Nuclear Reactors for the Atomic Energy Commission. Today he directs research on nuclear powerplants, their installation and refueling in submarines and surface ships from the Atomic Energy Center.

Mr. President, I am pleased that the Steuben Society, which seeks to memorialize the highest type of courageous public service, has chosen this year to recognize Admiral Rickover.

I ask that the Steuben Society's announcement of Admiral Rickover's selection, and the admiral's official biography, be printed in the RECORD.

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

STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA ANNOUNCEMENT

The 5th Steuben Society Of America Award To An Outstanding American: Vice Adm. Hyman George Rickover U.S. Navy, father of the nuclear submarine.

Always driven by a crusading zeal, Admiral Hyman Rickover was haunted by the thought that time may run out before he had completed his "revolution" of the U.S. Navy which he loves dearly. He fought a tough battle with a then obstinate administration until he won the support of the U.S. Congress. Finally, in 1963, the Navy, after years of opposition, accepted the Rickover doctrine that the surface fleet of combatant ships should be converted to nuclear power. He did pioneer work in leading the Navy into the nuclear age. One of the missile carrying ships is the "Von Steuben" SSB (N) 632.

Admiral Rickover's experiences in the nuclear reactor program have led him to his sometimes outspoken, sometime philosophical indictment of the American industrial and school system. He has no patience with waste and inefficiency.

The future Admiral had a hard beginning when he entered the Naval Academy in 1919. His father was a tailor who had immigrated from Russia and settled in Chicago, where young Rickover was born and attended the public schools. In his early Naval career he went through the normal jobs of an engineering officer, serving aboard ships and at shipyards. Not until after World War II did he arouse controversy, when he began pressing the Navy to study the feasibility of developing nuclear propulsion for submarines.

Rickover, already an engineer, got some of his special interest in harnessing atomic power during a brief assignment with the war-time Manhattan project, which developed the atomic bomb. Since then, he has been self-taught on nuclear matters. Out of his efforts came the Nautilus the first atomic submarine, and the construction of the nation's first large-size atomic power station at Shippingsport, Pa.

In 1965 he was awarded the Enrico Fermi Medal, one of a total of 52 awards, medals and citations.

With his mandatory retirement in 1964, his prominent place in American Military history was firmly established. But, retirement was not for him. The then President Johnson immediately reassigned him to active duty as the Director of Naval Nuclear Reactors for the Atomic Energy Commission, so he could continue his tireless efforts to modernize the United States Navy.

Today he directs the research on nuclear power plants, their installation and refueling in the submarines and surface ships of the U.S. Navy from the Atomic Energy Center. While his specific field is nuclear propulsion, he keeps a close watch on the conversion of the ballistic missile submarines to Poseidon missile carrying ships, increasing their power ten fold. He does not hesitate to call the ships captain, even at his home, when the project is not progressing as well as he feels it should.

The "Father" of the nuclear submarine is uncompromising in his insistence upon exact performance of duty, absolute loyalty, dedication to service to Country and genuine patriotism of the men who serve in the nuclear submarines.

He is held in high esteem by all who serve under him as well as the officers on the highest echelons of the United States Navy and is considered an outstanding patriot, serving beyond the call of duty, without much public notice and without fan-fare.

We salute Vice Admiral Hyman George Rickover, U.S.N., a genuine Patriot.

WARD LANGE,
*National Chairman.*
EDWARD J. SUSSMANN,
*National Secretary.*

BIOGRAPHY OF VICE ADM. HYMAN GEORGE RICKOVER, U.S. NAVY, RETIRED

Hyman George Rickover was born on January 27, 1900. He attended John Marshall High School, Chicago, Illinois, before his appointment in 1918, from the State of Illinois, to the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland. He was graduated and commissioned Ensign on June 2, 1922; subsequently he advanced, attaining the rank of Vice Admiral to date from October 24, 1958.

Following graduation from the Naval Academy in 1922, he had consecutive duty afloat until April 1927 on the USS LA VALLETTE and the USS NEVADA. Ordered detached from the latter, he returned to Annapolis, for instruction in electrical engineering at the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School. He continued the course at Columbia University, New York, New York, from which he received the degree of Master of Science in electrical engineering in December 1929.

Between January and June 1930 he had submarine training at the Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, and afterwards served consecutively in the USS S-9 and the USS S-48. From July 1933 until April 1935 he was attached to the Office of the Inspector of Naval Materiel, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Sea duty aboard the USS NEW MEXICO followed, and when detached from that battleship in the fall of 1937, he assumed command of the USS FINCH on the Asiatic Station, commanding her until later that year when he was selected for Engineering Duty and reported for duty at the Navy Yard, Cavite, Philippine Islands.

In June 1939, he was assigned to the Bureau of Ships, Navy Department, Washington, D.C., where he remained throughout the greater part of World War II. "For exceptionally meritorious conduct . . . as Head of the Electrical Section of the Bureau of Ships . . ." he was awarded the Legion of Merit on February 7, 1946. The citation follows:

"Overcoming tremendous procurement difficulties created by shortages in materials, manpower and manufacturing facilities at a time when an unprecedented increase in production of electrical equipment was required to meet the needs of our rapidly expanding Navy, Captain Rickover rendered invaluable service in obtaining competent engineers to man the Electrical Section, in determining the raw materials required, in scheduling and expediting production and in providing adequate manufacturing facilities for all electric power and lighting equipment necessary for the Navy's shipbuilding and maintenance program. Working with foresight and ability, he brought about continual improvements in electrical equipment to meet the developing and expanding needs of modern naval warfare, thereby contributed to the increased military effectiveness of the vessels of the Fleet and to the successful prosecution of the war."

Between April and July 1945 he had temporary duty on the Staff of the Commander, Service Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet, after which he became Industrial Manager, Okinawa, with further duty as Commanding Officer of the Naval Repair Base, Okinawa. Here he was in charge of building the Repair Base and facilities to repair vessels which might be damaged in the impending attack on Japan. "For meritorious service (in that capacity) . . . from July 20 to November 26, 1945 . . ." he received a Letter of Commendation, with authorization to wear the Commendation

Ribbon, from the Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

In December 1945 he reported as Inspector General, NINETEENTH Fleet, with headquarters at San Francisco, California, and remained there until May 1946. The NINETEENTH Fleet was engaged in "mothballing" vessels of the Pacific Fleet. He was then assigned to the Manhattan Project at Oak Ridge, Tennessee. He received a Letter of Commendation from the War Department, with authorization to wear the Oak Leaf Cluster on his Commendation Ribbon. The citation follows:

"For outstanding service in connection with the development of the Atomic Bomb as Assistant Director of Operations, Manhattan District during the period June 4, 1946 to December 31, 1946."

From September 1947 to February 1949 he had duty in connection with nuclear propulsion in the Bureau of Ships, Navy Department. He was then assigned to the Division of Reactor Development, United States Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C.

In July 1952 he received a Gold Star in lieu of a Second Legion of Merit, "For exceptionally meritorius conduct in the performance of outstanding services to the Government of the United States as Chief of the Naval Reactors Branch, Division of Reactor Development, United States Atomic Energy Commission, and as Director of the Nuclear Power Division of the Navy Bureau of Ships, from March 1949 to July 1952. . . ."

The citation further states:

"Displaying exceptional talents in the field of Mobile Power Reactors and exercising unceasing drive and energy, Captain Rickover more than any other individual, is responsible for the rapid development of the nuclear ship program. He has held tenaciously to a single important goal through discouraging frustration and opposition and has consistently advanced the submarine thermal reactor well beyond all expectations; his efforts have led to the laying of the keel of the world's first nuclear powered ship well in advance of its original schedule. His careful and accurate planning, his technical knowledge and his ability to clarify and resolve problems arising between Atomic Energy Commission, the Bureau of Ships and civilian contractors, have proven a contribution of inestimable value to the country's security and reflect great credit upon Captain Rickover and the United States Naval Service."

In January 1961, Secretary of the Navy William B. Franke presented him with the Distinguished Service Medal. The citation follows in part: "For exceptionally meritorious service . . . from January 17, 1955 to January 17, 1960 while in charge of the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program in the Department of the Navy and in the United States Atomic Energy Commission. Though Vice Admiral Rickover's skillful technical direction, unusual foresight, and unswerving perseverance, the United States has attained preeminence in the field of naval nuclear propulsion. His vision in the training of the crews of our nuclear-powered ships, and his insistence on high engineering standards are influencing those who bear a responsibility in preparing the Navy and the Nation for the demanding and exacting trials of the nuclear and missile age. As a result of his untiring and relentless efforts, nuclear propulsion has provided us with the foundation of the new Navy—nuclear-powered submarines which have revolutionized naval offensive and defensive tactics and nuclear-powered surface ships free to go anywhere at any time. Nuclear propulsion, developed under his astute leadership, will take place in history as one of the key developments profoundly affecting all the navies of the world. In addition to his major efforts in the nuclear propulsion field, Vice Admiral Rickover has made other important contributions in the field of Naval Engineering and has always been a source of wise counsel in matters affecting both the Navy and the national interest . . ."

"For exceptionally meritorious service . . . as Manager, Naval Reactors, Division of Reactor Development, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, and as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ships for Nuclear Propulsion from January 1961 to January 1964 . . ." he was awarded a Gold Star in lieu of the Second Distinguished Service Medal. The citation further states: ". . . Vice Admiral Rickover exercised dynamic leadership and outstanding professional competence in assuring the continuing contributions of a major element in our national capability to deter aggression. He skillfully directed the efforts of his staff toward the cooperative development of the POLARIS weapons system to its present advanced state, with sixteen POLARIS submarines now in active service and twenty-five more under construction. In addition, during this period, the nuclear-powered surface ships, ENTERPRISE, LONG BEACH and BAINBRIDGE, joined the Fleet. These ships, each of a different combatant type, are establishing high standards for the new fleet of combatant surface ships to follow. Under Vice Admiral Rickover's leadership, the cost of United States naval nuclear propulsion plants has been lowered, reactor core life has been increased, and significant improvements in simplicity and dependability have been achieved. His contributions in the field of civilian reactors have been important factors in the continued development of these units. He has exerted continued development of these units. He has exerted considerable influence on the industrial community in general with his keen insight and discerning comments on quality control and product reliability . . ."

On February 1, 1964 he was transferred to the Retired List of the U.S. Navy, but continued to serve in the United States Atomic Energy Commission with additional duty as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ships for Nuclear Propulsion, Navy Department. Upon the reorganization of the Navy Department, effective May 1, 1966, his additional duty title was changed to Deputy Commander for Nuclear Propulsion, Naval Ship Systems Command.

In addition to the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit with Gold Star and the Commendation Ribbon with Oak Leaf Cluster, Vice Admiral Rickover has the World War I Victory Medal; the China Service Medal (1937); American Defense Service Medal; American Campaign Medal; World War II Victory Medal; Navy Occupation Service Medal, Asia Clasp; and the National Defense Service Medal. He is an Honorary Commander of the Military Division of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, citation for which follows:

"As Head of the Electrical Section of the Bureau of Ships, Captain Rickover rendered very valuable assistance in supplying of electrical equipment to be used in the Royal Navy, and his cooperation, in placing at the disposal of the Royal Navy results of electrical research and development in the United States Navy, was one of the very greatest value to the Admiralty."

Admiral Rickover presently resides at 4801 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, Washington, D.C. He is married to the former Ruth Dorothy Masters of Washington, D.C.; they have one son, Robert Masters Rickover.

---

## LEGAL SCHOLARS OPPOSE LOWERING VOTING AGE BY STATUTE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on March 13, the Senate passed the so-called "voting rights" bill which included an unwise and unconstitutional provision giving 18-year olds the right to vote in local, State, and national elections. Regardless of the merits of extending the franchise to younger Americans, this attempt to circumvent the process of constitutional amendment is a dangerous affront to our constitutional form of Government. Expediency appears to have prevailed over sound constitutional principles.

I am encouraged to learn that several outstanding legal scholars have expressed their opposition to their provision of the Voting Rights Act. I ask unanimous consent that a letter to the editor of the New York Times from these distinguished lawyers be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT FAVORED FOR LOWERING VOTING AGE

To the Editor:

As The Times has reported, the Justice Department opposes, as unconstitutional, the pending proposal to lower the voting age in national and state elections to 18 by statute.

As constitutional lawyers—some of whom favor and some of whom oppose lowering the voting age, and none of whom counts himself a knee-jerk partisan of all Justice Department positions—we believe the Department is right on this very important constitutional issue. Our reasons are these:

1. Within broad limits, the Constitution leaves states free to set qualifictaions for participation in national and state elections. The limits are these: Those qualified to vote for the most numerous branch of the state legislature must be permitted to vote for Representatives and Senators.

No would-be voter can be excluded from any election on grounds of race (the 15th Amendment) or sex (the 19th Amendment). And no state can impose a poll tax in any national election (the 24th Amendment) or, in any election, prescribe a voting qualification so invidious or irrational as to be a denial of the equal protection of the laws (Section 1 of the 14th Amendment).

2. Those who believe Congress can lower the voting age by statute argue in substance that Congress can declare that the 46 states with a minimum voting age of 21 are denying younger would-be voters the equal protection of the laws.

Reliance is placed on Katzenbach v. Morgan, where the Supreme Court sustained a Federal statute barring states from denying the vote to Americans of Puerto Rican origin literate in Spanish but not in English. Katzenbach v. Morgan makes sense as part of the main stream of 14th Amendment litigation, policing state restrictions on ethnic minorities. But it has little apparent application to a restriction affecting all young Americans in 46 states.

3. There is a further, and to us conclusive, reason why Katzenbach v. Morgan is unavailing: The long-ignored Section 2 of the 14th Amendment explicitly recognizes the age of 21 as a presumptive bench mark for entry into the franchise. It surpasses belief that the Constitution authorizes Congress to define the 14th Amendment's equal protection clause so as to outlaw what the Amendment's next section approves.

A statute lowering the voting age would raise the expectations of ten million young Americans—expectations likely to be dashed by a judicial determination that the statute is unconstitutional. This lends point to the fact that when heretofore the nation decided upon a fundamental change in the composition of the electorate, the consensus was embodied, in permanent and unchallengeable form, in a constitutional amendment: One hundred years ago the 15th

Amendment, enfranchising blacks, was added to the Constitution.

Fifty years ago the 19th Amendment, enfranchising women, was added to the Constitution. If, in 1970, the nation is ready to welcome into the political process Americans who have reached the age of 18, Congress should, in fidelity to our constitutional traditions, submit to the states for ratification a new constitutional amendment embodying that new consensus.

ALEXANDER M. BICKEL,
CHARLES L. BLACK, Jr.,
ROBERT H. BORK,
JOHN HART ELY,
LOUIS H. POLLAK,
EUGENE V. ROSTOW.

NEW HAVEN, April 1, 1970

(NOTE.—The writers are members of the faculty at Yale Law School.)

## SUPPLY AND DEMAND OF NO. 2 FUEL OIL

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, on Tuesday, April 7, before the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Banking and Currency Committee, impressive testimony was given about the New England heating oil problem and the competitive squeeze of the east coast independent deepwater terminal operators.

I commend to the particular attention of Senators the statement of Mr. William F. Kenny, Jr., of New York, presented on behalf of the Independent Fuel Terminal Operators Association. In his statement, Mr. Kenny presents a new—and most disturbing—analysis of supply and demand for No. 2 fuel oil. Using oil industry refining statistics, he demonstrates that there has been and will be a steady decline in refinery output of No. 2 fuel—home heating—oil, with a total drop by 1980 of 18 to 23 percent from the 1968 level. This will mean a decline in production of between 300,000 and 350,000 barrels per day. During the same period No. 2 fuel oil demand is projected to increase steadily. The result is very clear: a dangerous supply gap in heating oil will appear in the 1970's. It will obviously have two effects—even higher prices for home heating oil, and recurring shortages. Signs of the gap have already appeared in certain areas at certain times in the Northeastern States over the past few winters.

Mr. President, the projected trend would pose no problem to the American consumer but for one fact: the present oil import program prevents importation of sufficient No. 2 fuel oil to fill the supply gap.

The solution is clear and simple: more imports of No. 2 fuel oil, which is cheaper and in plentiful supply from overseas sources such as the Caribbean, for the east coast. The President could, with the stroke of a pen, amend the oil import proclamation to prevent the disastrous consequences of the steady decline in domestic refinery output of home heating oil.

The majority and minority of the task force have recommended increased imports, so I would expect that a decision to head off this critical heating oil problem will be forthcoming in the near future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Penny's statement be printed in the RECORD, and call particular attention to part 3, entitled "Supply-Demand Projection."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM F. KENNY, JR., ON BEHALF OF THE INDEPENDENT FUEL TERMINAL OPERATORS ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for the opportunity of appearing before you.

My name is William F. Kenny, Jr. and I am President of the Meenan Oil Company of New York. With me today are Arthur T. Soule of the Patchogue Oil Terminal Corporation of New York and Mr. Andrews Nixon of the Webber Tanks Company of Maine. All of us are independent deepwater terminal operators and we are appearing today on behalf of the Independent Fuel Terminal Operators Association; Mr. Soule is President of the Association.

Our Association is composed of 17 independent deepwater terminal operators along the East Coast from Maine to Florida. A membership list is included as Attachment A of my statement. All members own or control deepwater terminal facilities capable of receiving ocean-going tanker shipments, and none is affiliated with a major oil company.

In my statement today, I should like to cover four areas related to No. 2 fuel oil:

First, the nature of our business;

Second, the competitive squeeze we are experiencing;

Third, the projected supply and demand of No. 2 fuel oil; and

Fourth, a proposed solution to the East Coast fuel oil problem.

### 1. NATURE OF BUSINESS

Our member companies have terminals located in ports along the East Coast. Ocean-going tankers dock at our facilities and unload finished petroleum products, largely home heating oil, into the storage tanks that are located adjacent to the docks. Oil is then customarily pumped or barged from these tanks to smaller terminals at in-land locations for further distribution, or is sold and pumped through a system or racks at our terminal sites into tank trucks which carry the product directly to the consumer.

A deepwater terminal is a major facility and involves a substantial investment. The total investment made by our members alone for their facilities is estimated at more than $70 million.

We are wholesalers who buy product from refiners and sell to retail jobbers, dealers and consumers. In this Committee's consideration of solutions to the No. 2 fuel oil problem, it is important to realize that the marketer; aside from the major oil companies, who has facilities to receive imports and can physically bring No. 2 fuel oil from overseas.

We estimate that the total demand for No. 2 fuel oil in District I, the East Coast from Maine to Florida, is 1 million barrels per day. More than half is consumed in New England and New York State.

Independent deepwater terminal operators handle 250,000 barrels a day or 25% of the wholesale market. The remaining 75% is largely handled by major oil companies. As is apparent, the major oil companies enjoy a dominant position in the market.

### 2. COMPETITIVE SQUEEZE

The independent deepwater terminal business has known better days. Our period of greatest strength was the decade of the 1950's. During that time the large integrated oil companies produced substantial amounts of No. 2 fuel oil from their refineries and they needed outlets for this product. So they encouraged independent terminal operators and marketers to build and expand and provided us substantial supplies of product at competitive prices.

As independent businessmen, we find ourselves operating in a land of giants, for the petroleum market is truly dominated by the largest and most powerful companies in the world. We welcome competition from these giants on an equal basis. Unfortunately, we have been placed at a severe competitive disadvantage by the oil import controls instituted in 1959, which cut us off from foreign supplies; and, of course, the majors control the domestic supply of No. 2 fuel oil. Thus, our competitive situation vis-a-vis the majors has steadily worsened, particularly over the last three years and the struggle to remain in business has become more difficult. In 1969 even some of the strongest independent deepwater terminal operators began to show significant losses in their domestic No. 2 fuel operations. Attrition in our ranks due to absorption by major oil companies has been substantial, and was documented in our submissions to the Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Control.

Rather than take up the Committee's time with a detailed analysis of our competitive problems, I ask your permission to include in the record copies of our July 15 and August 15 submissions to the Task Force which describe these conditions in some detail.

The work of the Task Force has given us great encouragement. Both the majority and minority reports recognize our competitive problems and the need for increased imports.

The majority report[1] concluded that "National security does not require regulating import volume so precisely as to deprive buyers—including independent refiners and marketers—of significant access to alternate supplies" (p. 69). The Report describes our problem as "a competitive squeeze upon independent marketers vis-a-vis their supplier-competitors, the forward integrated refiners. (p. 77).

The Task Force rejected a prohibition on product imports altogether stating that this would "deprive independent marketers—of No. 2 home heating oil, gasoline and other products—of sources that might otherwise serve as a competitive restraint on refineries integrated forward into distribution." (p. 82)

The minority report took note of our specific problem and recommended "allocations of No. 2 heating oil imports for terminal operators in District I on a basis equal to that allowed to oil refiners." (p. 364).

In brief, there has been widespread recognition due in large measure to the efforts of this Committee, of the general problem of East Coast No. 2 fuel oil imports and the more specific problems of the competitive squeeze upon the independent deepwater terminal operators.

That competitive squeeze can be described in a few brief sentences.

1. Although we have the physical facilities to import oil, we are forbidden under the present control system from importing No. 2 fuel oil.

2. We are forced to depend, for our supplies of this product, on domestic refiners, largely major oil companies.

3. These same oil companies who supply us with products also compete directly with us at the wholesale and retail level, thus creating for us the classic problem of competing directly in the sale of a product with the same people who supply us with that product.

4. The major oil company refiners have been cutting back steadily over the past few years in supplies made available to independent terminal operators on long-term (1 year or more) contracts or at competitive (i.e. posted) prices. Each year supplies avail-

[1] Attachment B contains Comments on Appendix L of the Task Force.

able to us have been cut-back over the previous year. And indications are that the Winter of 1970–71 will be even worse, for even the few companies who in the past two years could be relied upon for substantial supplies are indicating that they will have less product. Their reason is clear: they are producing less No. 2 fuel oil from their domestic refineries, because of the obvious economic advantage in producing more profitable products, such as gasoline and jet fuel. And a dangerous supply gap in home heating oil is developing.

Thus, we will be forced to reduce our business volumes year after year, to the point where we will go out of business, because it will be economically unprofitable.

I might add that we do not blame the major oil companies nor do we contend they are engaging in anti-competitive behavior. They have simply taken advantage of a situation presented to them by a United States Government control program, which grants them, through an accident of time, a substantial competitive advantage. For the program gives them access to overseas supplies of No. 2 fuel oil and of crude oil while it denies access to us.

The Federal Government is to blame for the current situation, and the Government must provide relief if competition is to be restored in the East Coast No. 2 fuel oil market.

3. SUPPLY-DEMAND PROJECTIONS

Perhaps most disturbing from our point of view as marketers of No. 2 fuel oil, and from the point of view of consumers of No. 2 fuel oil, have been projections and statistics on No. 2 fuel oil supply and demand. As these have come to light only recently, I believe they will be of particular use to this Committee.

The November 10, 1969 issue of the authoritative *Oil and Gas Journal* projects a radical drop in the yields of middle distillates. Middle distillates includes No. 2 fuel oil and diesel fuel. According to the *Journal*, this drop will primarily be brought about by the installation of hydro-cracking equipment. Hydro-cracking equipment enables a refiner to increase his yields of gasoline and jet fuel from each barrel of crude oil.

The projections are as follows:

CRUDE YIELDS OF U.S. REFINERIES

[In percent]

| | 1968 | 1980 |
|---|---|---|
| Gasoline | 45 | 52 |
| Jet | 8 | 13 |
| Middle distillates (No. 2 fuel oil and diesel oil) | 22 | 15 |
| Residual | 7 | 3 |
| Other | 18 | 17 |

The critical figure is, of course, the drop of distillate yield from 22 to 15%. If these yield percentages are translated into volume figures based on the *Journal's* forecast of 17 million barrels per day of crude oil runs in 1980, the total domestic middle distillate output in 1980 is shown to be 2,550,000 barrels per day, compared to 2,297,000 barrels per day in 1968, an increase of only 11% in production over the 12 year period.

The critical question is how this production level compares with the projected demand for middle distillates to 1980. As I have indicated, the two components of the middle distillate market are No. 2 fuel oil and diesel oil, accounting currently for two-thirds and one-third respectively of the total sales. Diesel oil sales have been growing at an average annual rate of 5.7% since 1960. Authoritative projections show that it will grow at an annual rate of 4.5%—5% over the next 10 years.

Assuming that diesel demand will continue to be met from domestic sources, domestic No. 2 fuel oil supplies will consist of the difference between total middle distillate supplies and shipments to diesel oil markets. The following table indicates production at both a 4.5% and a 5.0% diesel oil growth rate.

ESTIMATED DOMESTIC MIDDLE DISTILLATE PRODUCTION

[Thousands of barrels per day]

| | 1968, amount | 1980 | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Amount | Percent change |
| Diesels (4.5 percent annual growth) | 756 | 1,282 | 69.6 |
| No. 2 fuel oil | 1,541 | 1,268 | −17.7 |
| Total | 2,297 | 2,550 | +11.0 |
| Diesels (5 percent annual growth) | 756 | 1,358 | 79.6 |
| No. 2 fuel oil | 1,541 | 1,192 | −22.6 |
| Total | 2,297 | 2,550 | +11.0 |

As can readily been seen, if projected diesel oil supplies are to be met, No. 2 fuel oil supplies must decline by 18%–23% from their 1968 level! This means a decline in production of No. 2 fuel oil between 300,000 and 350,000 barrels per day!

Whether one is optimistic or pessimistic about the outlook for No. 2 fuel oil, we believe it is totally unrealistic to assume a decline in demand of about one-fifth over the next decade when No. 2 fuel oil demand has grown at an average annual rate of more than 1.5% since 1960.

According to our own forecasts—and those, we understand of the major oil companies—heating oil demand will grow at the rate of 1.5% to 2% per year for the next 10 years, given moderate increases in promotional sales and technical efforts. If these efforts are stepped up, we project a greater increase in demand. Even a relatively pessimistic forecast contained in *Energy Outlook for 1980* by the Chase Manhattan Bank, predicts no perceptible decline from the present level of sales.

Moreover, neither the Chase forecast nor our own forecast have tried to quantify the impact of one new factor which could cause a much sharper increase in demand for No. 2 fuel oil. I refer to the growing public demand for more stringent air pollution controls. No. 2 fuel oil has an extremely low sulphur content, and may be increasingly used as a partial substitute for higher-sulphur heavy residual fuel. In fact, within the last month Con Edison of New York put out a bid for 1.5 million barrels of No. 2 fuel. In this particular instance, there was simply not enough supply available to meet Con Edison's request, but should such requests become general, the overall demand projected for No. 2 fuel will surely be sharply higher than outlined in the above tables.

Turning back now to the basic supply-demand projections outlined in the *Oil & Gas Journal* study, we can see that perhaps the most significant factor, certainly that of more immediate concern, is the fact that this forecast has become a reality in the No. 2 fuel oil markets of the Northeast. Domestic refineries are already demonstrating increasing difficulty in keeping up with distillate demand. For example, in the first 11 months of 1968 compared to the same period in 1969, distillate oil demand rose by 2.8%, while the domestic refinery yield of distillates dropped by ½ of 1% (23.8% to 23.3% of total refinery runs). This amounted to a drop in total output of 3,675,000 barrels from 1968 to 1969. Even more significant is that a similar drop in yield has occurred in each of the last 5 years.

One example of the continuing increase in demand for No. 2 fuel oil in the Northeast is the fact that in New England, an area of high demand, the number of newly constructed one-family homes burning oil went from 28% in 1967 to 33% in 1968.

As this Committee knows, the U.S. oil refining industry is on record as opposing the need for imports of No. 2 fuel oil on the grounds that the product is produced in sufficient quantities from domestic sources. The projections and the facts of the market today, do not support that contention.

As marketers of No. 2 fuel oil, and as businessmen whose survival depends on a steady substantial supply of that product, we are deeply concerned. This is not a matter of a problem 10 years from now; it is a matter that is affecting us today and we believe it's a matter with which this Commitee should also be concerned. For, if the change in refining yields projected by the *Oil & Gas Journal* are approximately correct, a major supply gap in home heating oil supplies will develop during the 1970's.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it clear that while this data has and is resulting in a squeeze today on deepwater terminal operators, the real squeeze—the squeeze that this Committee should be most concerned with—is the squeeze that is going to occur for consumers in the Northeast. As you know, the majority of homes in the Northeast use No. 2 fuel oil. If supplies of this fuel are not available, the home-owner will have to convert his heating system to other energy sources. That means, since natural gas is already in short supply, that conversion will have to be made to electric heat. The initial installation in each case will represent a major capital expenditure by consumers and the day-to-day operating cost of heating homes will be substantially higher than costs today for heating with No. 2 fuel oil.

Given these facts, we are faced with two choices:

A. Continuing upward movement of No. 2 fuel oil prices as supply fails to keep up with demand, with continued attrition in the ranks of independent marketers; or

B. Increased imports of No. 2 fuel oil from lower cost sources, with provision that ample supplies be made available to independent marketers.

4. PROPOSAL

The Independent Fuel Termination Operators Association favors the second alternative—a system which would provide regular substantial access, on a continuing basis, to independent deepwater terminal operators of supplies of No. 2 fuel oil from overseas.

We are prepared to accept the judgment of both the majority and minority of the Task Force that complete decontrol is desirable. And we have taken no position between the tariff proposal of the majority and the quota proposal of the minority. We leave that basic decision to others.

However, we believe that under either proposal a workable system can be evolved to provide a greater measure of competition and arrest, and even reverse, the price escalation of No. 2 fuel oil that has occurred over the past six years.

If the quota system is retained, we propose that allocations of No. 2 fuel oil be given to independent deepwater terminal operators on the basis of a percentage of their qualifying terminal inputs with no quantitative ceiling established. We suggest that 30% of our terminal input would be a workable level. Given the statistics I have cited above, 30% of our business would amount to imports of 75,000 to 100,000 barrels per day into District I.

This level would enable us to compete on a more equal basis with the major oil companies who already have access to overseas supply of oil and, most important, would result in the introduction of increased amounts of No. 2 fuel oil directly into the East Coast market to fill the supply gap I have outlined above.

If the independent terminal operator's position is strengthened, that is, at the whole-

sale level, the position of the independent retailer further forward in the market will also be strengthened. For the forward marketers who are also competing with the major oil companies can avail themselves of alternative sources of supply, and they will no longer be forced, as they have been increasingly in the past few years, to rely on the major oil companies alone for their products.

If a tariff system is adopted we strongly urge that the tariff on No. 2 fuel be established at a level which permits importation of product, to fill the projected supply gap. As the Committee may have noted, we believe that the level of $1.55 per barrel on finished product recommended by the Task Force will not only prohibit any imports, but will actually result in price increases in the domestic market.[2] We estimate that a tariff level of $.84 per barrel could result in a consumer price reduction of 1 cent per gallon and therefore we would support the adoption of a tariff on No. 2 fuel oil at this level.

Mr. Chairman, again we appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and are most grateful for the effort which you and the members of your Committee have made toward a solution of the East Coast heating oil problem. We hope that a solution will be forthcoming soon, for, along with the consumers of the Northeast, we, as independent businessmen have been going through a difficult period. Unless relief comes and comes soon, our segment of the industry will dwindle and be phased out of existence as a competitive force.

---

MEMBERS OF INDEPENDENT FUEL TERMINAL OPERATORS ASSOCIATION

Belcher Oil Company, Miami, Florida.

Burns Brothers Oil Company, Brooklyn, New York.

Cirillo Brothers Petroleum, Bronx, New York.

Colonial Oil Industries, Savannah, Georgia.

Deepwater Oil Terminal, Quincy, Massachusetts.

Eastern Seaboard Petroleum Co., Jacksonville, Florida.

Gibbs Oil Company, Revere, Massachusetts.

Meenan Oil Company, New York, New York.

Northeast Petroleum Corporation, Boston, Massachusetts.

Northville Dock Corporation, Northville, L.I., New York.

Patchogue Oil Terminal, Brooklyn, New York.

Ross Terminal Corporation, Bayonne, New Jersey.

Seaboard Enterprises, Boston, Massachusetts.

Tappan Tanker Terminal, Hastings-on-Hudson, New York.

Union Oil Company, Revere, Massachusetts.

Webber Tanks, Bucksport, Maine.

Wyatt Coal and Oil Company, New Haven, Connecticut.

---

COMMENTS ON APPENDIX L TO TASK FORCE REPORT

The discussion in Appendix L is quite general and unspecific, and does not arrive at any firm conclusions; almost no factual data is provided to support the general observations. In large part, the Appendix raises a number of questions.

It does, however, make a number of observations that support the position taken by East Coast independent deepwater terminal operators:

1. On the question of inadequate supplies to independent deepwater terminal operators, the Appendix states that this matter may reflect the fact that "the prices at which refiners are prepared to sell and those at which large terminal operators expect to buy, differ." (pp. 315–316).

2. Wholesale prices have been going up in New England in recent years (p. 316). More particularly, that "the disappearance of a seasonal pattern . . . would change the effective supply price enjoyed by many of the terminals . . .". "Similarly . . . distress product sales may have become less important" and "a permanent reduction in the frequency of distress sales would tend to raise average supply price to Northeastern independent marketers in particular." (p. 317).

3. The import quota system has had an adverse effect on the Northeast. "No. 2 fuel oil is probably in artificially short supply in the Northeast relative to the rest of the country because the quotas have had their greatest effect there." (p. 318). This has reflections in prices in the Northeast. "There seems to be general agreement that with free importation, No. 2 fuel oil would retail for about three cents per gallon (about 17 percent) less in New England than it now does . . ." In a basic long-run sense, fuel prices are now higher in the Northeast, relative to what they might be, than is the case in other fuel oil consumer areas." (p. 318).

4. There is evidence that the integrated oil companies may be in a position to force a price "squeeze" on independent terminal operators. "There can be no doubt that freer importation of fuel oil would make a squeeze less likely." (p. 319). This is, in part, possible because "The import quota system certainly does make independent distributors more dependent on refiner-competitors because it cuts off foreign alternative sources of supply . . ." (p. 319).

5. The discussion is inconclusive on the question of whether independents are disappearing, but it is not, to the extent that disappearances have taken place, due to failures, but to acquisitions. "The long-term rise in percentage margins does not suggest that disappearance would be due to failures."

---

COMMENTS ON POINT NO. 15 OF THE APPENDIX TO SECRETARY SHULTZ' STATEMENT TO THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE, MARCH 3, 1970

Point No. 15 deals with a relatively secondary issue in a memorandum circulated by the Independent Fuel Terminal Operators Association namely, that the tariff levels on No. 2 fuel oil recommended by the Task Force are so high as to, in effect, encourage an increase in the price of No. 2 fuel oil in New England.

It should be noted that the Appendix discussion does not effectively deal with the central issue: that the level of proposed tariff is so high as to prohibit the importation of No. 2 fuel oil into the United States under present (and foreseeable) circumstances. This is the central point that has to be made, for it is only through permitting such importation to some degree that adequate supplies can be made available in the northeastern United States and that supplies of No. 2 fuel oil can be made available to independent distributors who, alone, have the potential for maintaining competition vis-a-vis the integrated companies. This being the case, the Independent Fuel Terminal Operators Association in their memorandum, pointed to the danger that a shutting off of imports of No. 2 fuel oil would reduce the degree of effective competition as well as supplies available and that the combination of these two factors would tend to induce an increase in price.

The discussion of Point No. 15 of the Appendix thus, in a sense, sets up a straw man and fails to deal with the substantial issue which is the fact that the recommended tariff would effectively bar imports of No. 2 fuel oil. Nor does the discussion under Point No. 15 gainsay the contention in the Independent Fuel Terminal Operators Association memorandum that the net effect could very well be a rise in prices. The following specific comments on the Appendix discussion of this question should be noted:

1. The Appendix asserts that the domestic price of No. 2 fuel oil is determined by domestic cost factors alone, and that the ability to import lower priced No. 2 fuel oil "results not in a lowering of the domestic price, but in unearned 'rents' to the few historical importers now permitted to import No. 2 fuel oil." The Appendix concludes that, since the domestic price of No. 2 is independent of the price of No. 2 imports "under the present quota system," a higher tariff could not affect domestic price.

These comments on the Appendix, if anything, underscore the importance of modifying the oil import control system to bring about greater competition through increased imports of No. 2 fuel oil. We agree that the small volume of imports permitted entry now have little effect on domestic prices. But, if a low tariff were set on No. 2 imports, then independent deepwater terminal operators would be in a position to provide competition to the integrated oil companies. Clearly, the integrated companies are not responsive to supply and demand factors in their pricing policies on No. 2. The only way to resolve the problem is to provide them with competition.

The implications of the Appendix discussion seems to be that such competition can never be forthcoming, but this is clearly not so. What the discussion indicates is a need to revise the present quota system to provide an opportunity for independent distributors to acquire adequate supplies of imported No. 2 fuel oil at low prices. The fact remains that, under the tariff proposal of the Task Force, the supply of No. 2 imports would be reduced and, more important, the integrated companies would enjoy the certainty of protection of their price levels accorded to them by an established government decision to maintain higher tariffs on No. 2 imports.

Under the present quota system, there always exists the uncertainty that, if they raise prices, increased quotas would be given to independent distributors; whereas, under a high tariff system that uncertainty would be removed and the integrated companies would be freer to maximize their profits without the danger of sanctions. What this discussion points to clearly is (1) that there is a need to revise the program and (2) that the revision proposed by the Task Force report would not serve to accomplish the public policy objectives that are desired.

2. The Appendix discussion notes that the proposed tariff on crude oil imports would "tend to lower the domestic price of No. 2 fuel oil by reducing the cost to refiners of domestic crude oil."

Given the pricing behavior of the integrated companies, discussed above, there is no *a priori* reason to assume that the result envisaged by the Appendix would in fact take place. Nor does the historical record support such a conclusion: one need only examine the time series data on prices for No. 2 and crude oil to see that there is little correlation between the two.

3. The Appendix discussion notes that the proposed tariff on No. 2 was designed to achieve two objectives, first, the retention of refining capacity in the United States and, second, "keeping the cost of product imports low enough to exert some competitive pressures in the domestic market and aid in relieving temporary shortages." Setting aside the fact that the second objective noted seems to contradict the observation earlier in the discussion that imports do not seem to have any significant effect on the domestic price of No. 2 fuel oil, it should be noted that the Appendix discussion seems to have second thoughts, at this point, about its own proposed tariff level. It notes that achieving this second objective, "requires a much finer tariff adjustment" and that the

---

[2] Attachment C contains Comments on Point 15 of the Appendix submitted by Secretary Shultz to the Senate Anti-trust Committee on March 3, 1970.

Task Force recommendation was only "tentative". Apparently, the recommended tariff level may, after all, be too high to permit imports to enter the country and to allow them to exercise a beneficient effect on prices and availabilities of supply. We are left then at the end of the discussion with the same problem with which we started: the Task Force recommendation of a tariff level on No. 2 fuel oil imports too high by the test of what is required in terms of the public policy objectives desired. In fact, we are told in the very last sentence that the gradual phase-out of the historical product import quotas "should be sufficient" to prevent any significant shortages or price rises (sic!) with respect to No. 2 oil due the institution of the tariff system recommended by the Task Force.

What emerges from this discussion are the following two conclusions: one, the existing quota system which is not allowed to affect the price of No. 2 fuel oil must be revised; and, two, the tariff proposal of the Task Force is not a solution to the price problem and in fact may aggravate it. We are faced then, as the Task Force was, with three alternatives: one, modification of the quota system; two, the substitution of the tariff system for the quota system; or three, substitution of an auction system for the quota system.

The substitution of an auction system can be rejected for the reasons spelled out in the Task Force Report, namely, that it would provide a means for the integrated oil companies, who have substantial financial resources and have a market strategy which they wish to pursue, to bid away supplies of imported oil from independent marketers. The fact that integrated oil companies have a market strategy with regard to No. 2 fuel oil has been amply discussed in the submissions to the Task Force of the Independent Fuel Terminal Operators Association. Their implementation of that strategy is also evident from their price behavior: evidence of this can be found in the fact that they appear never to be short of No. 2 fuel oil and are able to market it even when independent marketers cannot economically procure No. 2 fuel oil in the Gulf for delivery to New England destinations.

The independent terminal operators have no *a priori* preference between a tariff system and a revised quota system as long as each permits the entry of sufficient No. 2 fuel oil imports at a low enough price (including tariff) so that they can continue to perform their historic function as competitive marketers of this product to the consumer. A revised quota system however can be a more selective instrument in that it can permit making sufficient supplies of No. 2 fuel oil imports available to independent deepwater terminal operators without necessitating a wholesale change in the pattern of domestic production and importation of No. 2 fuel oil. In this respect, a revision in the quota system that provides allocations in sufficient quantities for independent deepwater terminal operators would minimize the disturbances that would result in terms of the objective, spelled out in the Appendix, of preventing "export" of significant refining capacity.

---

## FISH FARMING

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Mr. Roy Prewitt, one of the pioneers of the fish-farming business in Arkansas, has written an article for the American Fish Farmer, which I believe will be of great interest to the Members of this body. Fish farming is developing satisfactorily and holds much promise, not only in supplying the needed protein for the diet of our people, but, also, in giving opportunities to farmers who produce them. Some 10 years ago, the Federal Government invested a relatively small amount in an experiment station in Arkansas, and I am quite sure that the investment will be extremely profitable to the community as a whole and the businesses directly involved.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

### RAMBLING ALONG

(By Roy Prewitt)

An ancient recipe for preparing rabbit stew was prefaced with "First catch the rabbit." For more years than I like to remember I have been saying all over this land, in essence, the same thing about fish in ponds.

Man has always been intrigued with ways and means of catching fish, but curiously enough, he has made little progress in the art and science since the dawn of history. There is evidence that primitive man used nets and traps remarkably similar to those being used today.

In a speech I gave in St. Louis in the early 1960's, I stated that the only worthwhile improvement in the past 500 years was the development of nylon, but that this had been the result of a chemist's dream—who was not thinking of catching fish, but rather of women's legs. In the same speech. I used the sentence "We are still using the same methods of harvesting fish that Christ saw when He went down to the Sea of Gallilee."

I was widely quoted after the speech and shortly thereafter Donald McKernan, Chief of the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries used the quote and added ". . . and it was old then."

About the same time I found myself as the only fish farmer in attendance at a fish farming seminar on the campus at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor and was questioned by others in attendance—who were mostly scientists interested in fish farming—as to why Arkansas farmers had, in the main, quit growing buffalo fish when the market demand was good and the price was higher than that of most ocean fish. I tried to explain but without much success.

#### MECHANIZATION IS KEY

During the course of the seminar, a film was shown on buffalofish being harvested from an Arkansas pond. The water had been pulled down in a catch basin and a seine powered by men pulled the fish to the bank where they were lifted in dipnets to a wash tub. Then, two farmers started up the levee bank with the tub. The bank was slippery—as all pond banks are after the water has been lowered—and for each two feet the men stepped they would slip back one. When they were about half way up the bank I had the film stopped and told the scientists that they had just witnessed why so many Arkansas farmers had quit growing buffalofish.

I pointed out that the fish were being grown on idle land on rice farms which were the most highly mechanized farms in the world—that farmers, accustomed to the use of machinery in all their work, would never grow fish until most of the operation could be mechanized.

From that day until now, precious little progress has been made in the harvesting of pond fish by public agencies while researchers have been almost wholly concerned with growing fish but not in catching them.

It is difficult for people who are not fish farmers to understand all the problems involved in harvesting fish from ponds. As an example, a world-renowned fish scientist was recently quoted as saying that farmers could produce fish at far less cost than they could be harvested from the sea. "All a fish farmer has to do," he explained, "is draw off the water and pick up the fish."

I have tried this and I can assure you that it is impractical as every fish farmer knows.

#### FRENCH FARMING CITED

While researching the literature available on fish farming more than 30 years ago, I found a book which described fish farming in France during the middle of the last century. The author found French farmers growing fish in large level ponds very much like the ponds in the delta region of the lower Mississippi River valley and the plains of Kansas. He noted that when a farmer drained a fish pond he had to know where he was going with the fish and do so in a hurry. This is about where U.S. fish farmers have been insofar as harvesting fish has been concerned until late last year. However, American fish farmers have had more problems than "going somewhere in a hurry" with their fish. They have learned that fish lose weight and deteriorate in quality when down in a sump or catch basin, and they have had no way of knowing with any amount of accuracy how many fish and what sizes they had until all the fish could be harvested. Some fish would weigh one pound while others weighed two pounds; some buyers wanted one size while others wanted another size which required grading, always a costly and tedious process.

The power-operated haul seine, developed by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, was an improvement to some extent but it could only be used efficiently in large, flat ponds free of deep holes, vegetation and obstructions.

Of necessity, such sites required a dependable and economical water supply that could be pumped into the ponds. Under ideal conditions the seine could be brought to the bank with 40 or more thousand pounds of fish in varying sizes but the farmer still had to "go somewhere in a hurry" with his fish.

#### THE SELF-FEEDER AND TRAP

Two things happened in 1969 that appear destined to change the entire concept of building fish ponds and harvesting the fish grown in them. The first was the development of the self-feeder—notably those developed by Bruce N. Fleming of Ottawa, Kan., and Gene Poirot of Golden City, Mo.—and the second was the use of a trap device that would seem to have evolved from a feeder that has long been used for feeding land animals.

All these devices reached the market late last year and farmers were quick to see their value and immediately began to duplicate them when they found idle time on "rainy days." In the process, they were able, in many instances, to improve and refine the original designs.

It was the self-feeder that sparked the idea of Jim and Joe Adcox of Tuckerman, Ark., last October when they approached Gib Stramel, at that time production manager of Inland Fish Farms near Jacksonville, Ark., who desperately needed to "catch the rabbit." Stramel had wrestled with everything including the BCF seine and was willing to let them try. Most of what happened is recorded on page 17 of the February issue of this magazine. What was not recorded was the fact that these two men, using wire traps which they improvised on the bank of Stramel's pond, actually caught over 120,000 pounds of catfish in a little over a month. The actual cost turned out to be less than 1 cent a pound.

There is nothing new in the trap they used, but their putting a "surplus commodity station" in business for 24 hours a day in a trap is new. When they began loading out big trucks with fish every day, the word spread. Other farmers came on the run to see for themselves and rushed home to begin fashioning even better devices for their own operations.

CRAPPIE EAT DRY FEED

One farmer who called me at the time said his experimental trap had filled up with crappie and that in dressing them he found their stomachs were filled with catfish feed. I asked a prominent fish biologist if he knew that crappie would eat dry feed and he told me that he had been suspecting this after having observed their growth in catfish ponds.

It would appear that all species of fish that will eat prepared feed can also be economically harvested with traps. This includes minnows and fingerling catfish. Already, traps are being designed with netting cages as the final trap that can be detached from the main trap and towed to an unloading wharf designed to accommodate large trucks.

Traps are also being designed with grader bars so that they can be adjusted to control the sizes of fish that enter them and the sizes that are retained. A pump that is now successfully being used to pump live fish from ponds on the west coast without injury to the fish will almost certainly before long be put to use in removing fish from cages.

Doors can be left open in these traps permitting the fish to return to the pond when they are not needed. When the fish are needed, the farmer will be able to get them out on demand and get them to market in an orderly manner. His fish can also be warehoused right in the pond where they are being grown.

While the experience with the trap device described in the February issue indicates that catfish feed at lower temperatures than biologists had generally believed, catching them in the middle of winter will be a problem except in the lower southern region of the country until someone comes up with an attractant that will stimulate feeding.

Before 1969 ended, it was found that crappie could be trapped in very cold water. Not being able to trap fish in winter should not pose too much of a problem except for the fresh fish markets since fish can be processed and frozen for the rapidly growing frozen fish business.

REVOLUTION UNDERWAY

The Revolution has already been set in motion. Farmers are renovating ponds and reservoirs that cannot be harvested by conventional methods and preparing to stock them with fish. This is now beginning to happen all over the nation and plans are being made to impound water in valleys everywhere.

I believe good fresh water fish will be grown in all the rural areas of this nation within the next five years. In the next issue I will discuss in this column how ponds should be constructed and the problems that can be expected to arise.

## WISCONSIN PROCLAIMS APRIL 22, 1970, "QUEEN ISABELLA DAY"

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday, April 22, marked the 519th anniversary of the birth of Queen Isabella, the Spanish Queen who was singularly responsible for the historic journey of Christopher Columbus. Queen Isabella's tremendous insight, her willingness to listen to the preposterous claims of the Venetian explorer, and her courageous decision to finance his voyage have earned her a deserved place in our history. Certainly this country owes her a substantial debt of gratitude.

Mr. President, the State of Wisconsin has recognized the importance of April 22 as the birthday of this famous Spanish Queen, and has proclaimed April 22, 1970, to be "Queen Isabella Day." I ask unanimous consent that this proclamation issued by the Governor of Wisconsin be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROCLAMATION

Whereas, April 22, 1970 marks the 519th anniversary of the birth of Queen Isabella, dynamic Castillian queen, who through her faith and confidence in Christopher Columbus, gave the civilized world a new dimension; and

Whereas, Queen Isabella, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon, by her support of Columbus in his plans for exploration, earned for herself a unique place in the history of Western civilization; and

Whereas, in her own time, Isabella was a queen noted for clear intellect, energy, virtue and patriotism; and

Whereas, the qualities of confidence in the future, spirit of adventure with a purpose and sacrifice in the cause of human progress exhibited by Queen Isabella are characteristics worthy of emulation in our twentieth century era of exploration;

Now, therefore, I, Warren P. Knowles, Governor of the State of Wisconsin, do hereby proclaim Wednesday, April 22, 1970, as "Queen Isabella Day" in Wisconsin, and urge all citizens, schools, historical and other interested organizations to suitably observe this significant event in the history of the world.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Wisconsin to be affixed. Done at the Capitol in the City of Madison this fourteenth day of April in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and seventy.

WARREN P. KNOWLES,
*Governor.*

## SECRETARIES WEEK

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, Wednesday, April 22, was a day on which millions of Americans joined to voice their common concern with one of the Nation's most pressing problems, the pollution of our national environment. At rallies throughout the country, strong words bewailed the despoiling of our resources and denounced man as his own enemy.

There was, however, one occasion to give thanks and offer praises, for April 22 was also observed as Secretaries Day. Both in the United States and in Canada, Governors, mayors, and employers paid their tribute to a group of people who make an active and positive contribution to the education, professional, and civic growth of the community. Organizations ranging in nature from advertising association to service clubs have also participated in the observance of this event providing publicity and special programs to focus attention on the role of the secretary. Today, as Secretaries Week draws to a close, I call upon the Congress to join me in recognition of the vital part played by secretaries in government, business, education, and the professions.

The year 1970 marks the 19th annual observance of Secretaries Week, which was initiated in 1952 by the National Secretaries Association, in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Commerce. This year, extra emphasis was placed on the responsibilities of secretaries to their employers and their profession. To this end, many have taken part in secretarial seminars, providing a forum for consideration of these matters. I extend my warmest congratulations to the National Secretaries Association for the successful completion of this week of celebration and discussion, and to the secretaries themselves for their continued commitment to the betterment of our society.

## SENATOR SPONG STRESSES NEED FOR ONGOING ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN IN EARTH DAY SPEECHES

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, it has been my privilege to speak at four Virginia institutions of higher learning this week in connection with programs marking the observance of Earth Day.

I have discussed the need to improve the quality of our environment in talks at the University of Virginia, at Charlottesville; Mary Baldwin College, at Staunton; Christopher Newport College, at Newport News, and Old Dominion University, at Norfolk.

The response of the audience was gratifying. The younger generation is aware of the extent of pollution problems. I hope, however, that the present zeal for improving the quality of our environment is not a passing fad. In my talks to Virginia college students, I stressed that pollution abatement and control must be an ongoing mission. It has taken generations to befoul our environment. It cannot be cleaned up with a wave of a wand.

Our knowledge about some aspects of pollution is still primitive. Additional research is necessary if we are to develop the factual information necessary to achieve progress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks at a public seminar at Old Dominion University be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR.

Our contemporary culture, primed by population growth and driven by technology, has created problems of environmental degradation that directly affects all of our senses. One doesn't need to be a scientist to realize that. He need only to use his eyes, ears and nose.

Henry Thoreau foresaw the trend more than 125 years ago. In writing about machines, he said: "They insult nature. Every machine or particular application, seems a slight outrage against universal laws. How many fine inventions are there which do not clutter the ground."

Even before the days of Thoreau man was misusing the environment to assimilate his waste products. And until relatively a few years ago, there was no evidence of any adverse effects. In the process of transforming matter into energy through combustion, and of synthesizing new products through chemistry, man has used the air and water as dumping grounds for his wastes. In achieving technological progress and scientific breakthroughs, man has modified his environment. At first, the changes were insignificant because there were no major concentrations of population, and untamed frontiers were abundant. No one was particularly concerned over an occasional fish kill because another good stream was only a few miles away. If smoke from a factory

became bothersome, it wasn't too difficult to escape to a cleaner area nearby.

In short—man until very recently has accepted pollution as the price of technological progress. This laissez faire policy was questioned only when the scientific community began warning that man was pouring wastes into the environment at a rate faster than nature could reprocess them. The evidence that man was exceeding nature's assimilative capacity showed up in the form of polluted rivers, algae-covered lakes and smog-laden atmosphere.

In the United States we are pouring carbon monoxide, sulfur oxides and other potentially dangerous pollutants into the atmosphere at a rate of 142 million tons per year.

Our garbage growth exceeds our population growth. It has been estimated that an average of 5.3 pounds of solid waste is collected per person per day. That is more than 190 tons per year. By 1980, some 235 million people are expected to be generating eight pounds per person per day. That would be 340 million tons per year. These figures cover only those wastes that are handled by collection agencies. Overall, the nation is generating about 10 pounds per person per day of household, commercial and industrial wastes. In addition, about seven million motor vehicles are junked annually in the United States. More than three-fourths of them may be salvaged in varying degrees, but the excess contributes to an accumulation of abandoned vehicles that has been estimated at from nine million to 16½ million.

Even the oceans, our last frontier, have not been spared. Back in about 1675, the Governor of New York, Edmund Andros, issued a decree prohibiting the dumping of dirt or refuse "or anything to fill up ye harbor or among ye neighbors or neighboring shores under penalty of forty shillings." Nearly 300 years later we are still having problems with the disposal of the same type of wastes, and we have essentially the same type of control measures.

Unfortunately, the problems have been compounded by the extensive population growth extending from Boston to Norfolk. Because the land is covered with people, space has largely been exhausted for landfill operations. Incineration causes air pollution difficulties, so the wastes of this urban megalopolis is being dumped on the continental shelf.

The total amount of solid wastes being dumped into the ocean from the New York Metropolitan region alone, spread uniformly over Manhattan Island, would form a layer six inches thick each year. Viewed in another way, the discharge amounts to about one ton per person per year.

But New York isn't the only area that has restorted to sea disposal. The Corps of Engineers recently reported that 22 sites were used for waste disposal in the ocean between Boston and the mouth of Chesapeake Bay.

A research oceanographer who testified before the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution only last month said "knowledge of the effects of these waste disposal operations on the ocean is at best sketchy and completely absent for many areas and types of wastes."

It has been assumed that materials dredged from New York Harbor and hauled to the ocean for dumping consists primarily of clean sands, and that sewage sludges generated at waste treatment plants is just another form of manure. But the oceanographer said data he has collected indicate that this is far from the case for many wastes. For example, he said dredged materials in many parts of the harbor contains large amounts of sewage solids and are soaked with chemicals, including petroleum and petrochemicals. Sludges contain high concentrations of metals known to be toxic to marine organisms.

Wastes introduced into coastal waters may travel for long distances. The expanse of water between southern Massachusetts and Cape Hatteras is essentially a single unit, and currents generally move from the north to the south.

A little-known provision of the recently-enacted Water Quality Improvement Act will remedy the situation insofar as dumping is concerned for the first three miles offshore. The statute requires federal permittees and licensees to obtain from state water pollution control agencies a certificate of reasonable assurance that they will not violate applicable water quality standards. It would seem desirable to me to consider international agreements limiting the dumping of wastes, or an extension of our sovereignty further out to sea.

Oil spills present equally serious problems. In just 30 years, seaborne oil commerce has increased ten-fold. Moreover, the size of tankers is increasing at a dramatic rate. The Torrey Canyon was one of the ten largest tankers in the world three years ago when it went aground with 118,000 tons of crude oil. Its size soon will be run-of-the-mill. Nearly 200 tankers of more than 200,000 tons have been ordered by shipping companies in recent years, and ships of 500,000 tons capacity are being designed.

The pollution potential from collisions and accidental groundings are enormous. Moreover, the largest number of accidents occur close to shore or in ports—areas that frequently are of greatest economic, nutritional and aesthetic importance to mankind.

Pollution from shipping is only part of the problem. Offshore drilling rigs also pose a threat, as was dramatized by the Santa Barbara episode. The number of wells drilled annually off the continental United States has more than doubled in the past decade. Exploration is underway or planned in waters off 50 countries of the world.

It has been estimated that a minimum of a million tons of oil a year is spilled, flushed or leaked in oil operations. Half the seafood of the world comes from one-tenth of one per cent of the area of the sea, primarily the coastal areas which are most subject to pollution.

These are the results of a society that has become a virtual slave to technology. Fortunately, an increasingly large segment of the American public has come to realize that instead of devoting ourselves exclusively to the development of new things which are assumed to be better because they are bigger or operate faster, we must consider whether something new is worthwhile in terms of the total context of the environment.

This will necessitate a change in values by consumers as well as the obvious sources of pollution. After all, productivity is governed by demand. Many environmental activists want the "good life," but they also want bigger and better color TV sets, more powerful automobiles, and throw-away packaging that isn't readily degradable.

Industry, on the other hand, must act responsibly. It must find ways of producing without polluting. Industry must act regardless of whether it costs more and regardless of how the increased cost is absorbed. In the words of one corporate executive, "Industry will adapt voluntarily to the imperatives of environmental conservation, or ultimately it will be forced to do so."

The country's population growth and the pattern of its distribution will require changes in present-day attitudes. In George Washington's day the population of the country was less than four million. We passed the 100 milion mark in 1915, the 200 million mark in 1968, and by the year 2000 we will reach 300 million. But to see the situation in its true perspective one must examine where the growth has occurred. In the early days of the country there were only about 320,000 persons living in what we know as cities. Today, more than 140 million Americans—70 per cent of our total population—are crowded on two per cent of the land. If the present trend continues for another 25 years, 100 million additional people will be stacked on top of the 140 million already living in our cities and suburbs.

In considering the nation's population growth we must recognize that quality of life is related to quantity. Man obviously is highly adaptable. We have survived many environmental changes. But until we learn more about ourselves and can use our knowledge to ensure lives of happiness and fulfillment for all our citizens, control of population must be a high-priority national goal.

We also must exercise better management of our resources of land, air and water. This necessarily will involve more anti-pollution research, more controls and more money. Congress has been seeking solutions for several years to the problems involved in reclaiming the environment. Admittedly, most of our progress has been achieved in the past five or six years. The basic tools for control of air and water pollution are already on the statute books. They no doubt will be strengthened.

For example, there is need for better controls over the use of pesticides, particularly the persistent chlorinated hydrocarbons. The present federal administrative machinery to abate pollution is fragmented and should be modernized. Federal authority to control emissions from motor vehicles should be expanded to include other modes of transportation.

Each of the areas I have discussed today presents separate problems. They are not simple by any means. Several include highly complex economic issues which—if we are to act responsibly—must be taken into account.

---

## SECRETARY OF DEFENSE LAIRD

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, an editorial in the April 22 Washington Post, entitled "Secretary Laird on Strategic Arms," characterizes Secretary of Defense Laird's address on Monday, April 20, as "disjointed and indifferently argued." It then brings up specific points from this speech which appear out of tune with the writer's views—but ends up with the conclusion "Secretary Laird has somehow given a persuasive arms control speech." It is surprising how a "disjointed, indifferently argued" speech can be described as "persuasive" unless, perhaps, there was more to the speech than the Post editorial chooses to discuss.

From the phrases "perhaps with less design" and "he did not think it implied what we did," it is intimated that this speech was not meant to be pertinent to arms control, but just turned out that way. Rather, the Post seems to assume that the Secretary's speech was just a rationale for current U.S. weapons programs. For example, the Post says Laird's address—

focused on the gains the Soviets have made in strategic nuclear weaponry in the past five years and *concluding from this* the necessity for our proceeding with . . . MIRV and SAFEGUARD.

Is that really the message which Secretary Laird was delivering? I submit that a much more pertinent conclusion could be taken from the following section of his speech:

The Soviets have a momentum going both in strategic weapons deployments and in

strategic weapons developments. If their strategic posture could be expected to stay at the operationally deployed posture which exists today, I believe we would have a tolerable situation. What must concern us, however, is the momentum the Soviets have established both in deployments and developments and where that momentum may carry them.

While the editorial does use the middle sentence to point out that our posture today appears adequate, it completely ignores the other two, which are discussed at length in the Secretary's speech. From reading the full speech, it appears obvious that this issue of momentum—not past actions by the Soviets—was the major reason for the Secretary's conclusion that MIRV and Safeguard should proceed. This conclusion is supported by other sections of the Secretary's speech, such as "in the mid-to-late 1970's we would no longer be able to rely" and "pending a successful outcome in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, therefore, prudence dictates that we must continue our approved program to MIRV current forces" and "this is why we must also, at the very least, preserve an option to defend a portion of our land-based retaliatory forces."

Although we could accept a misinterpretation of the rationale put forward by Secretary Laird and perhaps ascribe it to a careless reading of his remarks, another section of the editorial is much more bothersome. One wonders what the Post suggests when it says:

> And the more horrendous one makes the Soviet potential appear in both technologies, the more feeble one's own argument becomes for development of the U.S. counterweapon—especially when one is, like Secretary Laird, endeavoring to stress the magnitude of Soviet threat and the relative modesty of our own response.

This sentence conveys a clear message to me—which is that we should roll over and do nothing in the face of this Soviet momentum. I suggest that this is one of the reasons, perhaps the major reason, why Secretary Laird is voicing his concern—that is, for the past 5 years we have been, in his words, virtually in neutral gear. Apparently, we should do even less, now that the Soviets are in high gear. I for one cannot accept this reasoning as a proper or acceptable philosophy for the United States.

It appears to me that Secretary Laird has made a rather cogent case for the current U.S. position, and that rather than being disjointed, his address is a valid explanation of the situation we face. From my reading of the speech, this position appears as follows:

First. We are concerned about the momentum behind the Soviet strategic buildup, and where that momentum will place them vis-a-vis the United States in the future unless we take offsetting actions or get a meaningful early agreement in SALT.

Second. The current strategic situation is not intolerable but could become so unless the United States takes steps to offset this Soviet momentum. These steps are geared to what can happen, rather than what has happened.

Third. The steps we have planned are negotiable at SALT and that is the place to resolve these issues.

Fourth. Pending success at SALT, we should not abandon these plans because we have no indication that the Soviet Union intends to slow down this momentum.

Fifth. We are serious in our approach to, and hopeful for success in, SALT.

Thus, I agree that "Secretary Laird has somehow given a persuasive arms control speech," but not, as the Post would have us believe, by accident. I believe he pointed out with excellent reasoning our approach to SALT, our concern about Soviet programs, and our desire—which I share—to resolve these issues at the conference table with the Soviets, rather than ignoring the other side of the strategic equation.

I ask unanimous consent that the Post editorial and the text of Secretary Laird's speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

SECRETARY LAIRD ON STRATEGIC ARMS

In San Francisco, in 1967, Secretary McNamara announced the Johnson administration's decision to go ahead with the Sentinel anti-ballistic missile system at the end of a long speech which had consisted mainly of arguments for not doing so: the facts he adduced simply pointed in a different direction from the conclusion he was to reach. Something similar happened—perhaps with less design—at a luncheon of the Associated Press on Monday, when Secretary Laird delivered an 18-page address focused on the gains the Soviets have made in strategic nuclear weaponry over the past five years and concluding from this the necessity for our proceeding with both the scheduled deployment of MIRVs in June and the (limited) Phase II deployment of the Safeguard ABM. It was a disjointed, indifferently argued speech and presumably it was meant to put pressure on the Soviets in Vienna and the congressional critics at home. But a close reading yields up another, unexpected result. For even those of us who did not oppose the President's ABM program last year and who are willing to acknowledge that summary, across-the-board arms agreements have their dangers and impracticalities must concede that Secretary Laird's Monday rationale for going ahead with MIRV and the ABM constitutes—despite itself—one of the most cogent arguments we have yet heard for a nuclear weapons deployment freeze. His own solutions, on the other hand, have only the most tangential relationship to the problem he describes.

The point is not facetious and it does not rest on either a disbelief in the Soviet progress Secretary Laird has cited or a sentimental hope that our conflict with the Soviets can be called off by joint communique. Rather, what the secretary's speech revealed with a special clarity was the built-in illogic of the position which must argue simultaneously the case for MIRV (which is designed to penetrate an ABM) and for an ABM (which is designed to defend against a force which has been MIRVed). And the more horrendous one makes the Soviet potential appear in both technologies, the more feeble one's own argument becomes for development of the U.S. counter-weapon—especially when one is, like Secretary Laird, endeavoring to stress the magnitude of Soviet threat and the relative modesty of our own response. In this connection the point might also be made that it is not quite accurate to describe the Soviets' effort as having been in "high gear" as compared with our own having been in "neutral" since 1965 "in both deployment and development of strategic nuclear weapons." While it is true that we have diminished our megatonnage, reduced the size of our bomber force and held to fixed numbers of land-based ICBMs and sea-based ballistic missiles, the development of MIRV—as the secretary himself observes—points to a massive multiplication of the nuclear warheads we will have available.

But we are not of a mind to argue with the secretary so much as we are to ponder the implications of much of what he said—even though he did not think it implied what we did. Secretary Laird, in his posture statement a while back acknowledged that the Soviet ICBM buildup, if it continued at the present rate, could make the planned Safeguard ABM obsolete in short order. In this address, while he argues the urgency of our proceeding with sea-based MIRVs as a hedge against a pre-emptive strike that would do in our bomber and land-based missile force, he also warns against the danger of depending solely on submarine-based missilry. He does not make a persuasive case that either the progress of the Soviet ABM or the prograss of the Soviet MIRV requires the deployment of our own MIRVs in two months, any more than he indicates that the Safeguard system will be adequate to the threat that may materialize. And as to the figures he provides on the Soviet ICBM development in the past five years, what the secretary characterizes as a Soviet attempt to "change the balance of power" turns out by his own account to be more like a Soviet attempt to create one: "The United States then, unlike the situation today, clearly occupied a superior position." We still do, of course, despite the gigantic efforts of the Soviets over the past five years. But the figures laid out by Mr. Laird suggest that the point may have been reached now when the much talked of nuclear weapons deployment freeze would in fact be in our common interest. As he himself put it while warning of the dangers ahead, "If their strategic posture could be expected to stay at the operationally deployed posture which exists today, I believe we would have a tolerable situation."

Whether or not some kind of freeze is in order is up to Mr. Nixon's negotiators to explore. Meanwhile, Secretary Laird's speech, as part of a tactical approach to the Soviets may or may not be of practical value. Elsewhere in his text the secretary observes that arms, as such, are not the cause of an arms race: "The fundamental driving force in an arms race is what one country perceives as possible objectives of another country's actions." That, like much of the rest of what Mr. Laird told the A. P. luncheon, is classical arms control dogma—only his perspective on its was a bit one-sided. What makes addresses like Secretary Laird's a bit chancy just now and the deployments he has in mind questionable is precisely that—how our objectives will be perceived—apart from whatever they actually are. As we said, Secretary Laird has somehow given a persuasive arms control speech, better in fact that those we have listened to in recent days and weeks by acknowledged opponents of what he is supporting.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE MELVIN R. LAIRD, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

I was particularly pleased when your President, Paul Miller of Gannett Newspapers, called me on a Saturday morning several months ago to invite me to speak to the Annual Luncheon of the Associated Press on the subject of the strategic balance. I told him that I regarded this forum as particularly appropriate to express my views on the need to make available to the American people additional information regarding national security.

When I assumed office 15 months ago, I immediately established as a top priority goal the restoration of credibility in the Department of Defense. Since then we have attempted to follow President Nixon's stated desire to make more information available to the American people.

The editors of the Associated Press and all members of the communications media in this country have a deep interest in this subject. I pledge to you that we shall continue to devote maximum attention to reducing and hopefully eliminating overclassification in the Department of Defense. And, we will provide all the information we can within the limits of national security, consistent with the safety and legal rights of our citizens.

This open news policy has brought about significant progress in at least five major areas where information was previously withheld from the American people.

1. Previous policy was to restrict public discussion of Prisoner of War matters. Present policy is to foster public discussion and to focus worldwide attention on the plight of our prisoners of war in order to gain humane treatment for them and to obtain their release.

2. Previous policy was to withhold from the public information on chemical warfare and biological research matters. Present policy is to keep the public informed about our new policies in these two areas, the reasons for these new policies, and the steps being taken to implement them.

3. Previous practices on reporting the costs of major weapons systems led to a major credibility problem in the Department of Defense. Our new policy of full disclosure on major weapons costs will help to restore the Department's credibility and will assist us in gaining better control of costs and in developing better management practices.

4. For several years, the American people were denied knowledge about our activities in Laos. Today, the American people are being informed about what we are doing and what we are not doing in Laos.

5. In the past, overuse of classification denied to the American people pertinent information on the nature and scope of the strategic nuclear threat. In my view, there is still too much classification, but we have tried and will continue to make more and more information available on this subject which is so crucial for the future security of our country.

In my remarks today I will attempt to shed more light on the crucial subject of the strategic threat. In particular, I want to discuss with you editors the nature and scope of the growing Soviet threat, recognizing full well that, in Vietnam, our negotiators have just begun round two of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, commonly called SALT.

I hope for success at SALT. I want to emphasize that point. I also want to emphasize that our top military leadership hopes for success at SALT. Where the security of the United States is involved, it is this objective—insuring national security—which is most important. A lower-cost means to achieve that objective, lower compared to what otherwise may be required,—if it can be achieved within tolerable risks—is obviously most desirable to all Americans, civilian and military.

The budget we have recommended to Congress for the next fiscal year demonstrates how deeply the Nixon Administration is committed to progress at SALT. We have called this year's defense budget a traditional budget. It is transitional because in terms of military capability, it is basically a status quo, stand-pat budget. We have postponed basic national security decisions in the strategic field in order to give maximum opportunity for SALT to be successful, and to foster a meaningful beginning for the era of negotiation President Nixon and the American people seek.

The objective of the Nixon Administration is to restore and maintain peace. With regard to SALT, the President's actions and words document this Administration's accent on negotiation rather than confrontation.

In my Defense Report to Congress in February, I expressed concern that the United States, by the mid-1970's, could find itself in a second-rate strategic position with regard to the future security of the Free World.

Today, in keeping with our policy of maximum information, I intend to present additional reasons for this concern.

It is important to discuss the growing strategic threat because it is essential for the American people to understand the complex issues involved, if we are to insure our national security interests through the decade of the 1970's. The American people need to understand the reasons President Nixon is pursuing the course he has recommended in this year's transitional budget.

As Secretary of Defense, I must face the fact that we are taking a risk by postponing hard decisions which the increasing Soviet threat poses for us. I recognize that in the interests of lasting peace, some risks must be taken. But, it is my judgment that as the American people are provided additional information, such as we are discussing here today, they will agree that we are literally at the edge of prudent risk. And the inescapable conclusion will be that if the Soviet strategic offensive buildup continues, the risk to our nation will become too great to sustain without major offsetting actions.

Therefore, what I particularly want to focus on today is the basic asymmetry between what the United States has been doing and what the Soviet Union has been doing in the field of strategic nuclear weapons in recent years.

In a word, for the past five years, the United States has virtually been in neutral gear in the deployment of strategic offensive forces, while the Soviet Union has moved into high gear in both deployment and development of strategic nuclear weapons. In the 1965–67 time period, the United States decided on a level of strategic nuclear forces, including Multiple Independently Targeted Reentry Vehicles (MIRVs), which was deemed adequate to preserve our deterrent posture for the threat of the 1970's which was projected then. No basic change has been made in the force level decisions established in the mid-1960's.

The Soviet Union, by contrast, has engaged in a major effort since 1965 to change the balance of power. The United States then, unlike the situation today, clearly occupied a superior position.

Except for the minimum "hedge" that SAFEGUARD will provide, we have not responded to the Soviet strategic offensive buildup with new deployment programs. We did not respond in past years because the United States deliberately chose to assume that the Soviet buildup at most was aimed at achieving a deterrent posture comparable to that of the United States. We have not responded this year because, as I have said, we fervently hope that SALT can render such a response unnecessary.

As much as we might wish it otherwise, however, we must concentrate our attention on what the Soviet Union is actually doing. In the current situation of a diminishing U.S. deterrent and Soviet momentum, we simply cannot base our plans and programs on what we hope the Soviet Union may do either unilaterally or in SALT. The Soviets have a momentum going both in strategic weapons deployments and in strategic weapons developments. If their strategic posture could be expected to stay at the operationally deployed posture which exists today, I believe we would have a tolerable situation. What must concern us, however, is the momentum the Soviets have established both in deployments and developments and where that momentum may carry them.

Let me explain in more detail the basic problem.

The most crucial aspect of national security is the strategic balance between nations that have competing interests in the world. The strategic balance has a direct effect on relations between the superpowers. It has an indirect effect on other nations both in terms of their own relations with each other and in terms of their relations with the superpowers. As one example, a situation of clear superiority on the part of the Soviet Union would have profound implications for any future political or military confrontation between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. In fact, a clear strategic superiority on the part of the Soviet Union would affect our interests and our obligations throughout the world.

In our continuing debate on defense matters, it has been said many times that the driving force behind the so-called strategic arms race is the "action-reaction" phenomenon. The recent ABM–MIRV discussions in this country illustrate this. The argument is made, for instance, that the deployment of defensive missiles by one side tends to generate increased offensive deployments by the other side.

I certainly agree that one side's actions definitely can influence what the other side does. But just as weapons in themselves are not the cause of wars, neither are a country's actions in weapons deployment—in themselves—the driving force in a so-called arms race. The fundamental driving force in an arms race is what one country perceives as possible objectives of another country's actions.

Let me explain it this way. Our goal is a stable peace. Our strategic policy to achieve that goal is deterrence. As publicly stated, the basic rationale for United States weapons deployment in the strategic field has been and remains deterrence. Our actions of the past several years underscore the fact that deterrence is our fundamental policy and that we seek no more than a posture of effective deterrence.

Because we in the United States seek a posture of deterrence to protect our interests and those of our allies, we obviously could recognize as legitimate a Soviet desire for a comparable deterrent to protect its interests.

I know that the actions of the Soviet Union in recent years have raised questions in the minds of some of you editors and others about the true objectives they are pursuing.

As I have said many times, I do not believe that it is appropriate for me, as Secretary of Defense, to attempt to assess the strategic intentions of another country. However, under my responsibilities, I must be concerned about present and potential strategic capabilities.

You representatives of a free press understand fully the national security price an open society must pay when competing with adversaries who cloak their plans in secrecy and attempt to hide both their objectives and their hardware behind the mantle of a closed society. The whole world knows what we in the United States have and what we plan in the national security field. Meaningful essentials are laid bare in an open forum—in official statements, in Congressional hearings, in the give and take of Congressional hearings, in the give and take of Congressional and public debate and in the reports of a free and competitive press. I would not have it any other way.

Let me emphasize again my conviction that the American people have a right to know even more than has been available in the past about matters which affect their safety and security. There has been too much classification in this country. In particular, too much has been withheld in the past about what has been going on in the closed societies of the Soviet Union and Communist China.

As we all pray for success in Vienna, let me point out that, in my view, the American people will support an arms limitation

agreement only if they are confident they have the relevant facts about the strategic balance.

The facts I am about to present are not taken from external Soviet discussions of their strategic forces. They do not come from press conferences in Moscow, from testimony in the Kremlin, from news stories in Pravda, or from published annual Defense Reports by Marshal Grechko.

Rather, the information I am presenting to you is based on our own observations of what the Soviets are doing—and on our belief that this information and these facts should not be withheld from the American people and should be made available to others in the world.

Let us examine what has happened in the past five years to shift the relationship between U.S. and Soviet strategic forces and to provide an accelerated momentum to the Soviets in the strategic field:

*In 1965,* the Soviet Union had about 220 launchers for the relatively old-fashioned missiles—SS–6's, SS–7's and SS–8's—somewhat similar to our TITAN. We had 54 TITANs in the inventory at that time.

*Today,* these two forces remain essentially the same. So in this category of old-fashioned multimegaton weapons the Soviets had and still maintain a better than 4–1 advantage.

*In 1965,* the Soviet Union had *no* relatively small ICBM launchers comparable to our MINUTEMAN. By 1965, we had 880 MINUTEMAN missiles operational and had established that the total force level for MINUTEMAN would be 1,000 launchers. In the 1965–67 time period, the United States finalized plans to convert a portion of the established MINUTEMAN force to a MIRV MINUTEMAN III configuration.

*Today,* the Soviet Union has over 800 such launchers operational, and a projected force that could exceed 1,000 launchers within the next two years. These launchers include both the SS–11 and SS–13 missiles. Concurrently, flight testing of an improved SS–11 missile continues. Thus, at present construction rates, the Soviets will achieve parity in MINUTEMAN-type launchers within the next two years or so and could move into a substantial lead in this category by the mid-1970's if they continue to deploy these missiles. The previously scheduled U.S. program to MIRV a substantial part of MINUTEMAN continues in progress.

*In 1965,* there were no operational launchers for the large Soviet SS–9 missile which, in its single warhead version, can carry up to 25 megatons.

*Today,* I can report to you that there are some 220 SS–9's operational with at least 60 more under construction. Testing of an SS–9 multiple reentry vehicle—the triplet version—continues. The U.S. has no counterpart to this program involving large missiles. So, in this area, the Soviets have and will maintain a monopoly.

*In 1965,* neither a depressed trajectory ICBM nor a Fractional Orbital Bombardment System existed in either the Soviet or U.S. inventory.

*Today,* the Soviets have tested both configurations and could have an operational version already deployed. The United States has developed nothing comparable to these systems.

*In 1965,* the Soviet Union had about 25 launchers for Submarine Launched Ballistic Missiles (SLBMs) on nuclear submarines, and about 80 more on diesel submarines. Most were designed for surface launch only. The U.S. had 464 SLBM launchers operational on 29 submarines in 1965 and Congress had authorized the last of the 41 nuclear-powered submarines in our POLARIS Force in the previous fiscal year.

*Today,* the Soviets have over 200 operational launchers on nuclear submarines for submerged launch SLBMs and about 70 operational launchers on diesel submarines. In the next two years, the Soviets are expected to have some 400–500 operational launchers on POLARIS-type submarines, and at present construction rates—6–8 submarines a year—could match or exceed the number in the U.S. force by 1974–75. United States POLARIS submarines still number 41 and no increase is projected in current plans. Conversion of 31 of our POLARIS submarines to the MIRVed POSEIDON missile is planned, and eight conversions have already been authorized by Congress.

*In 1965,* there was no development underway of a so-called Undersea Long-Range Missile System (ULMS) in the United States and there appeared to be none in the Soviet Union.

*Today,* the United States is spending relatively small sums in the research and development area on preliminary investigations of such a system. I can also report to you today that the Soviet Union, on the other hand, already is testing a new, long-range missile for possible Naval use.

*In 1965,* the Soviet heavy bomber force consisted of slightly over 200 aircraft, about 50 of which were configured as tankers. The U.S. heavy bomber force strength was about 780 in 1965.

*Today,* the Soviet heavy bomber force is slightly under 200, with about 50 still configured as tankers. U.S. heavy bomber strength has declined to about 550 today.

*In 1965,* we estimated that the Soviet Union had a complex of ABM launchers being constructed around Moscow as well as a number of radars under construction which could provide early warning acquisition and tracking functions for ABM use.

*Today,* we believe that 64 Moscow ABM launchers are operational together with sophisticated early warning radars and tracking capabilities. ABM testing for new and/or improved systems continues. Today, the first two SAFEGUARD sites have been authorized, but will not be operational before 1974–75. This modified deployment schedule is considerably behind the schedule Congress had approved in 1967 for the planned SENTINEL area defense, which called for initial capability in 1972, and nation-wide coverage in 1975.

Thus, in the space of five years—from 1965 to 1970—the Soviet Union has more than tripled its inventory of strategic offensive nuclear weapon launchers from about 500 to about 1700—which includes some 200 heavy bombers in both totals—and continues the momentum of a vigorous construction program. In that same period, the Soviet Union has virtually quadrupled the total megatonnage in its strategic offensive force. The United States, on the other hand, in the same time period, made no increase in its established level of 1710 strategic nuclear missile launchers and reduced its heavy bomber strength of 780 by over 200. In that same period the United States also reduced its megatonnage by more than 40%.

To repeat: The United States has taken no action to increase the total of approved strategic offensive delivery vehicles in the past five years in response to the rapid growth in Soviet strategic delivery vehicles. We have, of course, maintained certain options and other steps have been taken to preserve our deterrent in the face of this increase.

Two programs that have been the subject of intense public discussion are, of course, our MIRV and SAFEGUARD systems.

Let me emphasize that MIRV is needed to preserve our deterrent. Many people do not fully understand why it is necessary for us to continue the previously planned, Congressionally-approved and funded deployment of MIRV systems. The point is made that the current number of strategic nuclear weapons on alert in our force is sufficient for immediate retaliatory use in a crisis. Because MIRVing would more than double the number of deliverable weapons, the conclusion is drawn that this is unnecessary.

This conclusion could be valid, if we assumed that the POLARIS, MINUTEMAN, and Bomber forces all would survive a surprise attack and that the Soviet Union would not deploy an extensive ABM system. However, as was pointed out in my Defense Report in February, the rapidly-growing Soviet strategic offensive forces could seriously threaten both the U.S. MINUTEMAN and strategic bomber forces by the mid-1970's.

Assuming we do not take additional actions to offset the expanding threat—and this apparently is what some people urge—I must, as Secretary of Defense, face the disquieting possibility that in the mid-to-late 1970's we would no longer be able to rely on either the Bomber or MINUTEMAN force to survive a surprise attack. In such a situation, we would be left with only the POLARIS/POSEIDON deterrent force in our strategic arsenal for high confidence retaliatory purposes. This would pose intolerable risks for American security.

Thus, the critical choice in the face of that situation is this:

1. Do we rely on the fraction of the 656 current weapons that will be at sea on our POLARIS force if we do not convert to POSEIDON and do not defend our land-based strategic forces?

2. Or, do we continue the previously established program to convert 31 POLARIS submarines to the long-approved POSEIDON MIRV program—which would provide approximately the same number of sea-based retaliatory weapons on alert that we currently have today in the sea-based and land-based retaliatory forces combined, but with much reduced megatonnage?

Pending a successful outcome in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, therefore, prudence dictates that we must continue our approved program to MIRV current forces.

Moreover, as the experience of the past five years demonstrates, it would be dangerous and imprudent to place unquestioned reliance on the invulnerability of any single strategic system for more than five to seven years into the future.

This is why we must also, at the very least, preserve an option to defend a portion of our land-based retaliatory forces. That is a major part of what the proposed minimal addition to the SAFEGUARD Defensive program is designed to do. I will come back to that.

Because we want to give the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks every chance of succeeding, we are deliberately accepting certain risks by postponing hard choices related to strategic offensive weapons. These risks are acceptable only in the context of proceeding with the MIRV deployments that have been programmed and approved for several years and the SAFEGUARD increment we are recommending this year.

A second and equally important reason for MIRV is that it helps preserve our deterrent by increasing confidence in our ability to penetrate Soviet strategic defensive forces which, by the mid-to-late 1970's also could be quite formidable. In addition to the extensive air defense capabilities they already possess, the Soviets are pursuing a vigorous anti-ballistic missile research and development program designed to improve the present operational system or to develop substantially better second-generation ABM components.

We now have evidence that the Soviet Union is testing an improved long-range ABM missile. They are also expanding their radar surveillance coverage. We cannot rule out the possibility that they have or will give the extensively deployed SA–5 surface-to-air missile system an ABM role. We believe such a role is technically feasible for this system.

With regard to SAFEGUARD, which I men-

tioned previously, let me say this. In addition to other objectives, the reoriented SAFEGUARD program, initiated last year, is designed to provide protection for our land-based deterrent forces, the MINUTEMAN and Bombers. As you know, the President directed that each phase of the SAFEGUARD deployment is to be reviewed each year to ensure that we are doing as much as necessary but not more than that required by the threat. The increments of SAFEGUARD proposed so far will provide protection for a portion of our land-based deterrent, and permit flexibility with regard to our future course of action.

Without approval by Congress of the Modified Phase II SAFEGUARD protection proposed by the President, we would be forced to recommend going forward this year with other strategic nuclear offensive force programs.

All of my comments so far have, of course, been focused on the more immediate and troublesome threat posed by the Soviet strategic force buildup. The nuclear weapons program of Communist China also concerns us and directly relates to the need for preserving timely SAFEGUARD options as we move toward the mid-1970's. Time does not permit a discussion of this issue and the interrelationship of maintaining adequate strategic offensive and defensive forces to meet both the Soviet and Communist Chinese threats.

Where does all this leave us, and what is President Nixon attempting to do with the decisions he has incorporated in his Fiscal Year 1971 transitional defense budget?

Clearly, this Administration has not accelerated the previously planned deployment of offensive systems during our 15 months in office. On the contrary, we have slowed it down. The only major change we have made has been modification of the previously approved SENTINEL ABM deployment; and that change was a slowdown, not a speedup. We slowed the original deployment plan Congress approved, keyed it to the emerging threat on an annual review basis, and reoriented it to provide more timely protection needed for our land-based deterrent forces.

If the programmed forces established by the last Administration some years ago and approved by Congress were deemed appropriate and necessary for the security of the United States in the 1970's against the then projected threat, I am at a loss to understand how critics can claim that the Nixon Administration has escalated the arms race. The record clearly shows that we have not done so. We have chosen instead to defer major new weapons decisions as long as possible pending developments in the Strategic Arms Limitations Talks. In continuing the MIRV and ABM programs, we are simply going ahead with programs on which our deterrent policy was formulated by previous Administrations, even before the current momentum of Soviet strategic programs became clear.

With regard to the important talks which have just resumed in Vienna, the President has stated that every U.S. system is negotiable. To those who argue that the U.S. should take specific, and perhaps unilateral, action at the start of these negotiations, I would reply that the place to resolve these issues is at the conference table with the Soviets. Let us try to find out at the conference table the meaning of the Soviet Union's increased weapons deployments and let us conduct these important negotiations with full recognition of these continuing Soviet deployments.

My appraisal today has covered some of the available evidence of the Soviet military buildup. I am not unmindful, however, of possible other directions of Soviet policy that could be relevant to our security. There have been reports that Soviet economic problems may place pressure upon their leadership to devote major attention to internal matters, thus reducing the recent emphasis on a continued military buildup.

As Secretary of Defense, I will continue to hope that the shift in national priorities we have instituted in America will be duplicated in the Soviet Union. But until evidence of that shift is discernible in weapons deployment activities, I have no alternative but to base my actions and recommendations on the evidence available, much of which I have shared with you editors today and, through you, with the American people.

## BLAME FOR RISING FOOD PRICES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, all too often the American farmer is blamed for the rising food prices. However, statistics which have recently been made available indicate that while food prices have been rising, the price the farmer has been receiving has been declining. For example, recently when the price of bread increased from 22 to 23 cents, the price the farmer received for wheat, milk, and shortening decreased from 3.6 to 3.3 cents.

We now know that the farmer, like the wage earner, small businessman, and the homebuyer and builder, has suffered greatly from the inflation we have been experiencing. With a return of only 3 percent on his investment as opposed to a 10-percent return by major industrial corporations and some of the large farms, the average farmer finds it increasingly difficult to continue operating when his prices are falling and the country is experiencing a 6-percent rate of inflation.

I think it is important that we recognize the fact that the average farmer has been greatly hurt by inflation and that he is not responsible for the increase in food prices.

## EARTH DAY COMMENTARY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, pollution and environmental problems have become the subject of massive attention in recent months—magazine articles, television programs, statements by the President, and many public officials, and a number of bills introduced in Congress.

On April 22, Earth Day, we had a national environmental teach-in, with various special activities to focus on the environmental crisis being planned across the country. Although I understand that Senator NELSON played a leading part in formulating this idea, it was developed, organized, and energized by many young people.

I welcome and commend all this activity and I am hopeful that it will lead to some truly significant accomplishments in combatting the critical environmental problems. At the outset, however, I feel compelled to offer a word of caution. There is a tendency among Americans, and all humans I suppose, to feel that if we talk about a problem long enough, if we express enough indignation and concern, that it will somehow go away. Witness the example of the Vietnam war. Many Americans seem to have convinced themselves that after all the tumult in this country in the months prior to March 31, 1968, Vietnam ceased to be a problem.

Many people have tried, and some have apparently succeeded in phasing the war out of their minds, despite the fact that the death and destruction continues daily.

Just as we cannot afford to lessen our concern about Vietnam until we have brought the war to an end, we must not deceive ourselves into believing that by voluminous talking and writing we have resolved the environmental crisis.

The crisis is of such proportions that it is going to take a concerted and large-scale, long-term effort to effectively deal with it. One encouraging aspect of all the concern about the environment and ecology is that there are signs that this is an issue that could unite rather than divide Americans. All of us are affected by these problems and all of us need to work together in solving them.

Several significant measures have been passed by Congress as we have belatedly moved to confront these problems. Of course, as in the case of many other domestic needs, environmental quality activities are severely limited due to the lack of available funds. As I have often stressed, it is a matter of priorities, and as long as we have such a massive involvement in Vietnam and are spending billions for more and more armaments, these crucial domestic programs will be short changed.

This is even more tragic because reasonable expenditures now may save some enormous costs later. We need to act immediately to prevent the further despoiling of our air, water, and soil, rather than to wait until matters are completely out of control.

As an example of our current priorities, the $1.5 billion the administration plans to spend on the ABM this year is considerably more than allocated for control of air and water pollution. The fiscal 1971 budget provides $275 million for the Supersonic Transport—SST—aircraft as opposed to $106 million for air pollution control.

The total cost for the SST is estimated at $2.5 billion or more. We have been told that the SST can be used only for transoceanic flights because of the clamorous sonic booms. If they are flown over land they would add further to our considerable "noise pollution" problem. Anyone who lives or works near a major airport probably feels that this problem—plus the grimy exhaust-laden air—could not get much worse. All too typical of the times is the fact that the U.S. Army Band may have to move its traditional Washington outdoor summer concerts from Watergate. Because of the aircraft flying into or out of National Airport, trying to play or hear music is a losing proposition.

The folly of the SST should be evident. The jumbo jets already in service can carry more passengers over a longer range at lower fares than the SST. And if we are really worried about transportation, should not the problems of the millions living in our urban areas take precedence over the desires of a few who may be eager to get from the New York traffic jam to the London traffic jam a little faster?

The money could be well spent on developing and expanding urban rapid

transit rail systems, which would help alleviate the squeeze and pollution in our streets. Or the funds could be applied to developing and improving high-speed rail service between our major cities, thus reducing the mayhem on our highways.

Technology has brought some benefits to mankind, but no longer can we afford to ignore the human and environmental consequences of technological development.

We must also keep in mind the increasing population pressures in the world, which heighten environmental difficulties. Our deteriorating transportation situation, our problem with waste disposal, our noisy, dirty, crime-plagued cities make the problems of urbanization all too clear.

The need to raise more food for the ever-increasing world population can wreak additional damage by upsetting the balance of nature. We increase the threat to survival by heavy use of pesticides and certain chemicals which pollute streams, linger in living tissues, and threaten wildlife species. The pollutants we pour into the air not only harm man's health directly, but also may change atmospheric conditions dangerously.

I have in the past and will continue to support programs to provide assistance for population control programs in developing countries, as well as voluntary family planning in our own country, and I believe such programs are of great importance.

A very visible component of our environmental blight is the ugliness, clutter, and litter that we see not only in our urban areas, but in the countryside as well. This is why it is important to act to preserve some of our more beautiful natural scenery. An example of this is the bill to make the Buffalo River in Arkansas a national river, a part of our national park system. This bill would enable the preservation, in its free-flowing, natural state, of an important segment of this beautiful river in an area which contains unique scientific features. This bill was passed by the Senate in September, and we are hopeful of favorable action in the House.

In many sections of the country water supplies are contaminated, and marine life is imperiled. Between 15 and 20 million fish are being killed each year by water pollution. Some of our rivers have even become fire hazards. However, the budget request for water pollution control is less than the program authorized by Congress in 1966.

Solid waste disposal is a problem that grows by the hour and is plaguing more and more cities. We are burying ourselves under 7 million scrapped cars, 30 million tons of waste paper, 48 billion discarded cans, and 28 billion bottles and jars a year. Newspapers in two Arkansas cities, Fort Smith and Pine Bluff, have recently reported on the increasing problem there. On an average, every Arkansan living in an urban area throws away 4 pounds of solid waste every day of the week. A State official points out that most Arkansas cities are still operating open dumps where garbage is burned. This contributes considerably to air pollution and is against the law. A Fort Smith reporter, Taylor Joyce, recently wrote in the Southwest Times Record:

For as long as some local residents can remember there has been an open dump down along the Arkansas River on Fort Smith's northwest side. There has been almost perpetual burning there, creating noxious odors and blanketing the city with billows of smoke.

The dump has attracted insects and vermin and has been a breeding ground for flies, mosquitoes and rats.

The City Health Department wants to eliminate the dump because of the health hazards it creates.

But perhaps most important of all, the Arkansas Pollution Control Commission says the dump has to go because it poses an air and water pollution threat.

In Arkansas we have had the opportunity to avoid some of the problems and mistakes which have occurred in the older, industrialized States. The opportunity is rapidly slipping away from us. Not many months ago, speaking of the Arkansas River development project, I stated that by preserving the beauty of the river, the purity of the water and air, and retaining favorable living conditions for those who work in the area, it could truly be a model development. Now, it is most disconcerting to read of a statement by a State health department official who says that the Arkansas River could not be made pollution free because of increasing industrialization of the river valley and pollution caused by out-of-State sources. In an editorial on the subject, the Arkansas Gazette pointed out:

As it happens so frequently in the environmental field, the problem is interstate in nature and it presents a challenge for the federal anti-pollution effort that President Nixon promises his administration is ready to undertake. Already the federal government has spent over a billion dollars to create the inland waterway, and that ought to be enough to give it a vested interest in the quality of the water that flows down the costly river channel.

The problems are vast and numerous. We are, literally, surrounded by them. I hope that Earth Day will have marked the beginning not of conflict and confrontation, but of resolute and united action on many fronts to improve the quality of life and living conditions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial on the Arkansas River, from the Arkansas Gazette, and the articles on waste disposal, from the Southwest Times Record and Pine Bluff Commercial, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Fort Smith Southwest Times Record, Apr. 11, 1970]

CITY'S OPEN DUMP CREATES PROBLEMS

(By Taylor Joyce)

For as long as some local residents can remember there has been an open dump down along the Arkansas River on Fort Smith's northwest side. There has been almost perpetual burning there, creating noxious odors and blanketing the city with billows of smoke.

The dump has attracted insects and vermin and has been a breeding ground for flies, mosquitoes and rats.

From an aesthetic point of view, the dump has been an eyesore.

But with all its offensive features the dump has served its primary purpose pretty well. It has provided a place for the city to dispose of its solid wastes.

This has caused some citizens to ask, "Why all the clamor to abandon the open dump and go to another system of refuse disposal, namely a sanitary landfill?"

The reasons for wanting the change are almost as diverse as the people offering them.

Some want the dump removed for aesthetic reasons. They object to the smoke and the smell.

The City Health Department wants to eliminate the dump because of the health hazards it creates.

But perhaps most important of all, the Arkansas Pollution Control Commission says the dump has to go because it poses an air and water pollution threat.

Dr. L. A. Whittaker, director of the City Health Department, said, "There isn't any question in anybody's mind but what air pollution is a big problem down there."

He expressed concern over the burning of automobile tires. "Tires contain a great deal of carbon which is one of the factors in lung cancer," Dr. Whittaker said.

He also talked about the burning of paints, old batteries and toys containing lead. "It doesn't take much lead in the air to pose a real health hazard."

"Fortunately for the city the prevailing wind is out of the east and that keeps the city clear of the fumes and smoke for the most part," Dr. Whittaker said. "But when the weather is just right, high humidity and air relatively still, the air pollutants are a real problem for persons suffering from asthma, emphysema, bronchitis and other respiratory diseases."

"To my knowledge no one has ever died around here from the smoke and fumes, but they do aggravate those types of illness," he said.

Dr. Whittaker also pointed out that the dump provides a breeding place for mosquitoes and rats although there is no evidence that they are infected with the dread disease sometimes associated with them—bubonic plague in rats and malaria in mosquitoes.

"There is a large rat colony in the area, and the biggest problem with them is their consumption of human food and contamination of stored foods," Dr. Whittaker said.

Elimination of the dump could be expected to greatly reduce the numbers of these pests.

However, the greatest pressure for removal of the dump has come from the Arkansas Pollution Control Commission.

City Administrator Cliff Keheley said, "They wrote us a letter in 1967 telling us that the dump had to be off the river by the time Lock and Dam 13 was closed. They set a deadline of Aug. 1, 1969."

Although the deadline has already passed, Keheley says the commission hasn't pushed for compliance with the mandate. "The dump is definitely in violation of the state's air pollution code," Keheley said, "but the commission realizes the problem associated with removing the dump and hasn't pushed us too hard yet." Why couldn't the present dump be converted into a sanitary landfill?

"It's too small for one thing," Keheley said. "And the burned matter that's out there couldn't be successfully used to compact the garbage as is necessary in a landfill operation. You would have to remove all the burned matter and get down to the original earth and that could run into considerable cost."

So the city is searching for a landfill site, and hoping that the pollution control commission's patience doesn't wear thin until the site can be found.

[From the Pine Bluff Commercial, Apr. 5, 1970]

GARBAGE: WILL BE SWAMPED IN A SEA OF THROWAWAY PRODUCTS?

(By George Wells)

Of The Commercial Staff

The problem was bad enough to begin with.

And it's getting worse.

New people coming in all the time. Every once and a while a new plant of some kind. New services are opened to serve the new people.

And all of this mounts up. Literally, in the case of garbage.

On an average, every Arkansan living in an urban area throws away four pounds of solid wastes every day of the week. That's about 240,000 pounds a day at Pine Bluff.

Of course, this includes prorata share of industrial and commercial wastes. But that does not alleviate the problem.

Chances are, on top of all this pile of garbage, that things are going to get worse before they get better. Along with the population explosion—which may not be as marked in Arkansas as some other places, but which is nevertheless serious here too—there is the explosion of disposal products.

Throwaway bottles. Throwaway cans. Throwaway paper goods.

In fact, at the rate we are developing convenience through throwaway goods, we may soon conveniently swamp ourselves in a sea of wastes.

Any way you stack it, solid waste is a serious and growing problem.

What can be done about it?

Bury it. Burn it. Use it again. Mine it.

Roughly speaking, these are the alternatives in order of feasibility.

The State Pollution Control Commission is currently nudging municipalities to use landfills—dumping solid wastes into trenches, holes, natural ravines, borrow pits or gravel pits and covering the wastes periodically with dirt.

Sid Fitzgerald, solid wastes specialist for the commission, said that at present this is the best method available that most cities in Arkansas can afford.

One of Arkansas's big problems right now, he said, is that most cities are still operating open dumps and burning garbage in the open. This contributes considerably to air pollution and is against the law.

"But what can you do?" Fitzgerald said. "If you go in and tell them to stop, it complicates the problem. We're trying to encourage cities to go to landfills."

Controlled burning as a method of disposing of waste is getting a lot of attention right now, Fitzgerald said, because "people think that when you burn it, you've gotten rid of it."

However, he pointed out, burning is essentially only a method of reducing volume and there is still the problem of disposing of the residue. "This sometimes presents more problems" than it solves, Fitzgerald said.

But the basic problem with controlled burning, or incineration, is its high cost. Fitzgerald said he and Arthur (Bucky) Hendrix of Pine Bluff, who works with him in the agency, visited an incineration plant in Ohio.

"It cost six and a half million dollars," Fitzgerald said, "and got rid of 500 tons a day. And they still needed a place to deposit the residue."

Recycling, or finding some way to use wastes again, is also getting a lot of attention nationwide. Scientists have insisted publicly that, in the long run, this is the only solution.

These scientists advocate recycling not only to solve the problem of disposing of wastes, but also because they feel there is a limited amount of resources on the planet, and they will eventually play out if they aren't conserved and reused.

To date, however, little progress has been made in finding practical means of doing this. This is one of the major areas of study.

Fitzgerald said that probably the only serious attempt at recycling any wastes in this state would be with waste paper. He said that he did not know of any municipality that was doing this.

Mining garbage is, at the present state of the art, out of the question because of the extremely high cost of extracting reusable metal compared to the return.

There is another method related to the last two: composting. In this method, salvageable products are removed from the total waste, and the organic matter is then ground up and allowed to decompose through the action of bacteria.

The resulting product, compost, is generally used for soil nutrient.

The only problem with this is that there is no sizable market for it. Six such operations have already folded, Fitzgerald said, and the only ones that he knows of still in operation are subsidized by the government for research purposes.

He related that in one case he was familiar with, a private firm received $4 a ton from the city to haul off the stuff and make compost out of it and the operation still lost money because there was no market. The compost produced is expensive in comparison with regular fertilizers, Fitzgerald said.

So all roads lead back to the landfill.

"We're pushing the regional concept," Fitzgerald said.

By this, he explains, is meant a central operation serving several communities or a whole county. In fact, he said, he favors the regional concept regardless of whether the method of disposal is landfill, burning or anything else.

Sometime in the near future, he said, he and Hendrix will visit a countywide operation in Alabama. In this system, Fitzgerald said, containers similar to the ones used for the automated pickup in Pine Bluff are placed around the county. Containers for several yards are placed in neighborhoods in towns.

Irregular open dumps have been eliminated through its system and "from all reports we have received," the system seems to work.

Fitzgerald said that, taking into account the economics of the problem, some variation of this system will probably be the solution for some time to come.

There are shortcomings to the landfill operation, of course. These include:

LAND AVAILABILITY

In the East, many cities have already run out of available land, and if every city in Arkansas goes to this method, obviously the amount of land available and suitable will someday run out.

SEEPAGE

This could cause problems by polluting the water supply by draining through wastes and percolating through the soil to the water table. This problem is minimized by reducing runoff and by controlled digging.

Obviously one of the things involved here is simply not to dig deep enough to go into the water table. The other thing is to arrange drainage so that excess water is diverted around the site, thus reducing the water problem to that which falls directly on the site.

WEATHER

On top of presenting a drainage problem when it rains, there is the problem of the condition of the soil. If it rains too much, equipment can't be worked on some sites. If it is too cold, the ground freezes and becomes unmanageable.

To a certain extent, there is no defense against the weather. But some weather problems can be minimized in the same manner as above: by controlling drainage, in the case of water runoff, and by providing all-weather roads to the site.

"Sanitary landfill is just a stopgap method right now," Fitzgerald said. "It is the best method right now and until an economical method of burning or recycling is found," he said.

It is feasible in Arkansas for the time being, he said, primarily because of the relatively small population of the state.

"Sanitary landfill is not going to solve all the problems," he said. "In Arkansas, the problem can be summed up as a lack of cash, a lack of concern and a lack of awareness."

In many towns, Fitzgerald said, there is no garbage service because "public officials are afraid to do anything" that will cost money. "A lot of cities are large enough and should have garbage collection, but don't," he said.

In some of these cases, he pointed out, the Pollution Control Commission was suggesting a modified form of sanitary landfill—"cover it up once or twice a week or maybe only once a month."

But the important thing is, he said, that some form of disposal system be used. "This is as important as sewage disposal and water supply, and it should be handled that way," he said.

After a site is used up, Fitzgerald said, a city could use it by building a park or a golf course there.

Some other things that have been suggested, he feels, are not practical. Especially, he feels, the idea of building houses on them should not be adopted because there is some seepage of methane gas.

The seepage itself is not serious, he said, but the gas—which is created by the decomposition of organic matter—can accumulate in a closed place and become a problem.

---

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Mar. 9, 1970]

UNSETTLING REPORT ON THE DIRTY ARKANSAS

Glen T. Kellogg, the chief environmental engineer for the state Health Department, made a statement to the North Little Rock Rotary Club last week that ought to be terribly unsettling to everyone who had hoped and expected that great recreational benefits would accrue from the $1.2 billion Arkansas River navigation project.

Mr. Kellogg said he doubted that the river could ever be made safe for recreational use in Arkansas. The stream, he said, could not be made completely pollution free because of increasing industrialization of the river valley and pollution caused by out-of-state sources.

If the navigation project results in the sort of situation that Mr. Kellogg fears it will, then the industrialization that is so badly needed in Arkansas in the long run is going to be of such dubious value that it may be a liability. The engineer urged residents of Arkansas not to allow further pollution of the river, and that is indeed sound and compelling advice. Industry that pollutes should not be made welcome, no matter how many dirty dollars it brings into the economy; if it locates here anyway, it should be required to fully clean up its waste before dumping it into the river, just as the cities along the river are now being required to treat their sewage sufficiently before disposing of it in the stream.

In any event, the fact that the Arkansas River flows across state lines cannot serve as an excuse for states up the river—Oklahoma, Kansas and Colorado—to permit pollution-emission standards so low that Arkansas downstream has to accept the filthy by-product of industrial growth that it receives no economic benefit from. As it happens so frequently in the environmental field, the problem is interstate in nature and it pre-

sents a challenge for the federal anti-pollution effort that President Nixon promises his administration is ready to undertake. Already the federal government has spent over a billion dollars to create the inland waterway, and that ought to be enough to give it a vested interest in the quality of the water that flows down the costly river channel.

## PROPER MEDICAL CARE MUST BE PROVIDED FOR VETERANS

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the Nation has a long and proud tradition of showing itself grateful to those citizens whom it has called to arms in time of war. Nowhere is this gratitude better or more fittingly expressed than in the comprehensive medical care provided for veterans, and, most particularly, for veterans with disabilities arising out of their military service. To furnish this care, the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration operates one of the largest medical systems in existence, including 166 hospitals with more than 100,000 beds, over 200 outpatient clinics, and a number of other facilities. On any given day, more than 80,000 veterans will be occupying Veterans' Administration hospital beds; every month there are more than half a million outpatient visits to VA medical facilities.

But size and quantity of medical care are not enough. The veterans of this Nation, especially those with service-connected disabilities, deserve the very best medical care that can be provided. I am, therefore, very distressed by the reports of recent months which indicate that some elements of the Veterans' Administration hospital system may be deficient. I am particularly concerned to learn that staff shortages in the neighborhood of 1,300 positions have been reported in the six VA hospitals in Illinois and that the directors of these hospitals feel that they have inadequate funds for a number of purposes such as the placement of veterans in community nursing homes where care of this type would be advisable.

I am, however, encouraged by the fact that the appropriate committees of Congress have taken note of these allegations of deterioration in the medical care provided our veterans and have launched intensive studies to determine just what the shortcomings are and what needs to be done to correct them. In particular, I commend the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives. These two committees have taken the lead in investigating the present state of veterans' medical care, and I have confidence that the necessary improvements will be made. We must be certain the Veterans' Administration hospital system will again qualify for the praise it received almost two decades ago, in August 1951, in the report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

> The quality of medical care available to the beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration has been raised to a point where it unquestionably represents the best medical care available anywhere in the world at any time in the world's history.

## WELFARE REFORM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the Senate will soon be asked to vote on President Nixon's welfare reform package. I have recently seen two items in the press which I believe have important bearing on that vote.

The first article, by Eve Edstrom, reports that OEO's current income maintenance experiment is finding, as many of us have long argued, that the vast majority of the poor in this country are not welfare chiselers, but people who desperately seek to work their way out of poverty.

The second, by Jack Rosenthal, reports on a unique private offer of funds to help improve OEO's experiment by expanding the range of alternatives it is able to consider. Because of the importance of the OEO experiment to the case for welfare reform, I hope that Senators will examine these two articles closely and that OEO will decide to improve its experiment by accepting the reported offer of Mr. Leonard Greene. His concept of full work incentive is well worth close examination.

I ask unanimous consent that the two articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 3, 1970]

GUARANTEED-INCOME PLAN BREEDS PRIDE

(By Eve Edstrom)

PRINCETON, N.J.—Giving poor families extra cash to supplement their earnings apparently brings out the Puritan in them.

A sampling of attitudes among 10 per cent of families enrolled in an experimental guaranteed annual income project shows that most families in the program express contempt both for welfare payments and for people too lazy to work.

One father who receives a cash payment to add to his working wages said: "It's not a good idea if you like to drink or you're lazy."

A Spanish-speaking father in the same plan said, "It's an honor to work." A Negro machine operator added a qualification. "I love to work—'cause I have to," he said.

The family heads who made the above statements receive the income payments under a program similar to the landmark legislation proposed for all of the nation's poor families by President Nixon. The bill is scheduled for a vote on the House floor next month.

Until now, the preliminary results of that $4.5 million government-financed experiment have been put forth in general terms or in cold statistics.

But last week, Mathematica, a research group based here, released verbatim quotations from interviews with 10 per cent of the more than 7,000 families who receive the cash guarantees in New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

Although a few families expressed some reservations or misconceptions about the program, more typical responses included such statements as it is "four to five times better than welfare" or "it seems simple and uncomplicated compared to most government programs."

Unlike welfare, the families do not have to fill out complicated forms, do not have to account for how they spend their money, do not have to forfeit assets, and are not supervised by case workers and investigators.

In fact, the experiment's workers go out of their way not to advise families. If families need help, such as finding housing, they receive a list of agencies to contact so that they can learn to help themselves. The cash payments are strictly divorced from any services.

To be eligible for the payments, a family submits to a quarterly interview and reports its income and family composition each month. The income report form, as one family said, "couldn't be simpler. You'd have to be pretty stupid" not to understand it.

The one-page form, covering a four-week period, asks the family to list any changes in household members (because grants are based on family size) and to list earnings before taxes and other income such as Social Security benefits.

Families include their paycheck stubs with the report. If they don't have stubs, they can submit signed statements from employers. Their benefits are recalculated every four weeks, but are based on average earnings over the last three-month period.

Because the experiment is aimed simply at determining how income guarantees affect work patterns of those who receive them, the families are under no obligation to account for how they spend the extra cash.

But the families have shown a strong desire to prove they are worthy of the payments. Many have voluntarily attached paid bills to their income declaration forms to show how they have spent the money.

That the money is being used in a variety of meaningful ways was also shown by the interviews that Mathematica conducted last month in Trenton, N.J., where the first project families were selected in 1968, and in Paterson, Passaic and Jersey City, N.J., and Scranton, Pa.

Two Scranton families are using the money, spread over a three-year period, to renovate their homes.

"This way we are increasing the value of our home and will have something to show for the money," one family said.

That family has renovated one room and named it the "Council of Grants to Families" room. The Council is the subsidiary which issues the payments to the families.

Another family, noting that the payments were enabling it to move from a "dump" to a nicer apartment, said:

"We are trying to plan ahead. In three years, I might be making good money, and by then the kids will be older and my wife could possibly work. It sure has raised our standard of living."

A 60-year-old mother, living with her son's family, said the payments would make it possible for her to delay in applying for Social Security benefits until she was eligible for the maximum amount.

The income guarantee is helping one railroad worker to sit out a layoff, and has helped factory workers to get through "vacation without pay" periods.

A commonly expressed view was that the money gave families a small measure of security in case of illness or job difficulties. This was best expressed by the family that said:

"We aren't using the money to pay the electric bill or things like that. We put a little aside and just having it gives you peace of mind in case anything should happen."

Several families were negative in their responses, saying the money wasn't sufficient to help them provide adequately for their families.

A few families looked upon their bimonthly checks as windfalls to be used for spending sprees.

One young father has been quite successful in using his guarantee to extend his credit rating so that he could lavishly furnish his public housing apartment—complete with bar. He also tried to con the experiment's workers out of giving him his payments in one lump sum so that he could have a "stake."

Among those interviewed, there was almost universal contempt for the existing dependent children's welfare program, which began in the 1930's and would be replaced by the Nixon administration's Family Assistance Plan of income guarantees.

One family said that "on welfare you can't go any place or raise your cultural level." Another said welfare "kills people," and a third said welfare "makes liars and cheats" out of people.

Only a few of the income experiment's families did not endorse the concept of a national income guarantee plan.

"I don't think it will work," one father said. "It's like putting the whole country on welfare."

But the overwhelming view was expressed by families that said the program was a "good idea," that "all the people in the cellars and in the slums need it," that "you need a program for those not rich."

"Professionals can always find a job in their field," one Jersey City father said. "But there is no such thing as a guaranteed factory job."

Similarly, a Scranton father said:

"It's giving those who are already trying a chance to get ahead. Everyone can't count on steady work . . . Take Scranton. Six years ago if you wanted a job as a dishwasher you had to fight at least 10 other guys to get it. Think how much this program would have meant then."

Most of the families showed a clear understanding that the income guarantees, which average less than $100 a month, go down as earnings go up.

"You work more, you get less," said one father.

Another said he took a job knowing that the guarantee would go down, because he wanted to better himself. And one enrollee, who now only receives $20 a month, said that small incentive has made him "work harder in the last months putting in overtime whenever I can."

Under eight different combinations of tax rates and guaranteed income levels, the guarantees are entirely eliminated when earnings go above a certain level. To date, 10 per cent of the families in Trenton, Paterson and Passaic have increased their earnings so that they no longer are eligible for the guarantees.

One father correctly figured the point where he no longer would be eligible for benefits and said, "I'd be happy to go above it"—indicating, as many of the answers did, that the cash payments do not slow down work effort.

Typical comments were "I'd rather work than sit," and "it's all I ever knew all my life." Another family head said work was necessary so a guaranteed income plan would be "more an insurance policy than a handout."

The experiment is being financed by the Office of Economic Opportunity under contracts with the Institute for Research on Poverty at the University of Wisconsin, and Mathematica.

Although developed under the Johnson administration, the experiment is proving to be a unique testing ground for President Nixon's revolutionary welfare reforms, which appear assured of Congressional passage this year.

The reforms are mammoth in that they establish the first uniform federal income guarantee ($1,600 for a family of four) and include working poor families, as well as the non working poor, for the first time.

Critics have said the program might lead to widespread loafing. But the Mathematica interviews suggest the program, in the words of one father, will give the "guy who tries the feeling that it is worth it."

---

[From the New York Times, Feb. 28, 1970]

INVENTORY OFFERS TO SUPPORT TEST OF WELFARE GRANTS AND WAGES

(By Jack Rosenthal)

WASHINGTON, February 27.—A computer scientist from White Plains, N.Y., thinks that the Government is approaching welfare reform in the wrong way and is willing to put up $500,000 of his own money to prove it.

"The present system is terrible, and even the President's welfare reform plan would, in effect, put poor people in the same 50 to 67 per cent tax brackets as industrialists," says Leonard M. Greene, a 51-year-old inventor and producer of on-board computers for commercial aircraft.

He regards even a current Federal income-grant experiment as unsatisfactory and this week wired an offer to the Office of Economic Opportunity.

He would, his telegram said, personally support a broadening of the experiment to cover 100 poor families if they could receive income grants and also be allowed to keep all outside earnings.

The present experiment, conducted in New Jersey, seeks to determine what 1,359 low-income families do with income grants if they are permitted to keep some but not all outside income.

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

The O.E.O. issued a preliminary report last week indicating that families with grants are more likely to work than non-recipients. The experiment has two years to run.

An O.E.O. spokesman said today that the agency was not prohibited from accepting private grants. Mr. Greene's proposal, he said, "is an interesting offer" but the agency will have to learn more about it before acting.

Mr. Greene hopes to broaden the experiment to find out what happens to work incentives when poor people can keep all they earn plus the grants.

Mr. Greene, a one-time test pilot and air taxi operator, says the offer could cost him $500,000 over two years. He admits with a shrug that he is not sure the contribution would be tax-deductible.

In a slightly "mod" suit and wide tie, he does not look at all like a zealot, but like the wealthy businessman he has become as the result of his computer inventions.

"I don't consider myself a nut," he says, "or even as all that altruistic. I'm successful, but so what? Unless our society can solve this (poverty) problem, I'm a success on a sinking ship."

Mr. Greene came to Washington this week seeking support in Congress for his own welfare reform proposal, keyed to the same idea as his offer to O.E.O.—that the poor should get income grants and be able to keep all outside income besides.

Under his "fair share" plan, all citizens, poor or not, would receive income allowances. Those received by the poor would be untaxed or taxed at low rates. The amount of tax on the allowance would increase gradually, like the income tax, so that non-needy families would keep nothing of the allowance.

Mr. Greene believes that the Nixon Administration's proposed family assistance program, to reform the present welfare system, suffers from the same fault as the O.E.O. experiments.

Under the proposed program, pending in Congress, a poor family would be guaranteed $1,600 in annual Federal grants. It could earn an additional $720 without penalty. But it could keep only half of any earnings above that.

REBUFFED BY TRAINEE

"And that's tantamount to a 50 per cent tax," Mr. Greene says, "67 per cent if you add what the states might add."

Mr. Greene first came to devise a welfare reform system three years ago when his Safe Flight Instrument Company offered a good salary to a black youth to become a computer technician-trainee.

"And yet the boy had to turn us down," recalls Mr. Greene, eight of whose own 12 children are now in college. "The additional income would have disqualified his family from its place on the waiting list for public housing. What kind of society is it that compels a young man to barter his whole future for a place on an apartment waiting list?"

He believes that present law encourages people "to become 'vegetablized' and live on the dole. The only work they can seek is in hidden, cash jobs like driving cabs, caddying—and crime. These cash jobs are precisely those with no future."

"We should be encouraging people to work and to get ahead," he says, "not penalizing them for it."

---

## ENDING THE WAR

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I commend President Nixon for the work he is doing to end the tragic Vietnam war and for his excellent speech to the Nation on this work on Monday night.

In my view, the President accomplished two significant things by this speech:

First. Despite reported pressures from various military sources to curtail American troop withdrawals, he announced a continuation of the present rate of troop withdrawal without any break in the monthly average.

Second. We preserved a flexibility in the daily handling of our disengagement from Vietnam which he should maintain as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces.

All Americans should be heartened by his pledge of withdrawal of an additional 150,000 troops in the next year. The President, by this dramatic step, has shown his good-faith intention to end the war, but without moving so precipitously as to endanger the lives of American troops not included in present withdrawal plans.

I have often told the people of Pennsylvania in the last year and a half that President Nixon has taken steps which no previous President has done by actually removing troops, by actually scaling down the intensity of the combat, and by actually reducing the level of American fatalities.

I share his regret that negotiations in Paris have not borne fruit up to this point, but I urge continued efforts in Paris in the hope that there still may be encouragement from this quarter.

President Nixon showed Monday night that he is on the right track, and he has my full support.

---

## THE WARSAW GHETTO UPRISING: A COMPELLING REASON FOR SENATE RATIFICATION OF THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this week marks the 27th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising. It is particularly fitting and proper that we should pay tribute to the inhabitants of the Warsaw ghetto who gave their lives in an attempt to preserve the rights of their comrades.

In September 1939, the Nazis invaded Poland, and by October had completely taken over the country with its Jewish population of over 3 million. The occupation was immediately followed by a series of restrictive laws, designed to subject the Jews to starvation and disease. In Warsaw, this was accompanied by the institution of the "ghetto," an area of 100 city blocks, into which 450,000 Jews were confined.

In the face of many hardships imposed on them by the Germans, an organiza-

tion called the Jewish Fighter Organization—ZOB—was formed. The militancy of this group grew when it was learned that the thousands of Jews who were deported daily faced certain death in the gas chambers. However, due to the scarcity of firearms and the limited cooperation of the non-Jewish resistance, it was not until April 19, 1943, that the ZOB presented an organized attempt to drive the Germans from the ghetto.

Initially, they were successful, inflicting heavy German casualties, and routing their tormentors. Nevertheless, the Nazis responded with soldiers, tanks, and bombs. By May 16, they had leveled the ghetto and but for a few exceptions, had liquidated its entire Jewish population.

In 1948, the United States, along with 47 other countries, signed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The designers of this declaration among other things sought to define and to prevent the crime of genocide as it was practiced by the Germans against the Jews in World War II.

This week hearings open on the Genocide Convention. The United States was instrumental in drafting this convention, as it has been in the drafting of many other human rights conventions. However, we have not yet ratified this or any treaty which would demonstrate our strong opposition to the crime of genocide. It would indeed be a tribute to the brave people of Warsaw if the United States took speedy action in the ratification of the Genocide Convention.

## EASTERN AIRLINES NEWARK TO WASHINGTON SHUTTLE

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, as one who joined with our entire congressional delegation in the effort to keep the Newark to Washington shuttle in operation, I am, naturally, pleased that Eastern Airlines now has decided to continue the service.

I believe that the expansion and improvement of this service, as opposed to its mere continuance, would be in the interest of Eastern as well as in the public interest.

## CHINA AND U.S. POLICY A TIME OF TRANSITION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Mr. A. Doak Barnett, senior fellow, the Brookings Institution, delivered a most interesting speech before the Women's National Democratic Club on March 2 which was entitled "China and U.S. Policy: A Time of Transition." Mr. Barnett summarizes briefly the present situation in China and the major factors that have impelled Peking to reexamine its policy. He also examines the transition in the American attitude toward China and suggests some actions that the United States might take to improve our relations with the most populous nation in the world.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Barnett's speech be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I call attention to a few sentences toward the end of Mr. Barnett's speech. Mr. Barnett observes that "the key immediate issue is whether we should build an anti-Chinese ABM." Mr. Barnett comments that "on this the Nixon administration, in my judgment—despite the rightness of the direction of its general China policy—is quite wrong. The arguments against an anti-Chinese ABM, on political and other grounds, wholly apart from technical grounds, are overwhelming in my view."

Mr. Barnett testified before the Subcommittee on Arms Control, International Law, and Organization on April 9 on the specific question of the ABM and its effect on U.S. relations with China. At that time, he made an extensive statement on the undesirability of going ahead with an anti-Chinese ABM system. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Barnett's statement to the subcommittee on April 9 also be printed in the RECORD.

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

TESTIMONY BY DOAK BARNETT BEFORE THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON ARMS CONTROL, INTERNATIONAL LAW AND ORGANIZATION, SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, APRIL 9, 1970

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, let me begin by saying that I am very grateful for this opportunity to meet and discuss with you a number of questions relating to arms control—questions focusing on the ABM and the SALT talks and their relevance to the broad problem of U.S.-China relations.

I would like to make two preliminary comments about my statement. First, the views I will express today are purely my own, and do not in any way represent views of The Brookings Institution, which does not itself take any stands on policy issues. Secondly, since I have very recently written an article (appearing in the current issue of *Foreign Affairs*) which summarizes many of my views on questions we are considering today, I am taking the liberty of drawing material from that article for the purposes of the statement I am now presenting to you.

We are now, in my view, at a rather critical juncture in the evolution both of our policy toward China and our policy regarding arms control.

For the first time in several years, there now appears to be at least a limited basis for hope that movement can take place in our relations with mainland China, movement which may reduce tensions and increase contacts between us. The current Warsaw talks will help to determine whether some progress is possible, or whether the freeze of the last two decades will continue.

At the same time, I believe that the arms control negotiations which we and the Russians have initiated are clearly the most important ones in the postwar period. We are about to meet again in Vienna at a time when both sides are poised to deploy new weapons systems—in our case, ABMs and MIRVs—if no agreements to forego such systems can be reached. Decisions made in the period immediately ahead by Washington and Moscow individually, and by both at the SALT talks, will determine, therefore, whether the U.S.-Soviet arms race will accelerate or slow down in the years immediately ahead. These decisions will also—and this is one of the major points I wish to make today—have a very significant impact on the prospects for improved U.S.-China relations. The evolving triangular relationship among the U.S., Soviet Union, and China is now such that any action by one or two of the three inevitably affects the others.

Since my assignment today is to focus attention on matters relevant to U.S.-China relations, and specifically to consider how we should view the ABM issue and SALT talks in relation to the "China problem," I will not comment on other fundamental questions, such as whether effective ABM systems are technically feasible or how they might affect the stability of the U.S.-Soviet balance. I assume that others will discuss these questions with you.

Let me proceed with my assignment and start by saying that I believe the Nixon Administration is to be commended for the new general approach it has adopted in our overall China policy. In his February 18 report to Congress on foreign policy, the President stated that we do not now wish to "isolate" mainland China but rather hope that in time it "will be ready to re-enter the international community," that we look forward to a "more normal and constructive relationship" with the Peking regime, that "the principles underlying our relations with China are similar to those governing our policies towards the U.S.S.R.," and that we will "take what steps we can toward improved practical relations with Peking." This is a very sound and very encouraging approach, in my opinion. Moreover, the limited steps we have taken recently to implement this approach—namely the liberalizing of passport and travel regulations and the reduction of trade restrictions, are highly desirable and deserve strong support. The Administration should now be urged to continue making further and more substantial steps along these same lines—for example, by removing all restrictions on nonstrategic trade with mainland China.

However, having said this, I must immediately go on to say that in my view, the deployment of an anti-Chinese ABM area defense would be extremely undesirable and would, in fact, run directly counter to, and tend to undercut, the basic objectives that underlie our new overall China policy.

Deployment of an anti-Chinese ABM would be both unwise and unsound, I believe, for a number of reasons. Let me summarize these briefly now, and then proceed to elaborate on some of them at greater length.

(1) The ABM is not necessary for the defense of the U.S. against any foreseeable "Chinese threat." For the indefinite future, the U.S. will continue to have overwhelming nuclear superiority in relation to China, and there is every reason to believe that our superiority will operate effectively to deter the Chinese from any offensive nuclear actions or threats. It is not necessary, therefore, to try to achieve a total damage denial capability by building ABMs.

(2) If the U.S. insists on building an anti-Chinese ABM system, Peking will probably interpret this to mean (whatever Washington says to try to convince it otherwise) that we are determined to maintain an unrestricted capability of making "first strike" threats against China, and that we insist on denying China the ability to acquire even a limited, defensive, "second strike" capability. There is every reason to believe that this would tend to reinforce Peking's worst instincts in interpreting our motives and would work against the possibility of improving our relations.

(3) China's present opposition to all international arms control agreements is rooted, in part at least, in its basic sense of vulnerability and nuclear weakness. Peking obviously has been, and still is, fearful of threats by the superpowers and of U.S.-Soviet "collusion" directed against China. Until China achieves a minimal defensive deterrent itself, this situation is likely to continue. However, once the Chinese do acquire a limited "second strike" capability, it is at least conceivable that leaders in Peking may at that point be more inclined than at present to consider the advantages of arms control agreements in terms of their own interests. If so, the chances of inducing China to participate in arms control may increase at

that point. An anti-Chinese ABM will probably work to postpone that day.

(4) For these and other reasons, the U.S. should itself forego building an anti-Chinese ABM area defense system, and in addition should attempt, at the SALT talks, to reach agreement with the Soviet Union that neither we nor they will build such systems. If, in the absence of such agreement, either or both proceed to deploy anti-Chinese systems, this will tend to reinforce Peking's fear of anti-Chinese collusion between Washington and Moscow, which at least would complicate, and could well seriously set back, the prospects for improving U.S. relations with China.

Let me now elaborate on some of these points, starting with a few comments on Chinese motivations, nuclear capabilities, and foreign policy behavior, and how one should view the "Chinese threat."

There is no doubt, I believe, that ever since 1949 the Chinese Communist regime, in its relations with the superpowers, has felt very vulnerable to external pressures and possible attack by one or both of the major nuclear powers. Particularly since the late 1950's—following the Sino-Soviet split and the start of U.S.-Soviet collaboration in the arms control field—Peking has felt itself to be, in a sense, "encircled" by the two superpowers. It is still, in a fundamental sense, weak and knows it; its basic posture in big power relations is, therefore, of necessity defensive.

One of China's basic aims has been, and still is, to acquire at least a minimal nuclear deterrent to improve its ability to deal with the U.S. and Soviet Union. Its hope is to achieve a position less unequal than in the past, and to strengthen its bargaining position and leverage in relations with the big powers. Above all, its aim is to deter attack against China and reduce China's vulnerability to external pressures. This is the basic military-strategic motivation behind its nuclear program.

Without attempting to summarize in detail the progress of China's nuclear program, let me say that while its technological progress has been impressive in many respects, its actual nuclear capabilities are very limited and will remain so for a long time to come—because of the relative weakness of China's resource base.

By the middle or latter 1970's China will, at best, have accumulated perhaps 15 to 40 operational ICBMs plus 100 to 200 MRBMs and a limited number of other bombs deliverable by aircraft. (The most recent Defense Department estimates suggest that by 1975 China may have 10 to 25 ICBMs and 80 to 100 MRBMs.)

To provide a crude basis of comparison, today, the U.S. and the Soviet Union each has over 1,000 ICBMs, plus many thousands of other nuclear weapons deliverable by a variety of sophisticated systems including missiles, airplanes, and submarines.

Projections of China's nuclear capabilities through the 1970's make several things clear. There is no possibility that in the foreseeable future Peking can aspire to parity with the U.S. and the Soviet Union in the nuclear field. The Chinese cannot come close to achieving a "first strike" capability against either of the superpowers. Under any conceivable circumstances, in the event of a Chinese attack, Washington or Moscow could retaliate massively. The question is whether—and if so, when, and with what consequences—China may be able to acquire a limited, defensive, "second strike" capability which will serve as a minimal deterrent for China—that is, a capacity, if subjected to U.S. or Soviet nuclear attack, to retaliate and hit at least some targets in the attacking country or, in the U.S. case, possibly American forces in the Pacific or bases in allied countries. To date, it has yet to achieve this.

If the U.S., and Soviet Union, forego building anti-Chinese ABM systems, they will, in effect, be accepting the fact that by the latter 1970's, China will have acquired a small defensive, "second strike" capability.

What risks or costs would this involve? It would require acceptance of the fact that the U.S., and the Soviet Union, cannot with impunity consider or threaten nuclear "first strikes" against China. One can question, however, whether this would involve high costs. The arguments and inhibitions against considering nuclear "first strikes" in most conceivable situations are already very great. (Conceivably, this may be less true for the Soviet Union, than for the U.S., as the vague hints about a possible preemptive strike in 1969 suggest, but even Moscow must feel strong inhibitions about initiating a nuclear "first strike.") Moreover, in most limited conflicts in Asia, nuclear weapons are likely to be almost irrelevant.

The possibility that key non-nuclear powers such as Japan, India, and Australia might feel more vulnerable and threatened cannot be ignored. If this impelled them to embark on independent nuclear programs, the cost in relation to U.S. aims (including the desire to prevent proliferation) would be substantial. Yet, as long as such countries have confidence in the U.S. commitment to defend them against nuclear threats, and as long as it is clear that American nuclear superiority in relation to China is such that any offensive nuclear threats by Peking would not really be credible, there is no reason why China's acquisition of a minimal deterrent should basically alter the position or the views of such countries.

It is sometimes argued that if the U.S. maintains a "first strike" capability against China and builds invulnerable defenses, presumably by development ABMs, the Japanese are likely to have greater confidence in our defense pledges. I believe that it is much more likely, however, that if the U.S. focuses on such a defense strategy, rather than relying on the continued applicability of mutual deterrence, the Japanese may conclude that the U.S. in a crisis condition might concern itself only with its own defense and abandon interest in allies not protected by such defenses.

The fact is that not only have the Chinese to date resisted whatever temptation they may have felt to engage in "bomb rattling," it is difficult to see how, from their position of nuclear inferiority, they will have any significant capacity for credible "nuclear blackmail" in the foreseeable future. Peking's cautious emphasis, to date, on defense as its sole aim in developing nuclear weapons suggests that Chinese leaders may already realize this.

Some might fear that once the Chinese believe they have acquired a credible deterrent, they might tend to become more aggressive in areas such as Southeast Asia, feeling that they could take more risks in nonnuclear or subnuclear situations, involving conventional weapons, because they would be less vulnerable to nuclear counter-threats. Whether one considers this to be a significant risk depends very much on one's general assessment of China's foreign policy goals, strategy, and behavior.

If one views China as a power committed to broad territorial aggression and expansionism by military means, willing to take large risks, and prone to irrational action (i.e., inclined to commit aggression without regard for possible consequences), there would be cause for major concern. However, among specialists on Chinese affairs, both in and out of the U.S. government, there appears to be a fairly broad consensus that analysis of China's behavior and doctrine over the past two decades does not support this view. In general, this consensus, which I believe is sound, maintains that:

Although China encourages revolutionaries abroad, it is not committed to broad territorial expansionism. Among its national goals is the recovery of certain areas that it considers to be lost territories, but even in regard to these territories its inclination is to pursue long-term, low-risk policies, not broad military expansionism.

It appears to be pre-disposed to keep Chinese military forces within China's boundaries, and it seems likely to continue doing so, except in cases where it feels Chinese security—or that of a Communist buffer state on its periphery—is seriously threatened (as it did in Korea).

Its primary stress, both in the structure of its conventional military forces and the doctrine governing their use, is on defense rather than offense.

It cannot and does not ignore the possible risks and costs of large-scale conventional war, even when nuclear weapons are not involved, and it places a high priority on the desirability of avoiding large-scale war of any sort with the major powers.

It is strongly pre-disposed, in general, to low-cost, low-risk policies. While it clearly encourages and supports revolutionary struggles in other countries, such support does not include Chinese manpower on any significant scale. Even Maoist doctrine insists that all revolutionaries must be "self-reliant," and should depend primarily on indigenous resources; it opposes the use of Chinese forces to fight other revolutionaries' battles for them.

China has used pressures and probes against its neighbors for a variety of purposes, but in doing so its use of force has generally been carefully calculated, limited, and controlled.

In crisis situations, it has tended to act with considerable prudence and caution, and repeatedly it has moved to check escalation when there has appeared to be a serious risk of major conflict.

There is, of course, no absolute guarantee that these patterns of behavior, which seem to have characterized Chinese actions over the past two decades, will persist in the future. Nevertheless, there is a remarkably broad consensus among China specialists that they are likely to continue. In fact, there is a fairly widely-held view—a view that I share—that post-Mao leaders are likely to be more pragmatic and realistic than Mao, and subject to even greater internal as well as external constraints.

As a result of the internal disruptions caused by the Cultural Revolution in China during the past four years, the Peking regime has clearly been weakened in some respects. Consequently, there are now new constraints, in fact if not in theory, on Chinese policy, which will certainly affect its strategies abroad.

Moreover, as a result of the steady deterioration of Sino-Soviet relations in the 1960's, the "Russian threat" appears to have replaced the "U.S. threat" as Peking's major foreign policy preoccupation, and this seems to have impelled the Chinese leadership to consider new options and strategies, to reduce China's present isolation and vulnerability and explore new opportunities for maneuver and flexibility.

It is at least plausible to believe, therefore, that future Chinese leaders may downgrade the importance of revolutionary aims (not ending, but possibly deemphasizing, Chinese activity in this field) and upgrade the importance of state-to-state relationships and more conventional political and economic instruments of policy. There is remarkably little support among China specialists for the idea that China is now, or is likely to be in the future, prone to act in an irrational or highly reckless manner, which it would certainly be doing if it were to ignore the continuing fact of its nuclear inferiority, and its vulnerability to both conventional and nuclear retaliation, even if, and when, it acquires a minimal deterrent.

If these judgments are correct, there are strong reasons to assume that once China achieves a nuclear deterrent it can be expected, in a basic sense, to act much as the other nuclear powers have, and to be constrained, as they are, by the realities of nu-

clear deterrence. There is little basis for arguing that the U.S., or Soviet Union, can feel secure vis-à-vis China only if they have a total damage denial capability and an unquestionable ability to threaten China with a "first strike". To argue this is to argue, in effect, that the U.S. and the Soviet Union can only feel secure under conditions that guarantee that the Chinese will continue to feel highly insecure.

As I stated earlier, if the U.S. operates on other assumptions and proceeds to build an anti-Chinese ABM, this will not only tend to strengthen Chinese suspicions that we are determined to maintain a potentially threatening "first strike" capability against China and to deny China even a minimal defensive "second strike" capability, it will also tend to postpone the day when China may be willing to consider participating in international arms control agreements.

Fundamental change in China's posture on strategic and nuclear arms control issues will not be easy for Peking to make, under any circumstances, because of China's basic weakness relative to the two superpowers. However, if one asks when and under what conditions a more flexible and pragmatic leadership in China might be inclined to change its posture on arms control, and even begin to see arms control measures as in the interest of China as well as of the other powers, the answer would seem to be the following: When China is convinced that its own nuclear development has reached a stage where it has at least a minimal credible nuclear deterrent—that is, some kind of defensive "second strike" retaliatory capacity—so that it will be able to deal with the U.S. and Soviet Union on terms less unequal than at present.

It is not easy to define when this point will be reached. But it will doubtless be reached eventually, whether or not we build an anti-Chinese ABM. It is almost certain that in time the Chinese will have acquired a sufficient nuclear capability so that no one could be sure whether, if China were subjected to a "first strike", it could not mount a significant retaliatory strike, at least against allies or forces in the Pacific if not against the U.S. itself.

Whenever the Chinese, and we, are convinced that China has acquired some sort of limited "second strike" capability, the possibility that Peking may reconsider its present blanket opposition to arms control may increase, for a variety of reasons. The realization that pursuit of parity is a will-o-the-wisp is likely to begin to sink in, in China. Moreover, once China has acquired any sort of credible deterrent, some Chinese leaders may conclude that it is more feasible to try to reduce the gap between China and the superpowers through agreements limiting (or reducing) U.S. and Soviet capabilities than by trying to catch up in a hopeless race. And, as the cost of deterrence goes up (it inevitably must, as China gets involved in more sophisticated hardware), and as the competition for resources in China increases (between those stressing economic development and those emphasizing defense), there may be greater pressures within China, on economic grounds, to limit investment in strategic arms development.

The construction of anti-Chinese ABM systems would be likely, therefore, to postpone the day when there may be some realistic hope of including China in international arms control. It would tend to raise the level of nuclear development which Peking's leaders will consider essential as a minimum goal. And in general it will tend to make more remote the possibility of establishing a "more normal and constructive relationship" with China and the possibility of inducing Peking to "re-enter the international community"—which are now our stated, and in my opinion eminently sensible, goals.

What does all of this suggest regarding the decisions we should make and the policies we should pursue regarding an anti-Chinese ABM system—both in our own consideration of the problem and in discussions with the Russians at Vienna?

I strongly believe we should clearly decide that, in terms of our broad national interests and aims, we should not build an anti-Chinese ABM system, because it conflicts with the main thrust of ouor new China policy and is unnecessary for our defense—wholly apart from other possible reasons. The cost of such a system would certainly be in its disfavor, too, but clearly the costs would be tolerable if it were essential in terms of our defense and foreign policy goals. The point is that it is not only unessential, but would tend to be damaging in terms of our overall objectives.

We should not only make this decision ourselves; we should also in the SALT talks attempt to reach agreement with the Soviets on this issue, so that both we and they will forego traveling this road. This would be desirable in relation both to our aims regarding China and our desire to check the U.S.–Soviet arms race.

Both the U.S. and the Soviet Union must concern themselves, more than they have in the past, not only with the problem of strategic stability in their bilateral relations but also with the task of inducing China, over time, to improve relations in general and, eventually, to participate in arms control efforts and accommodate more fully than it has to date to the requirements of the nuclear age. Neither need fear that the Chinese will be able to achieve a "first strike" capability, or approach nuclear parity, in the foreseeable future. Nor should they consider China's eventual acquisition of a minimal deterrent to be a special danger. While it is true that China's acquisition of a credible deterrent will improve Peking's defensive capabilities, it will not significantly alter the overall nuclear balance. Moreover, China can be expected to act much as other nuclear powers have, and to be constrained, as others are, by the realities of mutual deterrence. Equally important, when China achieves a credible deterrent, Peking's leaders may be more inclined than at present to reassess their strategic polices and consider the value of arms control.

The hope should be that Moscow as well as Washington will see the importance of this. But even if Moscow does not, the U.S. in shaping its own strategic and arms control policies, should take the "China problem," as well as the problem of U.S.–Soviet bilateral relations, fully into account.

---

### China and U.S. Policy: A Time of Transition

(A. Doak Barnett's speech at the Women's National Democratic Club on Mar. 2, 1970)

I'm delighted to be with you and to talk with you briefly today about trends in China, as I see them, and in U.S.-Chinese relations. For the first time in quite a long time, there is something to talk about. For a good many years, this has been a rather gloomy subject to discuss—and I have discussed it for a good many years—not because relations between the two countries have been so bad, but also because there has been so little seeming prospect of any change or improvement.

During the past few months, this has begun to change, and although there is certainly no basis yet for great optimism or enthusiasm about the prospects, there are at least some rays of hope and small signs of a possible thaw, and this makes the subject of U.S.-China relations much more interesting, and more timely and encouraging, than it has been for some years.

I think it is clear, in fact, that we are now in a transition period; and although no one, certainly not I, can really predict or foresee the future, the future definitely seems more open-ended than it has been for a very long time.

China itself is in the midst of an extremely important transition period. Its situation both at home and abroad is basically different in many respects than what it has been in the past. But the U.S., too, is in the midst of a transition in its policy towards Asia as a whole and in its policy and attitude toward China specifically, so that China's changing situation and our changing attitude and policy have introduced, it seems to me, new elements of flexibility and change into a situation that has been frozen for so many years.

Now let me begin with a few comments on changes that have been taking place or are now underway in China itself, because they are an extremely important ingredient in the situation. I obviously cannot, in a very few minutes, do justice to the extremely complicated and even traumatic events that have taken place in China in the five years since the so-called Cultural Revolution began in '65.

The Cultural Revolution has been a remarkable, and in some respects a unique, historical phenomenon. In essence, it has been a struggle in which an aging and extraordinary utopian revolutionary leader lost faith in, and actually lost control over, for a while, the revolutionary regime which he had created; and then set about organizing what in effect has been a second revolution.

Mao in the early '60s no longer had day-to-day control over the Communist Party which ran China, so he turned to the Army, or at least part of the Army under Lin Piao who was Defense Minister, and to the youth of the country, particularly youth in the schools and colleges and mobilized both to attack the majority of his old revolutionary colleagues and the entire Party and Government bureaucracy which had dominated the country for fifteen years.

In a basic sense Mao had real cause to be disturbed by trends in China in the early 1960s. There was in China, in the aftermath the great leap forward and the economic depression which followed it a definite decline in ideological fervor and morale; a real growth of deadening, ossifying bureaucratic behavior; an emergence of vested interests and parochial interests; a growing and very serious generation gap; and increasing frustration and disillusionment among the youth.

In response to these trends and to the real economic crisis which China experienced in that period, the leaders in charge of day-to-day affairs in China did appear to become less and less revolutionary; more and more pragmatic, if you will—in Mao's terms revisionist—more and more like leaders in the Soviet Union.

And it was in this context, I think, that Mao decided that he was going to make one final, apocalyptic attempt to try to halt the decline and deterioration of the revolution, as he saw it, in China and try somehow to revitalize the revolutionary process, to try, in short, to ensure that the particular brand of values that he believes in would persist after he died.

In some respects this was a rather grand idea, a heroic revolutionary effort. The fact is, however, in my view at least, that Mao was a romantic, a Utopian, in thinking that he could do this, that he could impose his views on the country, and completely unrealistic in believing that he could achieve his aim, that he could perpetuate his values, by tearing down the bureaucratic structure of the regime that had been built up in the previous fifteen years; by setting loose chaotic forces for change and conflict.

He *did* set loose these forces. He *was* able to tear down, in a large degree, the bureaucratic structure that had grown up in the previous fifteen years. He was able to purge most of those who disagreed with him at the top in China. But he was not able—he has not been able to date, and will not be able—suddenly to replace all this and create a new order based on his particular values.

Consequently, after this long and very

chaotic period in China, China is now in the process, slowly and painfully, of trying to rebuild its political system, trying to define a whole new set of policies. In this situation, the Chinese leadership is very different from what it was in the decade before 1965, certainly very different from what it was in the 50s. Even though Mao's brooding presence is still there and he is able to inject himself into the situation when he wants to, he does not have real control over the situation in China; and the leadership, I would say, is basically a coalitional type of leadership in which people representing interests of very conflicting sorts are somehow trying to get along, somehow trying to run the country, somehow trying to evolve new policies.

As a consequence, the regime has had a very difficult time defining clear policies. As a matter of fact, it seems to me, if one looks back to the Party Congress last spring, the most notable thing about it was the failure to announce any real strategies and policies, and in my opinion this lack of policy has continued throughout the past year (it is now almost a year since the Party Congress).

In a sense, the atmosphere in China is almost like that of an interregnum already, even though Mao is still there. Clearly the Maoist era is approaching its end, but the post-Mao era has not yet started. And in a basic sense, one gets the sense of a country waiting for its old revolutionary leader to pass from the scene. Mao and his closest followers still do press for revolutionary policies of a variety of sorts, but they are not really able to carry them out throughout the country effectively. Others resist, drag their feet, sometimes push in other directions. And yet, until Mao does pass from the scene, those who might favor quite different policies, less Utopian policies, are inhibited from really pressing for what they believe in, because Mao's prestige is such that they cannot.

As a result of what has happened, the power structure in the country has changed to a very great extent. For one thing, power in a de facto sense has been decentralized very substantially. Peking just does not have the capability now to try to manage and direct everything from the center as it did ten years ago. Instead it is local leaders, military and other leaders in the provinces and at lower levels, who are running China in many, many respects.

Furthermore, it is not the party—and this is unparalleled in any Communist country—it is not the party which is running the country really now; it is the Army. Into the vacuum that was created by the Cultural Revolution, the Army had to step in. It was the only really centralized instrument of power left in the country, and it has stepped in; from the center right down to the local level the Army and military people are performing functions the party used to perform.

The party and government are now in the process of being reconstructed after the events of '67 and '68, but it is very slow, very painful, and there are many kinds of local conflicts, as the people involved try to decide what kind of a party it will be and who will be members of it.

When Mao dies, there will clearly be another period of uncertainty, some confusion and perhaps a power struggle. My own guess, though, is that somehow a coalitional type of leadership will be put together, a collective type of leadership. It will hold the country together. It is likely, in my view, to move in some new directions. As a matter of fact, I think it is highly probable that post-Mao leadership will move almost precisely in the directions that Mao has feared: it will move away from the idea of great, Utopian, apocalyptic, grand strategies; away from the radical revolutionary policies that Mao has tried to promote the last few years. Of necessity, I think it will move toward a somewhat more realistic, pragmatic policy designed simply to cope with the immediate and very pressing problems that the country faces and will face. There will be concern about the need to restore a larger degree of order, a larger degree of unity, a larger degree of purpose, to get the country back on the course of rational development. I believe China will move in these directions over time.

China's international position has also undergone some very great changes in the same period. The Chinese encountered a series of rather dramatic set-backs in their foreign policy in 1965, just on the eve of the Cultural Revolution: the coup in Indonesia—the Chinese had put a great deal of stock in their relations with Indonesia and the possibility of a revolution there—the failure of the attempt to hold a second Bandung Conference at Algiers that year—in which the Chinese invested a great deal of political prestige—and others. Then came the Cultural Revolution.

Although the Chinese adopted, and continued to exhibit a very militant, verbal posture, favoring revolutions all over the world, in practice they became so preoccupied with their internal problems that they virtually abandoned normal foreign policy activities abroad. For a couple of years, I think it is fair to say, China had no real foreign policy—it turned inward, and cut many of its external ties.

One indicator of this is the fact that at the height of the Cultural Revolution, in forty-odd embassies abroad China only had one ambassador. The rest had all been called home in connection with the Cultural Revolution. This situation started to change as the Cultural Revolution itself began to grind towards a halt in late "68 and early '69. Peking then begun to look cautiously outward again; it began to renew its foreign policy activities abroad.

Last spring it sent back the first group of seventeen or so ambassadors. Possibly two or three may have gone subsequently. All of these, incidentally, have been professional diplomats, not Maoist idealogues. Subsequently, it has promoted trade in a very systematic and non-idealogical way, and it has entered into negotiations with a number of countries about the possibility of establishing relations—Canadians and Italians. It has also entered into negotiations with the Russians over border problems, and most recently has agreed to renew negotiations with us.

Looking at what has happened to China's foreign relations through this period, I think the most important and most dramatic change has been in China's relationship with the Soviet Union, as a result of the Sino-Soviet conflict. This conflict, as I am sure you know, has been developing for years, from the late '50s on and has escalated step by step over the years.

The Soviet military build-up around China has been steadily increasing since about 1965, certainly since 1967. And finally, last year as you know, there were some very important and dangerous border clashes between the Russians and the Chinese in Manchuria and in Sinkiang, on the Chinese-Russian border there. I think it is clear that by last year the Chinese genuinely feared the possiiblity of a major war with the Soviet Union, genuinely feared Soviet attack, and were forced to the conference table by some subtle and not-so-subtle Soviet threats. They have been talking in Peking since last fall, but there is little sign—in fact, no sign—that the negotiations have accomplished anything to date and I suspect that progress will, at best, be very slow.

The sequence of events, I think, clearly has led the Chinese to regard the Soviet Union as a more immediate and more real threat to Chinese security today than the U.S., and this is a very fundamental change. The danger of a Sino-Soviet war is now Peking's single most important preoccupation in foreign policy, in my view, and within China there is a wide range of programs going on right now that are said to be, and to an extent doubtless are, preparations for the possibility of war. This threat hanging over China has been a subtle factor influencing its foreign relations with almost everyone else, including ourselves.

So there are number of major factors that have been impelling Peking to reexamine its policy: the situation at home, one of uncertainty and considerable fluidity; the need to rebuild a foreign policy, after a period in which they had almost no foreign policy and were very isolated, during the Cultural Revolution; the pressure of professionals concerned with foreign affairs, and certain other leaders in Peking, to have a degree of flexibility in rebuilding China's foreign policy; a new sense of threat from the Soviet Union, which I would say is probably the most important factor; and a feeling, which I think is valid and is shared by most of the powers concerned with Asia, that the situation in Asia is changing, that it is developing toward a much more multi-polar situation than in the past, a situation in which there will be more opportunities for maneuver and flexibility, and more necessary for it.

So this is the context in which China has begun to show some signs of increased flexibility. It is still groping. It certainly has not yet defined any clear new foreign policy or foreign policy strategy, but it is groping for new policies, as we on our side are doing.

These are, in very crude and simple terms, some of the facts that have been influencing the other side. The U.S. has also, I think, been undergoing an extremely significant transition in our attitude towards China. This has happened fairly gradually and in some respects undramatically—so much so that many Americans don't realize how much change has taken place.

Throughout the 1950s, U.S. attitudes and policies towards China were extremely hostile and fearful. We were committed not only to contain China, but also to isolate it, to keep it out of the international community, and to exert as much pressure on China as possible, in the hope that somehow the regime would change. I believe change in our attitudes began in the U.S. government as early as the Kennedy administration, but Kennedy was not able, or did not in any case take steps to change our policies.

During the Johnson administration there were some important steps, more important than many people realize, to redefine our broad posture toward China. At one point, in one very important speech, for example, Johnson actually called for "reconciliation" between the U.S. and China, a very different stance from that we had been committed to in the '50s. But during the Johnson administration there were few concrete steps taken to translate this change of posture into change of actual policy toward China.

The process of making real policy changes began last summer under the Nixon Republican administration.

Several factors help to explain this process of change, I think. One is just a gradual cooling, that time has brought about, in the emotions of the 1950s—which reached a peak in the mid '50s as a result of the Cold War, in general, and the Korean War, in particular.

A second factor has been a revised view of China and its potential threat. This is in part because of the Sino-Soviet split. It is obviously not true that China and the Soviet Union are today a cohesive, monolithic unit working against us. They are competing against each other as well as competing against us.

There are other factors too. Observation of Chinese foreign policy behavior over twenty years has indicated to people in and out of the U. S. government, who have studied Chinese affairs, that the Chinese have not been adventurous and irrational. They have, in fact, been prudent and very cautious in situations where there has been crisis and danger.

As a consequence, I think, in 1970 the "China threat" seems quite different from what it was in the '50s; and validly so, I

would say. Today there is simply not the sense of China posing a great, overriding threat to us, or to the rest of Asia, that many Americans tended to feel in an earlier period.

For these and other reasons, Nixon decided fairly early in his administration that he was going to take—or approve—some small concrete policy changes, and he started last summer. You are all aware of them, I think, but to remind you, in the middle of last summer we liberalized travel restrictions as far as China was concerned, and opened the first crack in the twenty-year total embargo that we had imposed on China trade—first by allowing tourists to buy Chinese goods in Hong Kong; then last December we took what was still a small, largely symbolic step but it is nevertheless significant—we decided to allow American subsidiaries abroad to trade with Communist China. Significantly, there has been almost no criticism in Congress; or by the public of these steps; that is a sign, I think, of the basic change that has occurred in public attitudes.

I have no doubt, myself, that these are just the first steps in a new direction, and are not the end of it. I would expect, in the relatively near future, some further steps, probably in the trade field—perhaps steps to open up some direct trade between the U. S. and China.

Then early this year, we and the Chinese finally agreed to sit down at Warsaw and reopen the talks that had lapsed for almost two years, and we have now had two sessions in rapid succession. I do not know what took place at either of these meetings. I am quite impressed, in fact, by how well the people in the State Department as well as the Chinese are observing their agreement not to leak what is going on. I find this encouraging; it suggests both sides are looking at these talks as serious negotiations and are not just viewing them as propaganda gambits.

But there are hints, I think, that the U. S. Government is encouraged by the meetings, and personally I think it is very possible that they will produce some results.

Having said that, let me say that in my opinion one should not have unrealistic hopes about large changes in our China relations rapidly developing out of these talks or other trends. The legacy of twenty years of almost no contact, and of intense hostility, certainly is not going to disappear over night. At best, steps towards normalization of relations are going to be slow, and take time.

But I nevertheless think that it is extremely encouraging that the U. S. has adopted the stand that it has, and that the Chinese are showing at least a hint of flexibility. The present administration has said that we will work towards a normalization of relations with China; that we will deal with China on the basis of the same principles that underlie our dealings with the Soviet Union—this is a big change from our approach in the past—and that we will focus first of all on small steps that will improve practical relations. I think this is an entirely sound, desirable posture and a desirable general direction for us to move.

There are, of course, some very large obstacles down the road, if we find it possible to move down this road, before we get to the point of any real normalization of relations. Probably the crucial one, and the most difficult one, is Taiwan. We are committed to the defense of Taiwan against any military attack. It is clear that we will, and should, maintain this commitment. The Chinese Communists are committed to the ultimate liberation, recovery, and incorporation of Taiwan into China. It is clear that they will maintain this as an objective. So it is a major problem. Conceivably, though both sides might show some tactical flexibility about it. It is clear that neither can change its basic position in the years immediately ahead. The question that we will face as we go down the road of some mutual compromise is whether the Taiwan issue can, for a while, be finessed, can in effect be put aside while we and the Chinese Communists deal with other problems and hope that we can make some progress on them.

In the 1950s, Peking was willing to do this, and looking back it is clear that it was rigidity and inflexibility on our side that prevented some mutual accommodation in the latter 1950s. For the past decade, however, Peking has had a very rigid and inflexible view. The question is whether the Chinese will now be slightly flexible; I think we are now encouragingly flexible. I am hopeful that perhaps both sides will be. On the U.S. side, though, I think it is terribly important that we not stop with the two or three important, but essentially symbolic and no very large, steps we have taken in adjusting our policy, but continue taking a number of other steps.

On some matters, we may well find it possible to reach agreement with the Chinese at Warsaw; on others, though, I think we ought to be prepared to continue taking unilateral steps on our side, on the assumption, and in the hope, that over time this will influence Peking, and will stimulate Peking to take responsive action, even perhaps parallel action.

There are many things that I think we still need to do. We should not stop, and be pleased with ourselves, because of the small progress we have made. We should continue exploring every possible avenue for increased contacts. On this, incidently, the most practical approach would be: instead of putting primary stress on trying to get Americans into China, we should take every opportunity to invite Chinese to come to meetings and conferences in this country. This is going on; the U.S. government is for it. We ought to keep doing it until the Chinese begin to send a few people; then I think they will reciprocate and let some Americans visit China.

In trade, I think it is clear—I am convinced most people in the U.S. Government believe this now—we should move to remove all restrictions on nonstrategic trade with China and put China trade on precisely the same basis as trade with the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries. There is every reason to do this; and no real reason not to do it.

Before very long we must also readjust our policy on the China seat in the U.N. This is a terribly complicated subject, and I cannot deal with it adequately now. My own preference, considering the various alternatives, is for us actively to explore some formula for "dual representation"; even though Peking and Taipei both disapprove of this. I am not convinced that it is not possible to work out some formula which ultimately they might be willing to accept.

We must also show greater sensitivity than we have in the past to China's military and strategic fears, and avoid all unnecessary military pressures and provocations. To cite one example, we obviously do not send airplanes on reconnaissance missions over the Soviet Union any more; we rely on satellites. But, out of Taiwan, there are still such flights over mainland China all the time. It seems to me that we should rely on satellites for intelligence about China, as we do about the Soviet Union and avoid this kind of very provocative action.

Even in regard to Taiwan, while maintaining our defense commitment regarding Taiwan—which we can and must—I think we can and should make some adjustments in our policy. We have already made one, incidentally, which has practically escaped notice. We have virtually abandoned active patrolling in the Taiwan Strait. We do not need the patrol in the Taiwan Strait. What we need is the Seventh Fleet and our Polaris Fleet in Asia; we do not need to have ships touring up and down the China coast. We have virtually stopped doing this, and I think this is both significant and desirable.

However, we should also commit ourselves to remove the limited American military presence on Taiwan, after Vietnam if not before—but preferably before, if we can. We do not have a large presence there. It is mainly connected with one air base which serves as a refueling station for U.S. planes going to Vietnam. But this is something that certainly is of concern to the Chinese Communists, and something we could do without reducing our capacity to fulfill our commitment to Taiwan—and something I think would be desirable.

More broadly—and this is very important—we should take the problem of China policy fully into account in our general strategic and arms control policy; this, I would say, we have not done. The key immediate issue is whether we should build an anti-Chinese ABM—a nationwide light area defense. On this the Nixon administration, in my judgment—despite the rightness of the direction of its general China policy—is quite wrong. The arguments against an anti-Chinese ABM, on political and other grounds, wholly apart from technical grounds, are overwhelming in my view.

For the indefinite future we will have absolute, unquestioned, overwhelming nuclear superiority over China—on the basis of any projection of what the Chinese may be able to do. There is no reason not to proceed on the assumption that our present deterrent against China will be wholly effective in preventing China from even considering any offensive use of nuclear weapons against either us or our allies.

Actually, there is every reason to believe that China's main strategic motive in developing nuclear weapons is to try to acquire a limited defensive second-strike capability. That is all they can hope for. They hope to deter us from considering nuclear first-strikes against China. If we insist on building an anti-Chinese ABM, in effect what we will be saying to the Chinese is that we insist on having a total, continuing, one-sided superiority; that we insist on having a total damage-denial capability against China; that we insist on having a credible first-strike capability against China; and that we insist on having the option of threatening China, without any fear of any kind of a retaliation, for the indefinite future.

This is hardly likely, I think, to be reassuring to the Chinese about our intentions. I would argue that it runs directly counter to the main thrust of our new China policy, and that is, morever, not necessary from any security point of view. We need, therefore, to make our strategic policy and our China policy more consistent than they now are.

I would argue, therefore, that on this issue, at Vienna, when we meet with the Russians in the SALT talks, our aim should not be to get Soviet and U.S. agreement to build ABMs. We should get U.S. and Soviet agreement that neither of us will build anti-China ABMs.

Let me make just one final comment about the overall Asian context of our China policy in the '70s. On many respects there is going to be a new ball-game in the '70s; we are beginning to realize this but have not fully adjusted to it. Instead of bi-polar confrontation between two ideologically motivated sides—a theoretically monolithic Sino-Soviet block versus a U.S. with a subordinate, compliant Japan—instead of this, there is going to be an increasingly complicated four-power relationship and four-power balance.

All four of the major powers involved in the region—the U.S., Soviet Union, China and Japan—are going to play significant roles, influential roles. All of them, including Japan, I would say, are going to play fairly independent and autonomous roles.

Of the six bi-lateral relationships involved in this four-power balance, it is clear that the one today that is least developed, and yet may have the greatest potentialities for at least some change in the years immediately ahead, is the U.S.-China relationship. If we are wise, we will take the opportunity that we have now to press ahead as much as we can to see what extent we are able, as the Nixon administration has proposed to move toward a normalization of relations with China—without any unrealistic wishful thinking or overoptimistic expectations, but with some basis for the first time in twenty years for believing that some change may be possible.

## LOWERING OF VOTING AGE

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. President, the Senate has taken what is, to my mind, unduly hasty action in moving to lower the voting age to 18 in all elections by mere congressional fiat.

I hasten to assure Senators that I am not opposed to extending the franchise to American citizens below the age of 21. I am, however, seriously concerned about how we reform our political institutions. The Constitution implies and it has been traditionally accepted, that elector qualifications are within the provinces of the several States. Four States have already set the voting age below 21.

I am a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 147, which would lower the voting age by constitutional amendment. This approach provides for review, in the ratification process, by the States without affecting, one way or the other, a State's right to lower the voting age if that is the desire of its citizens. The Senate's action ignores and preempts the rights of the States to determine the age at which its citizens shall vote.

Another aspect of a lower voting age which has been ignored by the Senate's action is the whole question of the rights and responsibilities of full citizenship. Citizenship for an adult American affects more areas than the responsibility of casting a ballot.

In most States a minor cannot sign a binding contract, but must have an adult cosigner to an apartment lease or to finance an automobile.

The age at which a man or woman may marry without parental consent differs from State to State and is frequently different for men and women within the same State.

A guardian or trustee must be named in many States for any person under 21 who inherits property.

The lists of prospective jurors are drawn from the voter rolls. By extending the franchise, we may be automatically extending the privilege and responsibility of jury duty from age 21 to age 18.

I do not intend to suggest that any of these additional rights and responsibilities of full, adult citizenship should not be extended below the age of 21. I do, however, suggest that these equally important rights and responsibilities should be considered by the States when they act to lower the voting age or when they consider ratification of a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age.

These corollary rights and responsibilities of adult citizenship should not be ignored when considering the voting age, any more than the rights and responsibilities of the States to establish the voting age should be ignored as the Senate has done by its action on the Voting Rights Act.

The Chicago Tribune and the Illinois State Journal have published excellent editorials on the question of lowering the voting age by the means the Senate has elected to use. I ask unanimous consent they be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Springfield (Ill.) State Journal, Mar. 18, 1970]

SOUR LEGISLATION: LOWERING OF VOTING AGE

At the moment the United States Senate appears to be content with its 64-to-17 vote passage of the Voting Rights Bill, amended to permit 18-year-old Americans to participate in elections.

The passage of time might give those who voted for the measure some sobering second thoughts. Senators, even more than the lay public, should be well aware that the voting rights extension it approved simply is sour legislation.

There are two troublesome aspects.

As the United States of America pursues its fight to guarantee all citizens equality of opportunity, it should not itself project the image of discriminating against its citizens or states.

Yet the Voting Rights Act does discriminate by singling out a handful of states for the focus of federal efforts when the problem is acknowledged to exist in all of them. It supports its actions on data that in some instances are six years old. The danger is that the measure can divide instead of unite Americans.

Secondly, and perhaps of more immediate concern, was the Senate's willingness to tamper with the heart of the mechanisms that make our republic what it is—constitutional authority that relates to the separation of powers.

A constitutional method was available to the Senate to lower the franchise age through the regular procedures for amending our basic law.

Instead of using it, the Senate chose, against the advice of the attorney general and its own constitutional students—to attempt to interpret the Constitution on its own.

There is a disturbing thought that the leadership of the Senate and a majority of its members bow to highly emotional pressures of the moment.

That would, of course be too strong a conclusion to draw from an isolated example. As important as it is. Unfortunately, there is considerable other evidence.

The leading example is the effort of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in recent years to establish our foreign policy. Another is the Senate's willingness to advise at great length in respect to the political philosophy that the administration's nominee for the Supreme Court should have, but decline consent on the basis of judicial qualifications.

Or consider for a moment the proposal by Sen. J. William Fulbright that the Senate should declare any United States military activity in Laos "unconstitutional." The constitution does not contemplate that Congress also should double as the judicial branch of government.

One of the great values of our constitutional process is that it deliberately discourages haste and whimsy, opting instead for the slower approach that benefits from national debate and due process of law.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Mar. 16, 1970]

THE VOTING AGE IS A STATE MATTER

The United States Senate, by a vote of 64 to 17, has approved an amendment to the voting rights bill which would lower the voting age to 18 in all elections, federal, state, and local.

Even the author of this proposal, Sen. Mike Mansfield (D., Mont.), the majority leader, implicitly acknowledged that its constitutionality is doubtful. He said he favored continued work by a Senate subcommittee on a proposed constitutional amendment to lower the voting age. This alternative will be available if the House refuses to accept the Senate amendment or if it is enacted and later held unconstitutional by the courts.

A number of senators challenged the Mansfield amendment on constitutional grounds, but the majority apparently was more concerned about the possibility of offending 13 million potential new voters than about the violence it might do the Constitution or what is left of the federal principle in our system of government.

We favor reduction of the minimum voting age to 18, but we believe this is a matter for state action. Kentucky and Georgia already have lowered the minimum to 18; Alaska has lowered it to 19, and Hawaii has lowered it to 20. No federal action is required, but if it is desired a constitutional amendment is the procedure prescribed by the Constitution itself.

The 15th amendment was adopted to give Negroes the vote, the 19th to give women the vote, and the 24th to abolish poll taxes. Altho constitutional amendments were deemed necessary in all these cases, the United States Senate now proposes to ignore the Constitution in respect to federal legislation to lower the voting age.

The Constitution is explicit. It provides that electors of senators and members of the House of Representatives from each state "shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the state legislature." For the election of the President and Vice President, the Constitution provides that "each state shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct," as many electors as it has senators and representatives in Congress.

Clearly then the states, and not Congress, are empowered by the Constitution to prescribe qualifications for voting. Supporters of the Mansfield amendment relied upon the specious argument that the 14th amendment guarantees, among other things, "the equal protection of the laws" for all citizens, and authorizes Congress to enforce its provisions by "appropriate legislation." Under this authority, Congress, in the voting rights act of 1965, denied states the right to require literacy tests in English for persons who have completed the sixth grade in another language. The Supreme court, in Katzenbach versus Morgan, upheld this section of the act as applied to a New York statute which excluded Puerto Ricans, illiterate in English, from the franchise.

This law, however, was a determination by Congress that English literacy tests deny "the equal protection of the laws" to citizens who are literate in another language. It does not follow from the Supreme court's decision that a state law classifying citizens by age for voting purposes is discriminatory. If that were the case any qualification whatsoever would be discriminatory, for some could vote and others could not.

A dissenting opinion by Justice John M. Harlan, who was joined by Justice Potter Stewart, upheld New York's literacy test law. It said the act of Congress could not be sustained "except at the sacrifice of fundamentals in the American constitutional system—the separation between the legislative and judicial function and the boundaries be-

tween federal and state political authority." An attempt by Congress to usurp the right of the states to determine the minimum age for voting would do far greater violence to the constitutional system.

## OVERPOPULATION AND POLLUTION

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, as we move into the last third of the 20th century, it has become dramatically clear that the danger we face from the destruction of the habitat and life support systems of man by overpopulation and pollution of all kinds is as great as that from nuclear holocaust.

The danger involved in the technology of progress and abundance was evident in the development of DDT and other long-lasting pesticides which proved extremely effective for fighting crop pests and diseases, but also proved to have other unwanted and deadly impact on other parts of the environment by spreading through the soil and waters and into the air to the farthest reaches of the world.

Polluted air and waters damage the quality of the present and destroy the promise of the future. We face the possibility of being inundated with the bottles, cans, jars, and other packaging castoffs of a consumer society.

But recognition of the problem has begun to grow. Yesterday, April 22, was Earth Day, and its celebrations and observances did much to build greater awareness of the need to carve out new priorities dedicated to humanity, livability and quality, rather than just more progress, bigness and abundance.

Kenneth E. Boulding, professor of economics and director of social and economic research for the Institute of Behavioral Science at the University of Colorado, in the April 1970 issue of the Progressive magazine which is devoted entirely to environmental articles, calls for a nonpolitical systems approach to the problems of the environment. He says:

> We need a new image of the total dynamics of the social system more realistic than those provided by ideologies either of the right or of the left.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this fine article, entitled "No Second Chance for Man," which outlines the framework within which efforts to improve the environment must take place, be printed in the RECORD.

### NO SECOND CHANCE FOR MAN

(By Kenneth E. Boulding)

One of the agreeable things about the young of any generation is that they tend to think that they invented the world, and it is this indeed that keeps the world fresh. It is likewise a strong sign of being over sixty that one points out, much to the distress of the young, that a great deal of what is happening has happened before. The current excitement about the environment in particular is at least the third peak of interest in this particular issue in this century.

Excitement about the environment seems to have a generation cycle of some thirty years. The first major peak in this country was at the turn of the century, associated particularly with Governor Gifford Pinchot, America's first professional forester, Theodore Roosevelt, and the first conservation movement, which gave us the Bureau of Reclamation and expanded the National Park and Forest System. The second peak was in the 1930s, with the dust bowl and the great dust storm of 1934, in which noticeable portions of the Great Plains landed on the steps of the Capitol in Washington, and this produced the Soil Conservation Act, contour plowing, and all that.

It is not wholly surprising, therefore, that another generation has discovered that the world is not wholly indestructible. Now it is perhaps air rather than soil, and cities rather than forests, which have created the anxiety, but the anxiety is of course quite legitimate. There is nothing in the proposition that something has happened before to argue against its happening now. It is possible, however, to get a certain perspective on what is happening now, and perhaps also to avoid certain mistakes, if we see it as part of the much larger process.

We probably know more about the economics of the environment, surprisingly enough, than about its biology and physics. One of the real problems of the present crisis is that we know so little about the earth as a total physical system, particularly in regard to the atmosphere and the hydrosphere, and even less perhaps about the totality of the biosphere. Consequently, it is easy to develop scares about the oceans which are extremely hard to evaluate in the absence of an adequate earth science.

The science of the total earth is still undeveloped, and the earth sciences for the most part have been "micro" rather than "macro" in their interests. It is not surprising that we know much more about Walden Pond than we do about the oceans, or about the inside of a chimney than we do about the atmosphere, simply because at the macro level there is a great deal more to know. As far as I can judge from the gossip I hear, meteorologists are still quite uncertain as to whether the earth is cooling down or warming up as a result of man's activities, and one feels that even economists have a better idea than that as to whether we are in some sense going up or down.

The economics of the environment has two aspects—a short-run and a long-run. Within the short-run, with a horizon, shall we say, of another generation, there are two further aspects, one involving the relative price structure and the other involving distribution of income and wealth. A great many short-run environmental problems arise because of a defect in the relative price system in that not enough negative commodities have negative prices. A negative commodity is a 'bad," as opposed to a "good." It is something which diminishes utility rather than increases it.

Virtually all processes of production produce a whole set of joint products, some of which are "goods" and some of which are "bads." The bads may be physical products, like water and air pollution; they may be more subtle things like noise pollution; or they may be still more subtle, like information pollution—the spreading of misinformation—which is perhaps the most important pollution problem of all. The pollution of the information system by lies, propaganda, and other communications which increase ignorance and malevolence is probably much more threatening to the future of mankind at the moment than is the pollution of water and air, although it is much harder to deal with.

Market institutions tend to be ineffective in the pricing of bads, mainly because the system of property does not encompass them sufficiently. The legal system tries to do this in the law of torts, under which a private person can sue for damages. These damages (bads) then become, as it were, a form of property for which one can be legally compensated. A great many bads, however, are nobody's property, and the legal system, as at present constituted, is therefore inadequate to deal with them.

Just as "public goods" constitute a special category which requires a political rather than a market form of organization, similarly "public bads" require political organization and action if they are to be dealt with. The simplest and most obvious way to deal with them is through a tax system, and a system of graduated effluent taxes is certainly the place to begin in the control of pollution, even though it is not a panacea or a universally practicable device. It is applicable mainly to industrial pollution, but it is hard to apply to what might be called household or individual pollution, the sort of thing that is represented by the personal automobile, simply because the individual pollutant is in such small quantities that it is hard to identify.

We have a rather similar problem in information pollution. We have a law of slander for what we might call private information pollution, but this is not adequate to deal with the problem of public information pollution, which requires, indeed, a development of constitutionality beyond what we now have.

The real question here is whether the sense of public concern is strong enough to persuade people to sacrifice certain private goods for the suppression of public bads. This is an example of the famous "freeloading" problem. The individual interest is to go on polluting as long as the rest of society picks up the tab. It requires, therefore, a sense of political awareness and a political community before this problem can be solved. One can predict with a good deal of confidence that the present excitement will not have much result unless it can be translated into political action. Unfortunately, there is a strong tendency for political action to provide mainly ritualistic and rhetorically satisfying solutions to problems, particularly when there is a real conflict of interests between the public and the private. The principle of "the public be damned" is the secret vice of practically everybody.

The problem is complicated by the fact that almost anything we do about the environment is likely to have considerable effect on the distribution of income and wealth. A good many of the problems that we visualize today arise because many things which used to be the privilege of only the rich have now moved a long way down the income scale to become the privilege of a large majority of the people.

Most of the pressures on the environment, whether in terms of air pollution, urban sprawl, super highways, artificial fertilizers and insecticides, and so on, arise because the mass of the people in the developed countries are no longer as poor as they used to be. Per capita real income in the United States has about doubled in the last thirty or forty years. There has not, however, been much in the way of the *relative* redistribution of income—that is, the proportion of the total income going to different income groups is remarkably constant. We have made the poor richer not by making the rich poor, which is hardly ever a good recipe for this, but by increasing output. Increasing output, however, inevitably increases the strain on the environment. The most obvious, though not the most desirable, way to reduce pressure on the environment, therefore, is to stop the poor getting richer—that is, to redistribute income back towards the rich again.

There is some distressing evidence that this was one of the principal results of the first two great environmental agitations. In spite of the fact, for instance, that the Bureau of Reclamation probably represents the high water mark of socialist ideology in the United States, having been set up deliberately to undermine the monopoly of private capital, to lower interest rates, and to subsidize small farmers, its ultimate effect may well have been to subsidize rich farmers much more than poor ones.

This is even more true of the agricultural legislation which emerged out of the 1930s, which has been so successful in subsidizing

the rich farmers that it created a fantastic technological upsurge in agriculture, and in so doing was the major factor in creating the current urban problem. I would not blame the Soil Conservation Service for all of this, but certainly it was part of a policy which has driven the poor farmer off the land into the cities, largely into the ghettos, and has created in the United States a hereditary aristocracy of superpeasants.

Even if we look at the public lands policy, we can see clearly, in the West especially, that National Parks and National Forests have mainly had the effect of keeping poor people out of the mountains. If it had not been for the scarcity of private lands and the fact that the public lands benefited mainly the private owners who were adjacent, considerable numbers of the displaced poor might have moved into the Western mountains and turned them into another Appalachia. This certainly would not have been desirable in the long run, but it does mean that the public land policy imposed a hidden cost on the poor, for which they were not compensated.

These earlier conservationist policies can be defended, of course, both in terms of the preservation of the enjoyment of nature, in terms of the conservation of natural resources, and in terms of economic development itself. The brute fact, however, is that it is not the poor who enjoy the beauties of nature, or who are likely to benefit much from the conservation of natural resources; it is mainly the rich, who both create and gain the most from economic development. One can see the present environmental excitement tending along the same lines. We will solve the problem of the automobile by taxing it heavily so as to support electrically powered public transportation which would push us back to about 1900, when automobiles were the privilege of the rich and public transportation was the much less convenient privilege of the poor.

Behind the noble banner of pollution control and environmental preservation, which is supposed to bring us all together and unite us in a great war on generally agreed upon vice, there is an uncomfortable shadow, the claims of the poor. We see this even more dramatically on a world scale where it is the increasing population of the poor, and their increasing demands for development—the only thing which can give them increased per capita income—which is really threatening to create a major world environmental crisis. The environmental disasters that threaten the rich countries in the next thirty years are almost trivial compared with the environmental disasters that threaten the poor countries of the tropics. A part of this is the result of the undeveloped nature of science itself and of the technology which is based on it. Science on the whole is a temperate zone culture and science-based engineering even more so.

It is easy, therefore, to make disastrous mistakes when we go about developing the tropics, simply because of our ignorance of tropical ecosystems, and also because tropical systems, at least in many parts of the world, seem to be much more precarious than those in the temperate zone. Dam building in the tropics can be particularly disastrous. Diseases, such as schistosomiasis, evaporation, silt, erosion, and displaced peoples present problems on a scale unknown in the temperate zone. The ecological disaster with which Egypt is threatened by the Aswan Dam, and also by its uncontrollably expanding population, is on a much larger scale than anything that threatens in the entire temperate zone.

These environmental crises in the tropics, however, are arising precisely because the people in this part of the world are no longer content to live the way they have always done. Furthermore, the partial impact of science-based technology, particularly the introduction of public health measures, destroyed the old equilibrium forever. There seems to be no way back, fortunately, to a world in which the poor are quietly content to starve and allow the rich to govern them.

What all this means is that while short-run solutions to current environmental problems can probably be found fairly easily, the long-run problem is tough indeed, and will tax the intellectual and moral resources of mankind to the utmost. I have been describing this long-run problem as the problem of "re-entry into spaceship earth." Economic development has been compared not inaptly to a "takeoff." We are all aware that we are going through a period of enormous change and that the transition in the state of man which these few centuries represent is perhaps the greatest transition he has ever made or ever will have to make. We are now in the middle range of the voyage towards spaceship earth, perhaps not yet at the middle, but it is not too soon to start thinking and preparing for the eventual slowdown of the increase in scientific knowledge, a slowdown in economic development, and a reentry into a type of society which will probably be so different from anything in the past that we can hardly imagine it.

It is impossible to predict in any detail either the future of knowledge or of technology. One thing, however, is clear—that whatever the future society is like, it will have to inhabit a "spaceship earth," as Barbara Ward has called it, of highly limited resources, and it will have to develop a circular or "looped" material economy.

Up to the present period, man has lived psychologically, and to a large extent physically, on a "great plain," which has always had a horizon, always had a frontier, and he has always had somewhere else to go. His material economy, furthermore, has always been, with some possible exceptions, "linear," in the sense that it has gone from exhaustible resources of some kind, such as mines, wells, or even the stock of huntable animals, into dumps. Man's economic life even in the paleolithic period seems to have consisted of exhausting his environment and fouling his nest. As long as there was a new environment and a new nest to move into, this perhaps did not matter so much, and man, by reason of his remarkable learning capacity, was able to expand into the whole earth and become its dominant species.

The great phenomenon of the Twentieth Century, however, is closure. Even when I was a boy there were still unexplored places on the globe; today there are none. The space enterprise emphasizes as never before the smallness and the loneliness of planet earth. It is the only decent piece of real estate in an enormous volume of space. We are conscious also that the time we are living in is unique, that it will never be repeated again. There is no second chance for man. If he cannot succeed in organizing his little spaceship on a permanent, self-sustaining basis before he has exhausted the stock of geological capital on which his development now rests, he will never have another chance. He will be inhabiting a plundered planet with all its geological capital squandered.

It is clear, therefore, that spaceship earth will require a technology quite different from what we have now, one in which the atmosphere, the oceans, and the soil are virtually the only sources of man's material artifacts and in which as these artifacts are used up their material components are in effect returned to the sources from which they came. There seems nothing inherently impossible about a technology of this kind. Indeed, some of the Twentieth Century developments point towards it, such as the fixation of nitrogen from the air and the extraction of magnesium from the sea.

The great unknown is the energy requirement. We may be able to devise an economy without an increase of material entropy, that is, in which we do not on balance diffuse concentrated materials, but, thanks to the second law of thermodynamics (that closed systems run down), it is impossible to have any economy without an input of energy. Virtually the only outside input of energy into the earth comes from the sun and this will go on for a long time. We can supplement this by burning up the earth itself, either the fossil sunshine in the fossil fuels or the nuclear energy. If we solve the fission problem this, too, would go on for a long time, although we might be faced eventually with the inability to export enough energy into space. If we burn up too much of the earth, it may get too hot for us. We may eventually, therefore, be forced back on the input of solar energy and utilize this for the necessary material transformations.

What we do not know now within orders of magnitude is the total human population that a spaceship earth would support at a reasonable level. Perhaps this is something we do not need to know for a long time, but at some point it is going to be a crucial factor in human history. We might visualize an earth of self-contained households, each raising all its food in sewage-fed artificial-algae tanks on one half of the rooftop and capturing all its energy on the other half of the rooftop with a solar trap, using virtually indestructible equipment, clothing, and furniture, with transportation mainly in the form of information carried by radiant energy. In this case I suppose we could have a world city with 100 billion people and a kind of universal Los Angelization. On the other hand, this may not be feasible and a much more elaborate structure may be necessary to support a considerably smaller population.

It seems absolutely impossible to predict what kind of social organization spaceship earth would require. One can visualize everything from a super-hierarchical brave New World, with a small elite and a large number of happy robots, or one could visualize a highly decentralized society relying on automatic cybernetic controls in a virtually anarchic utopia.

What is clear in the midst of all this uncertainty is that in the light of the enormous intellectual and moral task which lies ahead of mankind, the political revolutions of the last 200 years fade into relative insignificance. Neither the American, the French, nor the Russian revolutions created fundamental changes in the state of man and the ideologies which supported them are quite inadequate to bear the weight of this enormous transition which man faces.

This is not to deny the importance of the political task. Indeed, the organization of the political life of the planet may well be the factor that will make the difference between successful re-entry and possibly quite irretrievable disaster, for a landing is more dangerous than a takeoff. The political task, however, and the intellectual labor which must precede it still largely lie ahead of us. This is an age of disillusionment with all previous political solutions and political organizations. Neither capitalism nor Communism can solve the imminent danger involved in the international threat system. Nobody has solved the problem of how to develop the tropics without either demographic or ecological disaster. Nobody has solved the problem of how to prevent the insidious corruption both of the culture of the powerful and the culture of the impotent. We need a new image of the total dynamics of the social system more realistic than those provided by ideologies either of the right or of the left.

If the present excitement about the environment is to produce more than emotion, platitudes, and attempts to take us back to the good old days when the poor knew their place, it will have to stimulate us to an analysis of social dynamics both more realistic and more appealing than any we now possess.

## MAYBE THERE IS A CHANCE AFTER ALL

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, there appeared in the New York Times on April 16 an item that leads me to a new feeling of hope: maybe there is a chance for the Republic after all.

The Gallup poll issued a new survey on the attitudes of the American people. And they found that by a ratio of 3 to 2 Americans now consider themselves conservatives rather than liberals. Over half, 52 percent, say they are conservatives. Only 34 percent cling to their liberalism, while 14 percent of the public is willing to be convinced.

Now, I want it clearly recorded that in my view there is nothing wrong with being a liberal person. Our country must have its liberal-minded educators, industrialists, politicians, and plain citizens. Neither is there anything wrong, if I may say so, with being a conservative, for our country also needs people with respect for old values and concern for their careful modification to meet changing circumstances. But the liberals and conservatives of whom I speak will both, with equal indignation, have nothing to do with those who, in the name of "liberalism," really mean anarchy and mindless violence. We have had too much of this lately, and it is time our Nation woke up to what these pseudoliberals are doing to it. Historically, violent disruption of society, no matter what its putative purpose, brings only equally violent repression in its wake. That is the course we may find ourselves on, unless the traditional good sense of the American people reasserts itself.

Happily, this poll gives indication that this may in fact be happening. I ask unanimous consent that the Gallup poll be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATIVES OUTNUMBER THE LIBERALS, 3 TO 2, IN GALLUP POLL ON ATTITUDES

PRINCETON, N.J., April 15.—The American people by the ratio of 3-to-2 prefer to be labeled as "conservatives" rather than as "liberals," according to the Gallup Poll.

However, sharp differences emerge on the basis of the age of the respondent, region and educational background.

To test the grassroots appeal of the terms "conservative" and "liberal," Gallup Poll interviewers talked to a sample of 1,528 adults living in more than 300 localities in a survey conducted March 20–22. All persons in the survey were first asked:

"What is the first thing that comes to your mind when you think of someone who is a liberal (a conservative)?"

Descriptions of a "liberal" varied from "someone who looks at all sides of a problem" and "a person who believes in mankind" to "someone who is generous with other people's money" and "a drug addict."

The public's image of a "conservative" ranged from "a person who looks before he leaps" and "a decent sort of guy" to "a penny pincher" and "a self-centered square."

The following question was asked of all persons who expressed an opinion on the two questions dealing with the image of a conservative and liberal:

"Suppose you had to classify your self as either a liberal or a conservative, which would you say you are?"

Here are the views of this group, who accounted for 73 per cent of the total sample:

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| Conservative | 52 |
| Liberal | 34 |
| No opinion | 14 |

Persons over 30 years old among those who answered the image questions leaned heavily in favor of the "conservative" label, but adults in their 20's preferred to be classified as liberals by 47 per cent. Eight per cent did not express a choice.

The following tables show in detail the public image of a "conservative" and of a "liberal," with the percentages based on all persons in the sample:

*Image of a conservative*

FAVORABLE

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| Saves, doesn't throw things away | 16 |
| Cautious (careful) | 10 |
| General remarks (favorable) | 5 |
| Total | 31 |

NEUTRAL

| | |
|---|---|
| Mentions Nixon, current administration | 6 |
| Mentions specific person other than Nixon | 5 |
| Mentions political position or party | 3 |
| Total | 14 |

UNFAVORABLE

| | |
|---|---|
| Does not want to change, does not take a chance | 12 |
| Close-minded, intolerant, self-centered | 9 |
| Total | 21 |
| Miscellaneous | 3 |
| No opinion | 35 |
| Total* | 104 |

*Image of a "liberal"*

FAVORABLE

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| Open-minded, fair | 12 |
| Generous, good-hearted | 6 |
| Wants change, active in bringing about needed reforms | 5 |
| General remarks (favorable) | 2 |
| | 25 |

NEUTRAL

| | |
|---|---|
| Mentions specific person | 7 |
| Mentions political position or party | 7 |
| Mentions a specific problem (civil rights, etc.) | 3 |
| | 17 |

UNFAVORABLE

| | |
|---|---|
| Gives things away, spends too freely | 8 |
| Negative descriptions (Communists, hippies, drug addicts, etc.) | 5 |
| Gets carried away, wild, too far out | 4 |
| Permissive, indifferent | 4 |
| General remarks (unfavorable) | 4 |
| | 25 |
| Miscellaneous | 2 |
| No opinion | 37 |
| Total* | 106 |

**Total adds to more than 100 per cent because some persons gave more than one response.*

## THE ABM: IS IT A DOOMSDAY MACHINE?

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the time is fast approaching when we shall once again be asked to vote authorization of an expanded anti-ballistic-missile system—ABM. Its proponents have long since begun to beat the drums in an effort to alarm the American people into accepting this shockingly expensive, appallingly dangerous weapon.

What, they ask, if we do not have the ABM and an enemy attack appears to be underway? The more terrifying and appropriate question is, however: What if we do have such a system and use it? The answer, it now appears, is the extinction of mankind through strontium 90 poisoning.

The question was posed and answered last fall by Dr. Ernest J. Sternglass, professor of radiation physics at the University of Pittsburgh. His chillingly entitled essay, "The Death of All Children," received far less attention than it deserved. In order that it be available for consideration by the Senate during this year's debate, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE DEATH OF ALL CHILDREN—A FOOTNOTE TO THE A.B.M. CONTROVERSY

(By Ernest J. Sternglass)

Hopefully it is not too late to ask the members of Congress in their deliberations over the Administration's proposed Anti-Ballistic Missile system to pause and reflect on the nature and urgency of the matter they have been debating

In view of new evidence on the totally unexpected action of strontium 90 on human reproductive cells, it is apparent that Congress has not yet considered what may well be the most important factor affecting its decision to proceed or not to proceed with the first steps toward the A.B.M. shield. The fact is this: a full-scale A.B.M. system, protecting the United States against a Soviet first strike, could, if successful, cause the extinction of the human race. (Indeed, the scientific evidence indicates that *already* at least one of three children, who died before their first birthdays in America in the 1960's, may have died as a result of peacetime nuclear testing.) Such is the conclusion indicated by new information on the unanticipated genetic effect of strontium 90, presented at a recent meeting of the Health Physics Society.

Proponents of the A.B.M. system argue that it is necessary to prevent the destruction of our deterrent forces by a massive first strike of Russian SS–9 missiles carrying thousands of multiple warheads. But the threat of such an attack loses all credibility against our present knowledge that the vast amounts of long-lived strontium 90 necessarily released into the world's rapidly circulating atmosphere could lead to the death of all Russian infants born in the next generation, thus ending the existence of the Russian people, together with that of all mankind.

The unanticipated genetic effect of strontium 90 has become evident from an increase in the incidence of infant mortality along the path of the fallout cloud from the first atomic test in New Mexico in 1945, and from a *detailed* correlation of state-by-state infant mortality excesses with yearly changes of strontium 90 levels in milk.

The computer-calculated change in infant mortality was found to have reached close to one excess death in the U.S. per one hundred live births due to the release of only 200 megatons of fission energy by 1963. This indicates that a release of some 20,000 megatons anywhere in the world, needed in offensive warheads for an effective first strike or in the thousands of defensive A.B.M. warheads required to insure interception, could lead to

essentially no infants surviving to produce another generation.

The specter of fallout has of course loomed before in the national anxiety over nuclear explosions. But the result of these studies comprises the first documented, long-range analysis showing direct quantitative correlations between strontium 90 and infant mortality. (They will be published later this year as recorded in the Proceedings of the 9th annual Hanford Biology Symposium.)

The physicists who exploded the first atomic bomb at Alamogordo had expected radioactive materials of some kind and assumed that they would fall to earth downwind as far as fifty miles away. Accordingly, the test site had been located in an isolated area of southern New Mexico. When a subsequent series of tests was held in 1951, six years later, the scientists moved to the isolation of desert country in southern Nevada. By now, however, and without the knowledge of the scientific community, the death rate of children *in states* downwind from Alamogordo had begun to rise.

The infant mortality rates in the United States have been carefully collected for many years. From 1935 to 1950, the rate shows a steady decline, and mathematical models allow the rate to be extended to show, on the basis of previous experience, what the infant mortality rate for any time, consistent with the immediate past, ought to be. But while elsewhere (with one exception) in the U.S. the rate continued downward as expected; in the states downwind of Alamogordo it did not. There was no change in the infant death rate in 1946—the year after the Trinity test—but by 1950 the rate in Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and both Carolinas deviated upward from the normal expectancy. Increases in excess infant mortality of some twenty to thirty percent occurred some thousand to fifteen hundred miles away in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Alabama, where mortality rates were between 3 and 4.5 per hundred live births. Thus, as observed by our research group at the University of Pittsburgh, the Alamogordo blast appears to have been followed by the death, before reaching age one, of roughly one of one hundred children in the area downwind. No detectable increase in mortality rates relative to the computer-determined 1940–45 base line was observed in Florida, south of the path of the fallout cloud, or in the states to the north; and the mortality excesses became progressively less severe with increasing distance eastward, in a manner now understood to be characteristic of the activity along the path of a fallout cloud. Though the increase in infant mortality in these states was taking place during the years 1946–1950, it does not appear to have been associated with the Alamogordo fallout before our studies beginning in October, 1968.

Meanwhile, the study of radiation effects proceeded elsewhere in the scientific community. It became known in the early 1950's that radioactive strontium was concentrated in cow's milk and transmitted, along with the calcium to which it bears a close chemical resemblance, to the rapidly growing bones of the fetus and the subsequent infant. Still, the radiation from strontium 90, though long-lasting, was relatively small in degree; and it was a matter of record, from studies of young women employed in painting luminous watch dials, that very large amounts of radiation over long periods of time are required to produce bone cancer or leukemia in adults. Besides, the survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and their offspring were carefully observed without discovering any very serious long-term effects of radiation. A small number of leukemia cases turned up, and a very few detectable abnormalities among their children, but compared with the rest of Japan the difference was slight. The measurable effects of fallout, at the time, did not seem so ominous after all. So atmospheric nuclear weapons testing proceeded in Nevada until 1958, and continued in the Pacific until 1963 under the pressure of the Cold War. No obvious or clear-cut incidents of serious harm to anyone were reported outside the immediate area of testing.

Still, there was concern among radiobiologists and geneticists over the possibility of radiation effects on the highly sensitive human reproductive cells, rapidly dividing and developing to form the human embryo during the first few weeks and months of gestation. Evidence from animal experiments, as well as from the observation of pregnant women who had been exposed to X-rays, suggested that ova and embryo might be from twenty to fifty times more sensitive to the development of leukemia than the mature adult. If so, the potential danger of even relatively small amounts of radiation would be greatly magnified.

The evidence implicating X-rays in childhood leukemia had been discovered—quite unexpectedly—by Dr. Alice Stewart of Oxford University, in the course of a survey designed to uncover the causes of a disturbing rise in childhood leukemia among the children of England and Wales during the 1950's. Her study, published in 1958, showed that mothers who had received a series of three to five abdominal X-rays in the course of a pelvic examination gave birth to children who were almost twice as likely to die of leukemia or other cancers than the children of mothers who had not been X-rayed during pregnancy. Subsequent studies showed that only about six percent of all childhood leukemia is related to X-rays, but Dr. Stewart's research remains significant, since before then no serious effects of ordinary diagnostic X-rays had ever been demonstrated, especially since a single abdominal X-ray gives the fetus a radiation dose not much larger than what each of us receives in the course of some three to five years from cosmic rays and the natural radiation in the rocks around us.

It is true that leukemia and childhood cancer are relatively rare. Only about one child in one thousand is affected. Nevertheless, since leukemia and other cancers are the second greatest cause of death among children between five and fourteen (ranking only after accidents), Dr. Stewart's findings were regarded by physicians as startling, and efforts were made to check them. Perhaps the most definitive such examination was done by Dr. Brian MacMahon at the Harvard School of Public Health. Using a study population of close to 800,000 children born in large New England hospitals, where careful records of X-rays given to mothers were available, Dr. MacMahon confirmed Dr. Stewart's findings. He observed only about a forty percent increase in the cancer rate among exposed children, probably because of improvements in X-ray technology that allowed lower exposures.

Meanwhile, in April, 1953, a sizable amount of nuclear debris from a test explosion in Nevada was wafted downwind some two thousand miles to the east and, thirty-six hours later, deposited by a rainstorm over the Albany-Troy region of New York State. Dr. Ralph Lapp, one of the first scientists to be concerned with the hazards of peacetime nuclear testing, drew attention to this heavy local fallout. Subsequent examination of the childhood leukemia pattern in this area showed that leukemia doubled over a period of some eight years after the fallout—and then decreased. Here, for the first time, was a documented case in which fallout appeared to produce serious effects at a rate consistent with what was expected from the study of children exposed to prenatal X-rays.

Further examination of the leukemia rate for the entire State of New York revealed a pattern of increase and decrease following the sequence of individual test series in Nevada between 1951 and 1958, with a characteristic time delay of about five years after each detonation. The rise and fall were particularly marked in the age group from five to fourteen years, the group most indicative of radiation-produced cases.

More disturbing yet, the evidence showed that the arrival of the fallout was followed by a halt in the normal decline of the rate of stillbirths. For the previous fifteen years, from 1935 to 1950, the stillbirth rate had shown a regular and progressive decline. Within a year after testing began in Nevada in 1951, the rate began to deviate upward. Between 1957 and 1963 the fetal death rate, instead of steadily declining as it had from 1935 to 1950, leveled off completely at around twenty-three per thousand live births. In 1964, the fetal death rate rose to 27.3 per thousand, the first such leap since records had been kept in New York State. In 1965 and 1966, it declined slightly, as a gradual reduction of fallout in milk and food took place throughout the U.S. In contrast to New York, the fetal death rate for California—upwind of the Nevada test site, and therefore not affected by it—continued its steady decline, in line with the 1935–1950 figures from which New York so sharply deviated. Still, the rate of decrease began to slow down in California also—two to three years after the onset of hydrogen bomb tests in the Pacific in 1954.

The implications of the fetal death rate could be considered much more serious for society than the incidence of childhood leukemia, since there are more than ten times as many fetal deaths reported than cases of childhood leukemia. Moreover, for every fetal death reported, an estimated five or six are not reported, yielding perhaps fifty or sixty fetal deaths for each case of leukemia. Consequently, the search for further evidence continued. More fallout seemed to be followed by more fetal deaths, but no precise statistical correlation had been drawn. Since the amount of strontium 90 deposited in the soil is easily measurable, the cumulative deposit of strontium 90 was plotted against the *excess* of fetal mortality over what the mortality *should* have been if the 1935–1950 decline had persisted. The finding: except for the first few years of testing in Nevada, when short-lived isotopes rather than the long-lived strontium 90 were dominant, the fetal death rate in New York followed the same general pattern as the accumulated strontium 90 on the ground. Both curves showed the same decrease in rate of climb coincident with the temporary halt of nuclear testing from 1958 to 1961; both show a sharp rise beginning with the large Soviet test series in 1961. Two years after the test ban in 1963, both the fetal death rate and the radioactivity in the environment once again began to decline.

A similar pattern in the fetal death rate exists in the data for the United States as a whole for all periods of gestation up to nine months. Again, there is a steady rate of decline until the Fifties, a leveling off in 1951–52, and an actual rise in 1954, corresponding to the onset of the Pacific H-bomb tests; and a second rise in 1961, corresponding to the Soviet test series.

But perhaps the most disturbing evidence of all indicates that the rates of the infant mortality in the United States and all over the world seem to have been affected by nuclear testing. The infant mortality rate is far more accurately known than the fetal death rate, since the death of a baby, unlike a miscarriage or an abortion, rarely escapes notice in the advanced countries. Like fetal deaths, infant mortality had shown a steady decline in the period 1935–1950; but beginning with the Nevada tests in 1951 and continuing until just after the test ban in 1963, the rate suddenly leveled off in the U.S. This leveling off did not occur in such other advanced

countries as Sweden. Holland and Norway, or in Southern Hemisphere countries like Chile and New Zealand, until late in the 1950's when hydrogen-bomb tests in the South Pacific and Siberia began to produce worldwide fallout on a much increased scale. Only after the major portion of the most violently radioactive material from the 1961–62 tests had disappeared did U.S. infant mortality begin to decline again in 1965, at a rate close to the previous 1935–1950 decline.

The most serious effects appeared in the age group from one month to one year. Here, the rate of deaths per one thousand live births should have been, according to the 1935–1950 figures, about 2.7. Instead, the observed number was 5.4 per thousand, twice what it should have been and twice what it actually was in Sweden, where the rate had steadily declined to 2.6 per thousand.

Not only was there a drastic change in overall infant mortality for the U.S. as compared to the rest of the advanced countries, but there were also disturbing patterns of change within the U.S. For example, the infant mortality rate started to level off sharply in the Eastern, Midwestern and Southern states within two years after the onset of atomic testing in Nevada in 1951, while it continued steadily downward in the dry Western states. But this is exactly the known pattern of accumulated radioactive strontium on the ground and in the diet, since strontium is most heavily deposited in states of high annual rainfall, especially in those to the east of Nevada.

Serious difficulties remained, however, in establishing a casual connection between nuclear testing and these drastic changes in fetal and infant mortality. First, why should fallout, and in particular strontium 90, cause fetal and infant deaths, since it goes to the bones and should therefore cause, if anything, bone cancer and leukemia many years later? Second, there was no observed direct quantitative relation between different levels of strontium 90 in the body and mortality rates at any given age. Therefore it was difficult to see how the very small amounts of radiation resulting from peacetime testing could possibly have been the cause of the deviations in fetal death and infant mortality, especially since no significant genetic effects had been observed among the children of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki survivors.

The causation puzzle now appears to be solved. In 1963, K. G. Luning and his coworkers in Sweden published their discovery that small amounts of strontium 90, injected into male mice three or four weeks prior to mating, produced an increase in fetal deaths among their offspring. No such increase appeared when corresponding amounts of chemically different radioactive cesium 137 were injected. More recently, evidence presented at an International Symposium on the Radiation Biology of the Fetal and Juvenile Mammal in May, 1969, has demonstrated severe chromosome damage, fetal deaths and congenital malformations in the offspring of female mice injected with strontium 90 before and during pregnancy. Similar effects have now been observed for very small quantities of tritium, produced by both A-bombs and relatively "clean" hydrogen weapons.

In the light of these studies, the absence of genetic effects in Hiroshima is understandable. In Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the bombs were detonated, not on the ground as in New Mexico, but at such an altitude that there was essentially no fallout in these two cities proper. The radiation exposure there resulted almost exclusively from the brief flash of X-rays, neutrons and gamma rays at the instant of explosion. Consequently no special effects related to strontium 90 appeared in the children of the survivors; but the rate of cancer deaths among children up to fourteen years in Japan as a whole jumped by more than two hundred percent between 1949 and 1951, four to six years after the bomos, when the fallout had had a chance to produce its effects througnout the southern parts of Japan—exactly the same delay observed after the fallout from Nevada arrived in Albany-Troy.

But the problem remains of demonstrating a direct connection between the levels of strontium 90 in human fetuses and infants, on the one hand, and observed changes in fetal and infant mortality, on the other. Such a direct connection seems to emerge from the so-called "baby-tooth survey" carried out by the Dental School of Washington University in St. Louis, supported by the U.S. Public Health Service and directed by Dr. H. L. Rosenthal. Using the data from tooth-buds and mandibular bones of aborted fetuses and from baby teeth collected in the greater St. Louis area, Dr. Rosenthal's study showed that the concentration of strontium 90 in the teeth followed closely the measured concentrations in bone and milk. Measurement of the strontium 90 content of milk anywhere in the world permits a calculation of the concentration in the bones of infants and fetuses developing in the same areas. We have found a direct correlation between the yearly changes of strontium 90 contained in the teeth (and therefore the bones and bodies) of the developing human fetus and infant, and the changing excess mortality rates, going up and down together as atmospheric tests began in 1951 and stopped in 1963.

From our examinations of the infant mortality changes from a computer-fitted base line for 1935–1950, for various states in which the Public Health Service reported monthly values of the strontium 90 concentrations in the milk since 1957, there emerges a close correspondence between average strontium 90 levels and infant mortality changes. Wherever the strontium 90 rose to high values over a four-year period, as in Georgia, a large, parallel, year-by-year rise in infant mortality also took place; while in areas where there was little stontium 90 in the milk, as in Texas, the infant mortality remained at a correspondingly lower value. Other states such as Illinois, Missouri, New York and Utah also show a rise, peaking in the same 1962–1965 period at levels between these extreme cases, each according to their local annual rainfall and strontium 90 concentrations in their milk.

For the United States as a whole, we found a detailed correspondence between and among: 1) the excess infant mortality relative to the 1935–1950 base line; 2) the total strontium 90 produced by nuclear weapons; 3) the strontium 90 thus produced actually reaching the ground; and 4) the four-year average concentration in U.S. milk from 1955, the year after the first large H-bomb test; and 1965, the year when strontium 90 concentrations began to level off and started to decline once again.

At the peak of this excess infant mortality, it was the District of Columbia that showed the largest excess in 1966—157 percent, compared with an average excess of 72 percent for the U.S. as a whole. The low value was found in dry New Mexico, minus-eleven percent—actually below the 1935–50 base line.

To appreciate the magnitude of these effects, it must be recognized that in the 1950's about 2.5 to 3.2 infants out of every hundred born in the U.S. died before reaching the age of one year. The average excess infant mortality, therefore, represents close to one child out of one hundred born, or one of every 2.5 to 3.0 that died during the first year of life.

Since about four million children were born annually during this period, close to 40,000 infants one year old or less died in excess of normal expectations each year, totaling some 375,000 by the mid-Sixties and continuing at about 34,000 per year since the end of atmospheric testing by the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.

It is no wonder, then, that infant mortality has been a major concern of our Public Health Service since this trend was first pointed out in 1960 by Dr. M. Moriyama of the National Center for Health Statistics.

However, as Dr. Moriyama and his associates observed during an international conference devoted entirely to infant mortality in 1965, none of the factors so far considered—medical care, population movement, new drugs, pesticides, smoking or epidemics of infectious disease—suffices to explain the observed facts.

That the recent excesses in infant mortality cannot readily be explained by medical and socioeconomic factors normally influencing mortality trends may be seen from an examination of the death rate in the various states following the Alamogordo blast. At the University of Pittsburgh, we have plotted the percentile infant mortality excesses or decrements relative to the computer-determined 1940–1945 base line for the first and fifth years after Alamogordo. In 1946, one year after the detonation, there was no sign of any excess infant mortality in the states downwind from New Mexico; but by 1950 a clear change toward excess infant mortality appeared in the states over which the fallout cloud had drifted, and only in those states. Furthermore, the excess mortalities are seen to be distributed in such a pattern as might be expected from nuclear fallout originating in New Mexico, since the effects are lowest in the dry area of western Texas, and largest in the areas of heavy rainfall first encountered by the cloud, namely Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi and Alabama, declining steadily thereafter toward the Atlantic.

The only other area that showed a clear excess infant mortality greater than ten percent as compared to the 1940–1945 period was found to be North Dakota. There, subsequent measurements of strontium 90 in the milk, carried out by the Health and Safety Laboratories of the Atomic Energy Commission, revealed the highest concentrations anywhere in the U.S. for which data is available prior to 1960. The causes of this "hot spot" are not yet fully understood, but they are quite possibly connected with known accidental discharges of radioactivity from the Hanford plant of the Manhattan Project, directly to the west, in the early years of its operation, where the fissionable plutonium for most of the nuclear weapons was produced beginning in 1944.

Since no excess infant mortality was registered along the path of the New Mexico fallout cloud in the first year after the detonation, the deaths occurring downwind in later years could not have resulted from the direct effects of external radiation from fallout on the developing embryo. It becomes clear then that we are dealing with an effect on the reproductive cells of the parents, or a so-called genetic effect.

The evidence available so far therefore suggests that radioactive strontium appears to be a far more serious hazard to man through its long-lasting action on the genetic material of the mammalian cell than had been expected on the basis of its well-known tendency to be incorporated into bone. The resultant effect appears to express itself most noticeably in excess fetal and infant mortality rates among the children born two or more years after a nuclear explosion. Presumably such factors as lowered birth weight and reduced ability to resist ordinary infectious diseases are involved, accounting for the greatest increase in infant mortality in the U.S. as compared to the advanced countries of Western Europe since the early 1950's. Children who receive adequate medical care are more likely to survive these factors than those who do not.

What does all this imply for the debate over the deployment of new nuclear weapons systems, such as the A.B.M. or the M.I.R.V. (Multiple Independent Reentry Vehicle),

carrying many nuclear warheads in a single missile? To appreciate the probable genetic effects of a large nuclear war, we can consider first the effect of small tactical-size nuclear weapons comparable to the 20 kiloton bombs detonated over Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and in the desert of Alamogordo. Since increases of some 20 to 30 percent excess infant mortality were observed from a thousand to fifteen hundred miles downwind in Arkansas, Alabama and Louisiana, where mortality rates were between 3 and 4.5 per-hundred live births, the detonation of a single, small tactical-size nuclear weapon on the ground in the western United States appears to have led to one out of one hundred children born subsequently dying before reaching the age of one year. Therefore, the detonation of a hundred or so weapons of this size, amounting to the equivalent of only two megatons in the form of small warheads, would be expected to lead to essentially *no* children surviving to maturity in the states directly downwind.

But according to a former Defense Secretary Clark Clifford, speaking at a N.A.T.O. conference in the Fall of 1968, we have close to eight thousand tactical nuclear weapons in the kiloton range ready to be released in order to protect our European allies from a ground attack by Russia. Thus, we would probably achieve the protection of Western Europe at the cost of the biological end of these nations through the death of the children of the survivors, together with the likely death of most children subsequently born to the people of Eastern Europe, Russia and China as the radioactive clouds drift eastward around the world until they reach the United States. Thus, the use of the biologically most destructive small nuclear weapons in tactical warfare now appears to be at least as self-defeating as the release of large quantities of nerve gas, killing indiscriminately soldiers and civilians, friends and enemies alike.

But, what about the use of large megaton warheads in a massive first strike or in A.B.M. missiles detonated high up in the stratosphere or outer space, as proposed for the Spartan missile that is to provide us with an impenetrable shield against a first strike attack by large Chinese or Russian missiles in the 1970's?

According to the figures on infant mortality in the United States, based on the testing of large hydrogen weapons in the Pacific and Siberia, both in the atmosphere and outer space, close to one out of every one hundred children born are likely to have died as the result of only about 200 megatons worth of fission products into the world's atmosphere, under conditions which were especially designed to minimize the possible effects on health.

According to the testimony of Defense Secretary Melvin Laird in the Spring of 1969, the U.S.S.R. will have the capability of launching some 500 SS–9 missiles, each capable of carrying 25 megatons worth of bombs in the form of many multiple warheads, or a total of some 1500 to 2500 warheads. Together with comparable numbers launched by smaller missiles, the total megatonnage would therefore be of the order of 10 to 20,000 megatons needed in a first strike that attempts to destroy most of our thousands of missiles and bombers at the same time.

Thus, the threat of a first strike by Russia loses all credibility since, in order to have any chance at all of preventing devastating retaliation, it would necessarily have to release so much radioactivity into the circulating atmosphere that it would lead to the death of most Russian infants born in the next generation, ending the existence of the Russian people together with that of all mankind.

Since it takes at least three to five Anti-Ballistic Missiles launched to insure a high probability of interception, the U.S. must be prepared to launch some 5000 to 15000 A.B.M.'s in order to provide a meaningful "shield" against such a massive attack.

We know that each Spartan missile must contain a warhead of at least 2 megatons to produce a sufficiently intense X-ray pulse to achieve interception, so that the use of this system to protect our own missiles and cities would require the detonation of some 10,000 to 30,000 megatons into the stratosphere, not counting any radioactivity from the Russian warheads, from our own counterstrike, or from the Russian A.B.M. missiles.

Thus, even if anti-missile systems were to work with ideal perfection on both sides, preserving every home, every school, and every factory from destruction, the release of long-lived radioactive materials would produce more than a hundred times as much radioactive poison as during all the years of peacetime testing. Based on the excess mortality observed during the period of testing, this would most likely be sufficient to insure that few if any children anywhere in the world would grow to maturity to give rise to another generation.

Nor will it make much difference how high above the atmosphere the bombs are detonated, because the strontium 90 takes twenty-eight years to decay to half of its initial activity, long enough for most of it to return to earth well before another generation of children is born. And even if a perfectly "clean" weapon containing no fissionable material at all could ever be developed, the carbon 14 it produces would get into the genetic material controlling the life processes of all living cells, and it takes 5770 years before half of its radioactivity is exhausted.

The implications of the warning mankind has received from the death of its infants during nuclear testing are therefore clear:

Nuclear war, with or without anti-missiles or elaborate shelters, is no longer "thinkable" due to a fatal flaw in the assumptions of all our military war-gamers, namely the unexpectedly severe biological sensitivity of the mammalian reproductive system to genetically important by-products of nuclear weapons, which must now be regarded not merely as vastly destructive explosive and incendiary devices, but as the most powerful biological poison weapons that man has yet invented.

---

## THE U.S. NATIONAL ARBORETUM

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, on April 22, many of the people of the Nation took time out to stop and think about our earth and its struggle for survival. One aspect of this day was that we seemed to see more clearly both the beauty of nature and the destructiveness of man. There were many speeches made about what ought to be done, and I hope that it was not just rhetoric.

If we want to look for something to do that will stop a part of man's destruction of nature, we have to look no further than the Nation's Capital. The U.S. National Arboretum is one of the most beautiful spots in the Washington, D.C., area. It is a magnificent spot in which we can withdraw from the noise and smells of our highly industrialized society where we can get away from the fumes and sight and sound of cars and trucks and buses and enjoy the serenity of nature.

Now, however, an East Leg Parkway has been proposed that would run along the arboretum side of the Anacostia River, using precious aboretum land.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article written by Mr. Tom Stevenson and published in the Washington Post of April 19 be printed in the RECORD. The article eloquently describes both the arboretum and the threat to it.

If we are serious about saving our environment, it is with small but important issues like this that we must deal and deal decisively.

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

NATURALISTS FEAR RUIN OF ARBORETUM

(By Tom Stevenson)

The U.S. National Arboretum is considered one of the great arboretums of the world and one of the big attractions of the District of Columbia. Yet, an effort is being made to take a lot of Arboretum acreage and use it for a roadway. The decision rests with Congress.

Robert F. Lederer, executive vice president, American Association of Nurserymen, and Mrs. Glenn B. Eastburn, executive director, American Horticultural Society, have warned their members that a proposed East Leg Parkway along the Arboretum side of the Anacostia River would require the use of land now occupied by the Arboretum. Richard P. White, chairman of the National Arboretum Advisory Council, says that the proposal, if adopted, would cripple the Arboretum.

"In jeopardy," said Dr. White, "is a collection of plants worth millions of dollars, really priceless, since they could not be moved to a new location without heavy losses, and some of which, due to their worldwide nature, could never be replaced; and a corps of trained scientists in horticultural research, highly efficient, that might move elsewhere and that would be hard to replace, once lost."

One of the outstanding attractions at the Arboretum is the Gotelli collection of dwarf conifers. Over a period of 15 years, William T. Gotelli, of South Orange, N.J., assembled more than 1,500 plants from all parts of the world. In 1963 he gave the collection to the Arboretum. He said it was too fine for one person to possess, and he wanted it at the Arboretum where all could enjoy it. Here the conifers of normal growth contrast pleasingly with their dwarf counterparts, in an arrangement of rocks and stone-mulched beds set among velvet green grass walkways.

In late April and early May, 70,000 azaleas on the slopes of Mount Hamilton, in the Arboretum, are in bloom beneath a canopy of tulip, oak and dogwood trees.

Along the Anacostia River are hundreds of magnificent camellias, both sasanquas and japonicas. Last fall the Camellia Society of the Potomac Valley in a test program, produced thousands of blooms on the japonicas by regulating their growth through a process called gibbing. More than 100 varieties of sasanqua are planted along trails and among stately Japanese temple trees.

Nearby, a central alley bordered by specimen plants of flowering dogwood is set among hemlocks and informal plantings of other dogwoods. In the collection are about 65 kinds of dogwood, including the weeping form, the bunchberry and the Chinese dogwood.

The collection of more than 600 crabapples represents one of the largest test plantings in this country. Though the trees are still young, crabapple blossoms are beginning to add considerably to the flower display of mid-April, the effect being heightened by underplantings of daffodils. Ornamental crabapples are considered the most dependable of all small flowering trees for cold climates. At the Arboretum there are varieties suitable for every region that experiences temperatures below zero in the United States. The Arboretum's collection is also be-

ginning to provide information on the best varieties for the middle and upper South.

There is a fine collection of hollies, American, English, Chinese, Japanese and miscellaneous evergreen types. The plants are labeled to help visitors identify them. The holly plantings also suggest possible landscape use of these plants. In addition to the hollies on display, the Arboretum has research collections which are being used in breeding programs to develop superior forms, particularly for sections of the country where hollies are not now climatically adapted.

The holly trail leads to a unique six-sided teakwood bench from which one can view plantings of 25-foot tall hybrid magnolias, deciduous hollies and crabapples.

Fern valley is a naturalistic planting of ferns and other plants native to Eastern North America. Of special interest is a wall for lime-loving ferns, made from limestone rocks said to have been originally used in a rocky parapet constructed by Braddock's army.

A start toward a complete collection of flowering cherries at the Arboretum was made through a gift by National Capital Optimists. The collection is being added to each year, and will serve for research and possibly hybridizing.

Many of the plantings at the Arboretum in addition to the flowering cherries, have been contributed to the general public, individuals, nurserymen, and garden clubs.

In addition to being a beauty spot, the Arboretum is an educational institution—an outdoor museum in which one can study many kinds of trees, shrubs and other plants. It is a research institution, using its plants for cultural observation and in breeding and testing programs. In cooperation with the New Crops Research Branch of USDA, it distributes new plants and seed to other botanic gardens of this country.

## LIMITING FARM PAYMENTS TO $10,000 PER CROP OF COTTON, WHEAT, AND FEED GRAINS

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, considering the inflationary pressures in our economy and the budget constraints which are applied to so many vitally needed programs, it seems unbelievable to me that we should still continue wasteful programs of large farm subsidy payments to a small handful of wealthy producers.

When the Agriculture Appropriations Act was considered in the Senate last year, I offered an amendment to the bill which would have limited the payments to individual producers of cotton, wheat, and feed grains to $10,000 per crop. Because I had to offer my amendment to the appropriation bill, this limitation would have applied only to the 1970 crops.

Basic farm legislation expires this year. We now have an unparalleled opportunity to enact long-range changes in the farm program which would have the effect of placing permanent limitations on these programs. I intend to offer my amendment again this year and I will be working with Senator BIRCH BAYH in a bipartisan effort to bring this about. We are planning to introduce our amendment next week. If our proposal is enacted, a potential saving of $250 million annually could result.

Last year I placed in the RECORD a list, by State, of producers receiving $10,000 or more from these three programs in 1968. Figures are now available for 1969, and they show an alarming increase in just 1 year. The number of payees receiving $10,000 or more increased by 1,877 in the cotton program, by 2,836 in the feed grains program, and by 1,806 in the wheat program.

Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators who will be considering a limitation on farm subsidies this year, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table provided by the Department of Agriculture which lists by State those producers who received $10,000 or more from cotton, wheat, and feed grains programs in 1969.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE—NUMBER OF PAYEES RECEIVING $10,000 OR MORE DURING 1969 CALENDAR YEAR IN THE FOLLOWING ASCS PROGRAMS

| State | Cotton (number) | Feed grain (number) | Wheat (number) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama | 773 | 31 | |
| Alaska | | | |
| Arizona | 850 | 79 | 14 |
| Arkansas | 1,679 | | 5 |
| California | 1,652 | 240 | 135 |
| Colorado | | 193 | 437 |
| Connecticut | | | |
| Delaware | | 5 | |
| Florida | 13 | 33 | |
| Georgia | 710 | 194 | 5 |
| Hawaii | | | |
| Idaho | | 5 | 433 |
| Illinois | 1 | 808 | 9 |
| Indiana | | 478 | 5 |
| Iowa | | 997 | 2 |
| Kansas | | 339 | 739 |
| Kentucky | 9 | 69 | 2 |
| Louisiana | 790 | 4 | 1 |
| Maine | | | |
| Maryland | | 24 | |
| Massachusetts | | | |
| Michigan | | 52 | 1 |
| Minnesota | | 486 | 49 |
| Mississippi | 2,461 | 11 | 3 |
| Missouri | 299 | 453 | 12 |
| Montana | | 6 | 1,113 |
| Nebraska | | 799 | 93 |
| Nevada | 13 | | 5 |
| New Hampshire | | | |
| New Jersey | | 6 | 1 |
| New Mexico | 316 | 272 | 193 |
| New York | | 11 | 8 |
| North Carolina | 149 | 87 | 1 |
| North Dakota | | 46 | 483 |
| Ohio | | 164 | 7 |
| Oklahoma | 167 | 47 | 362 |
| Oregon | | 6 | 323 |
| Pennsylvania | | 15 | 2 |
| Rhode Island | | | |
| South Carolina | 619 | 36 | |
| South Dakota | | 77 | 206 |
| Tennessee | 405 | 24 | |
| Texas | 6,068 | 2,029 | 808 |
| Utah | | 1 | 51 |
| Vermont | | | |
| Virginia | | 32 | |
| Washington | | 11 | 1,131 |
| West Virginia | | | |
| Wisconsin | | 93 | |
| Wyoming | | 1 | 28 |
| Total | 16,974 | 8,264 | 6,667 |

## DEATH OF JACOB H. MOGELEVER

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, Jacob H. Mogelever, a distinguished Rhode Islander, a newspaperman, author, and for the past 28 years the Treasury's chief promoter of savings bonds, died recently at his home in Bethesda.

Although he had not lived in Rhode Island for many years, he maintained a continued special interest in the affairs of his home State and, in his position in the Treasury Department, he worked closely and effectively with the Rhode Island State director of savings bonds, Miss Katherine M. Cullinan.

I know this energetic and imaginative man will be greatly missed. He was a tireless worker in behalf of the country and savings bond purchasers, whose importance in providing funds for the operation of the Government cannot be overemphasized. I wish also to extend my deepest sympathy to Mr. Mogelever's family.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two articles about Mr. Mogelever be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Providence Journal, Apr. 6, 1970]

J. MOGELEVER, BONDS PROMOTER, NEWSMAN, DIES

Jacob Mogelever, 69, a former reporter and copy editor for the Journal-Bulletin and chief promoter of Treasury Department savings bonds for the last 28 years, died Saturday night at his home in Bethesda, Md.

"Jake," as he was known locally, was born in Providence in 1900 and grew up in Central Falls and Pawtucket. His parents, Bernard and Sarah Mogelever, were Polish immigrants.

In 1942, he became chief of press and special promotions for the savings bond division of the Treasury Department.

Over the years, he used numerous gimmicks to plug the bonds, including covered wagons, talking dogs, an elephant riding into the Treasury building, duplicate Liberty Bells, symphony orchestras and all the communications media.

Mr. Mogelever went through the elementary grades in Central Falls and graduated from Pawtucket High School in 1918. He was a graduate of Brown University, Class of 1922.

While at Brown, he worked with the Journal-Bulletin in its Pawtucket office. He was a reporter at night and a street-corner paperboy during the day. He was a reporter until 1924, when he joined the copy desk in Providence.

In 1926, he returned to Pawtucket and was managing editor of the Pawtucket Times for seven years. He then became city editor of the Newark Star Ledger, a position he held until 1942.

Mr. Mogelever is survived by his wife, Mrs. Hodes Mogelever; two daughters, Mrs. Bonnie Pollack, of Silver Spring, Md., and Naomi, a student at Yale University; two brothers, Morris, acting state athletic commissioner in New Jersey, and Louis, a police reporter for the Newark Star Ledger.

The funeral service will be in Takoma Park, Md., with the burial in Falls Cemetery in Virginia.

---

[From the Washington Post, April 6, 1970]

J. H. MOGELEVER DIES, TREASURY OFFICIAL, 69

Jacob H. Mogelever, newspaperman, author and for years the government's number one savings bond salesman, died Saturday at his home in Bethesda after a heart attack. He was 69.

A native of Providence, R.I., Mr. Mogelever got his first newspaper job on the copy desk of the Providence Journal. He went on to become managing editor of the Pawtucket Times and later city editor of the Newark Star Eagle.

In 1940, Mr. Mogelever moved to Washington, where he was made head of promotion for the U.S. savings bond division of the Treasury Department.

He helped produce several movie shorts featuring Hollywood and Broadway stars promoting bond sales.

In 1960, Mr. Mogelever accomplished what he said was a longtime dream—he published a book. It was called "Death to Traitors" and told the story of Gen. Lafayette Baker, who came to Washington in the 1860s to head Lincoln's Secret Service.

"I'm no Civil War buff," he explained. "I'm

just a litle guy that wandered in and found a good story to tell and wanted to tell it. It's escapist adventure."

In 1968, Mr. Mogelever received the Treasury Meritorious Service Award.

He is survived by his wife, Hodes, of the home, 5201 Camberley Ave.; two daughters, Naomi, of New Haven, and Bonnie Pollack, of Silver Spring; two brothers, Louis, of Elizabeth, N.J., and Morris, of Allenhurst, N.J.; three sisters, Anne Cohen, of Pasadena, Calif., Rose Reichart, of Cleveland, and Mrs. Nathan Salant, of Washington, and two grandchildren.

## AMATEUR RADIO RIGHTS FOR RESIDENT ALIENS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, last year I introduced S. 1466, a bill to grant the right to operate amateur radio equipment to resident aliens. Oddly enough, under existing law, this important group of Americans is not allowed to obtain ham radio operators' licenses.

Mr. President, this situation is most unfair. It is utterly without any reason and constitutes a discriminatory legal technicality which denies several thousands of our future citizens the privilege of enjoying this interesting activity.

I remind Senators that this group of resident Americans includes persons who are so strongly attracted to our country that they not only have chosen to settle here, but have declared their intent to become U.S. citizens as soon as our law will allow.

These permanent residents have fallen into a legislative gap which on one side benefits temporary visitors from abroad and, on the other side, U.S. citizens. If an amateur enthusiast is merely visiting the United States on a student, business, or tourist visa, he can obtain an authorization to operate amateur radio equipment while he is here if his home country offers reciprocal rights to our citizens. However, if the very same person decides to settle in this country, he will be completely cut off from all right to enjoy his ham radio activities.

In order to correct this unfair and discriminatory oversight in the present law, my bill will authorize the FCC to issue amateur radio licenses to permanent residents whenever they have filed a declaration of intent to become U.S. citizens. I am happy to report that since last March, when the bill was introduced, there has been a growing movement of support for the cause of the immigrant radio amateurs.

First, the bill has received the endorsement of the American Radio Relay League which represents most of the 270,000 Americans who are members of the ham fraternity. Second, it also has received the backing of the International Amateur Radio Union which consists of 80 national societies representing radio amateurs from most other countries of the world.

In addition, CQ, QST, 73 Magazine, and DIALOG have all given their strong editorial support to the bill. They are the leading radio amateur periodicals in this country.

But, Mr. President, most encouraging of all, to me, is the fact that 25 Senators have agreed to join as cosponsors of this measure. I believe it is of particular importance to note that these Senators represent 18 different States stretching from Hawaii to both coasts of the mainland. To my mind, this indicates a widespread national interest in assisting this important group of future citizens.

Mr. President, the anomaly of the present status of permanent residents is pointed up by one typical illustration. American residents in this category are fully subjective to American taxes, they are fully subject to compulsory service in the U.S. military services, and, indeed, many of them who now serve in the Armed Forces are regularly using military radio transmitters.

So, we have the odd situation where American immigrants are considered 100 percent capable of serving faithfully in the U.S. Armed Forces, but at the same time the very same people are not considered capable or responsible enough to operate amateur radio stations.

This is downright nonsense, of course; and the plain truth is that it stands as an unfortunate oversight in the present communications law that few people have noticed before. It is high time Congress took action to correct the matter, and I hope that the Senate will begin action promptly on the solution I have proposed, and in which I am joined by one-fourth of the Senate's membership.

Mr. President, at this point, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the names and States of all 25 Senators who have agreed to join as sponsors of the proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIST OF COSPONSORS

Mr. Fannin of Arizona.
Mr. Cranston and Mr. Murphy of California.
Mr. Dominick of Colorado.
Mr. Fong and Mr. Inouye of Hawaii.
Mr. Bayh of Indiana.
Mr. Dole of Kansas.
Mr. Metcalf of Montana.
Mr. Curtis and Mr. Hruska of Nebraska.
Mr. Bible and Mr. Cannon of Nevada.
Mr. McIntyre of New Hampshire.
Mr. Goodell and Mr. Javits of New York.
Mr. Packwood of Oregon.
Mr. Pell of Rhode Island.
Mr. Hollings and Mr. Thurmond of South Carolina.
Mr. Baker of Tennessee.
Mr. Tower of Texas.
Mr. Bennett and Mr. Moss of Utah.
Mr. Randolph of West Virginia.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD three recent magazine articles which endorse and discuss the proposal I have introduced.

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

[From CQ, August, 1969]

ALIEN OPERATORS

Editor, CQ:

My name is Marcel Saidman and I immigrated from Romania to this country in 1965. I am specialized in foundations and underground structures and since my arrival I am with Stone and Webster Engr. Corp. in Boston.

I am complaining against the section of the Communication Act of 1934 which requires an applicant for a radio-amateur license to be a citizen of this country or to be an alien having an amateur license and whose government has a bilateral reciprocal agreement with the United States.

I would like to comment on that section as follows:

1. An alien who is already a "permanent resident" of the United States and has filled out and signed the "declaration of intention to become a United States citizen" has already been verified and approved by the American authorities and will in time become a citizen.

2. People in this category have most of the duties of the American citizens: they are paying taxes, serving in the American Armed Forces and those with the Signal Corps of the Army are regularly using military transmitters.

3. Based on reciprocal Operating Agreements, radio-amateurs from 23 foreign countries can operate their own radio amateur station in this country. Are these radio-amateurs more American or more reliable to this country than we, the permanent residents?

My complaint could be considered as unreasonable if only American citizens could enjoy the right to get a license for operating a radio amateur station.

But as long as non-American people like tourists or short-time visitors are granted this right, why should it not be granted to us who are permanent American residents and have already declared our intention to become citizens? Why not to us who are taxpayers and thus are contributing to the welfare of the American community? Why not to us who are serving in the Armed Forces and thus are considered faithful to these United States?

Last year Congressman T. R. Kupferman introduced a Bill under the Nr. HR 16764. Being too late the Bill died in the House Committee on Commerce.

Another similar Bill was introduced this year to the Senate by Sen. B. Goldwater under S. J. Res. 27.

We hope you will help us in passing this resolution in spite of the fact that we new immigrants have nothing to offer in exchange as other countries do, other than our blood, our affection for this country, or our strong desire to work hard for the welfare of this nation which welcomed us and where we found the freedom of which we were deprived in our native country.

MARCEL SAIDMAN, ex-YO3FZ.
BRIGHTON, MASS.

[From DIALOG, November-December 1969]

AMATEUR RADIO LICENSES FOR IMMIGRANTS

(By George Pataki, ex-YO2BO)

I would like to inform the readers of DIALOG about the problem of licensing immigrant radio amateurs, those who are permanent residents of the United States, and intend to become future citizens of this country.

As you may know, the Communications Act of 1969, as amended, allows only American citizens or nationals to apply for an amateur radio license. For an immigrant it takes five years of residency to become eligible for citizenship; consequently it takes more than five years to be able to apply for a W/K call.

I have talked to many amateurs, both American and foreign, and have heard many reasons favoring amendment of the present regulations. For example, an immigrant living in California said that while in the Army he was entrusted with official radio communications, but that as a civilian he was not trustworthy enough to get an amateur radio license. Canadian operators have told me that in VE-land any immigant can get a temporary license, good for six years; but, after five years they can become citizens, in which case the license becomes permanent.

Amateurs from various countries having

reciprocal operating agreements with the United States, and having a student, business, or tourist visa, can operate their own stations here; but if the same person decides to settle in this country, he will find that, as an immigrant and as a permanent resident, he has all the duties of American citizenship, but fewer rights. He will lose his license from his native country, but he can not get an American license for five years.

The present regulations permit anyone, including aliens, to operate an amateur radio station in the United States—under the supervision of the licensee, who must tune the transmitter and turn the on-off switch. Imagine a crystal-controlled and vox-operated transmitter—what then is the duty of the licensee?

Perhaps we aliens are not trusted enough. Then why are we admitted to the country? Or perhaps the FCC does not trust our skill to operate, unassisted, an amateur radio station. Let us take the test, then, the same test given to American applicants.

I am a graduate engineer in electronics and communications, and I work for CBS–TV in New York City. I handle all kinds of equipment for one of the world's largest television networks feeding more than 200 stations. But I cannot operate, alone, an amateur radio station.

I like amateur radio very much. I like to communicate with other operators from other countries; I am interested in their ways of living, their opinions, and their technical experiments. Why should I be stopped for five years from enjoying my lifelong hobby?

Because of this situation I went to see my former Congressman, Theodore Kupferman. He didn't know too much about the amateur radio service, but he did understand the problem. In an attempt to correct this unfair situation, he last year introduced in the House of Representatives a bill (H.R. 16764) intended to "amend the Communications Act of 1964 to make certain aliens, admitted to the United States for permanent residence, eligible to radio station operators." Unfortunately, this bill died in Committee.

In January of this year Senator Barry Goldwater, known in our circles as K7UGA, introduced a similar bill—Senate Joint Resolution 27. Later, on March 11th, feeling the need for a more comprehensive bill, Senator Goldwater introduced a new bill, S. 1466—a companion measure to Joint Resolution 27. This bill has received the endorsement of both the American Radio Relay League and the International Amateur Radio Union.

Letters and editorials have recently appeared in QST and CQ in support of these bills. Hundreds, perhaps thousands, of amateurs have written to their senators in support of this legislation. On September 29th, 1969, twenty-one senators, representing eighteen different states, joined Senator Goldwater as co-sponsors of S. 1466. I list these senators here, so amateurs living in the various States may know which senators are responsive to this amateur radio problem:

Senators Fannin (Arizona), Cranston and Murphy (California), Dominick (Colorado), Inouye and Fong (Hawaii), Bayh (Indiana), Dole (Kansas), Metcalf (Montana), Curtis and Hruska (Nebraska), Bible (Nevada), McIntyre (New Hampshire), Javits (New York), Packwood (Oregon), Pell (Rhode Island), Thurmond (South Carolina), Baker (Tennessee), Tower (Texas), Bennett (Utah) and Randolph (West Virginia).

I urge American amateurs to write to their legislators in support of this legislation. I am hopeful that the American amateurs, who have always shown so much friendship to us DX operators, will support us in making it easier for us to get a W/K call.

---

[From the XTRA, January 1970]

IARJS MEMBER LEADS FIGHT FOR LICENSING OF IMMIGRANTS IN THE USA

When this is published either George Pataki, ex-YO2BO, and ex-operator of Romanian club station YO2KAC, will be the victor in his fight for passage of Senate Bill S–1466, or he will be in there fighting that the Bill is passed in 1970.

George Pataki, now living in Jackson Heights, N.Y., was a very active amateur before immigrating to the United States from Romania. On arrival in the States, he found that although inroads were being made in respect to reciprocal licensing, this solved the licensing problem for the visitor only, and it ignored the DX'er who was immigrating to the states . . . enforcing a 5 year wait period for those who had come, planned to stay and become citizens.

George went to work for the CBS television network in New York City, and then took up the helm of a campaign to encourage amending the Communications Act of 1934, to allow immigrant DX'ers, of permanent status, to be licensed and be allowed to operate. He wrote letters to officials and to various publications; he gave talks at AR club meetings.

Full details of all these efforts are not given in this column, as a first-hand article by ex-YO2BO will be found elsewhere in this issue of the EXTRA.

George's efforts created sufficient interest so as to result in the introduction of S–1466, sponsored by CHC'er Sen. Barry Goldwater, K7UGA, plus 21 additional Senators. A last minute article, appealing for support, appeared in Dialog, Journal of the International Amateur Radio Journalistic Society.

George Pataki arrived in the United States in 1965, and will become a citizen on 24 Oct 1970. He is 39 and is married. He is a graduate electronics and telecommunications engineer. He, as so many of our other amateur immigrants, would be a credit to the American Amateur Radio Fraternity.

Editor, K6BX comments: It is possible Senate Bill S–1466 will not clear both Senate and House this year and might be voted on in 1970, so, we here reprint by courtesy CQ magazine Zero Bias the following:

ALIEN OPERATORS—MORE PROGRESS

With *Senator Barry Goldwater* at the helm, the progress of *S–1466*—sometimes known as the Alien Operators Bill—has been sure and methodical. The bill was originally sparked by George Pataki, ex-YO2BO and his determination to see an error which was unwittingly written into the Reciprocal Privilege Bill some years ago and corrected to allow aliens to operate amateur equipment in the U.S. under present law, a vacationer from one of the 41 foreign countries which the U.S. has negotiated reciprocal agreements can operate unhindered in the U.S. amateur bands. An alien, or political refugee to the U.S., even if he has begun the naturalization process is now denied the same privilege.

The latest corrective legislation to be introduced is S–1466, and is sponsored not only by Sen. Goldwater, but the following 21 Senators: Sen. Fannin (Ariz.), Sen. Murphy (Cal.), Sen. Cranston (Cal.), Sen. Dominick (Col.), Sen. Inouye (Hawaii), Sen. Fong (Hawaii), Sen. Bayh (Ind.), Sen. Dole (Kans.), Sen Metcalf (Mont.), Sen. Curtis (Neb.), Sen. Hruska (Neb.), Sen. Bible (Nev.), Sen. McIntyre (N.H.), Sen. Javits (N.Y.), Sen. Packwood (Ore.), Sen. Pell (R.I.), Sen. Thurmond (S. Car.), Sen. Baker (Tenn.), Sen. Tower (Tex.), Sen. Bennett (Utah), Sen. Randolph (W. Va.).

Of the eight Federal agencies which have been called on to report and advise *on S–1466*, seven have replied favorably, and one is still due to report. When the final agency report is in, committee hearings will be held, probably before the end of the year, and barring any major upset, the odds appear to favor passage of *S–1466* sometime this session.

Your letters to your U.S. Senators, urging support of S–1466 can only help assure passage when the vote comes.

---

## BUSINESS AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, if one thing is clear about the myriad problems that confront the Nation, it is that government alone cannot solve them—not, at least, within the framework of our present constitutional system.

Government is one great power system in American society. Private enterprise is the other. If we are successfully to confront and master the giant difficulties that threaten us—crime, racism, pollution, health care, inflation, and so many others—business is going to have to assume a large measure of responsibility.

In very briefest compass, that is the central theme of an important speech given last week by Mr. J. Irwin Miller, chairman of the Board of the Cummins Engine Co., Inc., of Columbus, Ind. Mr. Miller is familiar to most Members of the Senate as a business statesman of world rank. We have learned to give very serious attention to his remarks on public affairs. But I venture to say that he has never made a more significant statement than his speech, which I now ask unanimous consent be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITIES OF BUSINESS IN THE 1970'S

(By J. Irwin Miller)

"Responsibility" is a word which parents like very much to use when talking to their children, and businessmen when discussing workers, competitors, and government. In normal use, it means what some other fellow ought to do.

Its root meaning, however, is a little less comfortable, the word refers to one half of a contract. In its original form a responsibility is the promise of something in return for the receipt of something.

You and I are well aware that we have received something from our shareholders. What, however, have we received from society, and what, if anything, do we owe in return?

Business has a very large stake in the quality of the society within which it operates.

We and our businesses exist in a society which has been largely shaped by others, and we flourish only as we are rooted in a society which is healthy, orderly, just, and which grants freedom and scope to individuals and their lawful enterprises. To the extent that our own society exhibits many of these characteristics, we must gratefully confess that *they are not of our making* and that we have received them for free. It is not then wholly unthinkable to imagine that we have a responsibility to help keep society healthy and good. Perhaps it is even our responsibility never to pursue our limited aims in any manner which is harmful to that society—or even further—our responsibility to help solve its problems and avert its dangers in so far as we are able. Let us take a look at the society of today and consider what might or might not need doing in the 70s. Finally let

us ask ourselves what, if any, responsibility business might have for doing what needs to be done.

We are of several minds about the state of the nation. But first, some facts: We are enjoying material well-being such as no nation in history has known, well-being for more people and for a greater portion of the population: In the 60s we made very great gains: Real per capita income up 30%; Real GNP up 50%; 13,000,000 more jobs. Unemployment down from 5½% to 3½%. Families with incomes below the poverty level cut almost in half—from 18% of the whole to 10%. The material prosperity of the vast bulk of Americans is almost unbelievable. Television sets, dishwashers, automobiles, boats, pensions, access to college, paid vacations, retirement in Florida—these are realities for four out of five Americans. The American dream has come true, and neither historians of past times, nor Communist leaders of today would have believed it possible in so short a time and for so many. Surely, therefore, we are *the tranquilly confident inhabitants of a golden age.*

Fact Number Two: What a laugh! Most writers, whether of the right or of the left, use the word "crisis" today in every article they publish. Twenty years ago the same word appeared, but it was invariably connected with the external hostile threats of Russia and Red China, and before that of Japan and Nazi Germany. Today the volume is turned up full on: Urban crisis, race crisis, pollution crisis, inflation crisis, health crisis, housing crisis, crime crisis, and youth crisis.

And that is only a partial list. Most of us in this room will confess not so much to a sense of solid and satisfactory achievement, and confidence in future progress, as we will to *fear*—and vast uneasiness. There is a hint of doom in the air, and we are a worried people. At a time when so many of the aims of the American Revolution are now a clear reality, we hear the word "Revolt" on every side—youth revolt, black revolt, poor peoples' revolt, and women's revolt.

And most lately, Taxpayers' Revolt. One would have thought that, if any such concerns were justified, the good old American word "Reform" would be on our lips instead. Why "Revolution"—just when we have almost got it made? It may be, of course, simply that we have been scared by the noise. Perhaps it is only a few kooky students; a few angry girls; a handful of disturbed blacks; some lazy poor people who are getting uppity, and think welfare is a right. Perhaps we need only to get tough, enforce respect, return from permissiveness to discipline, and these noises will diminish to their proper volume.

There is one small thing wrong with this analysis, attractive as I find it personally. *You and I* are also talking the language of revolution. Is the taxpayers' revolt real, or is it not? Since World War II the normal pattern in state and municipal elections has been to approve 75% of proposed bond issues and reject 25%. In 1968 elections these percentages were very nearly reversed. At a time when all citizens were loudly complaining about crowded schools, crowded hospitals, crowded streets, polluted air, inadequate prisons and enforcement, the majority of bond issues aimed at remedying these *very* conditions were rejected.

It is not only the youth and the blacks who demonstrate, well-to-do citizens defy court injunctions, threaten school boards, shout at tax hearings, picket mayors, overturn school buses. If this country were a business, and the workers were becoming increasingly violent and destructive, if foremen and middle management were beginning to shout and retaliate, an intelligent Board of Directors would demand to know what was back of it all.

I come from a small town. In our business we recruit many young college and business school graduates each year. When they are brought out for an interview, we take them on a tour of the town. But it is a very special tour. They are driven through the best residential sections. They are shown our newest schools. They have lunch at the new clubhouse of our new golf course. They see our most modern churches and the new wing of the hospital. There is also another tour on which we *could* take them, and other people in our town to whom we *could* introduce them, but we do not take our prospective employees on this tour, nor do we introduce them to the other citizens—to the mother of eight whose gas has been shut off because the trustee to whom she must go for welfare has decided he will pay for coal, but not for gas (she doesn't have a coal stove); or to the local license bureau which refused to renew the license of a cleaning lady (white) until she paid the delinquent taxes of the husband from whom she was divorced 9 years ago. Of course, when a wealthy citizen goes with her to the bureau, there is no problem or taxes to be paid.

We do not take them to a section of rental houses which still have dirt floors, newspapers on the walls, outside plumbing with wells near privies (and high rents). Neither tour is the whole story in our town, but no one should think he knows our town unless he takes both tours.

We have a tour of American society which will offer clear proof of one of the greatest achievements any society has been able to show. I .m proud of the evidence and the achievements, and my country means a great deal to me. I am one of those fellows whose eyes become a little misty when he sees the flag and tries to sing the anthem. But I am well aware that we also have tour No. 2 in this country. We all ought to take it because it relates to our subject this morning. We cannot claim to understand our nation and our people unless we take both tours. Where shall we start?

Well, let's begin with the familiar part—the morning drive to work. In most cities I visit it takes noticeably longer to travel the same distance each time I return. Poisonous fumes are somewhat greater, accidents somewhat more numerous. It is steadily more dangerous to take an evening stroll. Streets are dirtier and uglier. More garbage is on the curb waiting collection, more abandoned cars by the roadside. We are visibly losing ground. Yet in only 30 years (the time between World War II and today) there will be another hundred million people in this country, and most of these will live in cities.

How much money will it take to permit the extra hundred million to move and live even as well as you and I are moving and living today? And is 30 years enough time to make the plans and raise the money and get the job done? This extra hundred million will expect to go to school. Do any of you live in communities where schools have extra capacity now? Have any of you personally visited inner city schools in this or any other great city—and personally inspected the crowding, the decay, the hopelessness which teachers feel about their jobs? With construction costs advancing at 1% each month, can we imagine the additional funds which will be required, if the extra hundred million are to receive no worse education than exists today.

Or have you been taken suddenly ill lately and tried to obtain a house call from a doctor in a strange city, or get admitted to a strange hospital? More and more city hospitals have beds in corridors. Hospital expense is rising at about 20% per year. In many important criteria, infant mortality, for example, we do not even rank among the ten best nations in today's world. What sums do you imagine will be required even to hold our own in health care for the extra hundred million in the next 30 years?

Or housing—how will the extra hundred million be housed as they appear month by month during the next 30 years? As of this moment there is no demonstrated answer to true low cost housing. When we consider that housing starts are now well below the level of need; that housing costs (like schools) are increasing at 1% a month, we can see the possibility that the single family dwelling may soon be within reach only of the most wealthy, and we have legitimate reason to wonder how and what kind of shelter will be available to the next hundred million when they arrive. I will not continue this catalogue. It is sufficient simply to note that, if we are to stop losing ground, and if we are to be ready to serve the next hundred million within 30 years, very large sums of money must be spent, beginning now, on transportation, on educational facilities (even if we operate the system 12 months a year), on health care facilities, on air and water pollution, on housing. These are all matters which require big expensive solutions, mostly public solutions. The solutions will *not* happen naturally. Naturally we have fallen behind. And time is so short that we must be under way *now*, if our material condition is not to deteriorate further, and irretrievably.

So, as a national enterprise we face an extraordinarily large capital program, which must be accomplished in a short space of time, or the whole national plant could become so run down that, for all our wealth, we may very well be unable to rebuild it adequately to the needs of those it is required to serve.

We have also another set of problems which concern the national enterprise. The first group—some of which we have just described—are caused mainly by rapidly growing numbers, and by a national physical plant which is increasingly unable to meet our needs. The second group is of another order: It concerns how all of us feel about ourselves, our friends, our manner of living, our opportunities, our society. It makes a difference in your factory how workers feel about their bosses and each other, and it makes a difference in the country, too. There *is* such a thing as *the American way of life.* For me, Thomas Wolfe has described it as well as anyone. Here are his words:

"To every man his chance . . . To every man, regardless of his birth, his shining, golden opportunity. To every man the right to live, to work, to be himself, and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him . . . This is the promise of America."

When a baby is born in this country there are conditions that surround him that are not within the society's control. He may have loving parents or hateful parents. He may have a congenitally weak heart, or he may have the heart of a 4-minute miler, and so on. These we cannot do much about. But there are things America can do for that new born baby. We can see to it that within the society itself each baby born in this land has an equal chance at the starting line. That is what America is all about. That is why most of our ancestors came over here. That is why we said no kings, no nobility. That is why we established the first national public school system. We have always felt that equal opportunity for good education, paid for by the state, was not some form of socialism, but instead the very foundation of the American dream.

All members of the society will of course not make the most of their equal chance. We know that. Some will turn out to be lazy. Some will be smarter than others. Some will be quarrelsome. Some will be criminals. Some will be geniuses. Most will be solid citizens. But it is clear to us that, if our country is unique in history, if it has anything worth saying to the rest of the world, it is that each new baby is of

equal importance, and deserves an equal chance.

But now, you are saying, that is all too general and too fuzzy. Specifically what do we mean by "his chance"—and would any two of us agree on a definition? I think this is not too difficult a question. And I think I do not even have to answer it. You can answer it for me. What do you want for your baby at his birth? I doubt if you really want a guaranteed million dollar income, or preferment for public or private office regardless of ability. If you do, you are at least ashamed to confess to it. Instead you probably want some things like these: You want him to be strong and healthy, to have access to all the education his mind can put to good use; You want him to have as good a chance at a job or profession as any other child of equal capacity; You want him to receive just and equal treatment in the society in which he lives. You might mention other things, too; but even those would sound much like the above. In summary you would say you want no special favors for him, but that you will be furious, if he is denied opportunities that would otherwise be his, simply because it is discovered that he has red hair, or a big nose, or that he is *your* son, and for no other reason. I can only assume that, if this is how you feel and how I feel, then it is probably how other parents feel too, and furthermore, it is not only how we feel about our children, but it is how you and I feel about ourselves, and our own chances in this world.

If this be true, I'm not so sure we like what it all means. It means the new arrival should have access to as good an education as he is able to absorb—whether or not his parents happen to be wealthy. It means he should have access to the food and diet necessary for a healthy body, whether or not his parents happen to have the money. (Poor diet and hunger in infancy can rob the new baby permanently of his chance.) It means that, if he is to be denied access to a particular job, or to advancement or to opportunity, it must truly be because he is individually less able than another—and never never because a person is white or black, rich or poor, Catholic or Jew, or a woman. You and I know very clearly what fair treatment, an equal chance at the starting line, means to us—for ourselves and for our children. If health, education, equal justice were denied to *our* children, but promised at some distant time to some distant generation, you and I, and most especially our wives and mothers, might show very little patience indeed. "Progress" would mean nothing to us, if it were not available to our children when they most required it. The American dream and the survival of this free society hang quite simply upon the ability of each of us to be as indignant, as determined to act in correction, if another is deprived of his fair chance, as if we, or our children, were deprived.

Now where are we? We have identified two species of problems, and they are quite simply grave enough to destroy us within the next 30 years, if we do not solve them. If 90 of the next hundred million crowd themselves into cities—as they are certain to do—and if we move no faster on transportation, schooling, air & water pollution, garbage collection, housing, slums, rat control than we are moving today, do you really think these cities can even function? Or consider the Blacks, the Puerto Ricans, the Indians, the Women—are each of them not rapidly becoming more vocal, more frustrated, more violent? If they do not gain an equal chance at the starting line with the bulk of white male Americans, in education, housing, justice, job opportunity, do you really think these Americans will put up with it for 30 more years? You and I know what Americans historically do when they are convinced that they are stuck with the short end of the stick. They revolt—king or no king, government or no government. So I think it is not amiss to guess that these two species of problems are grave indeed, and of a kind which can destroy us as a nation, if they are not solved in a very short space of time.

What are the kinds of solutions we must expect? The first of our two kinds of problems is physical. It affects the health, mobility, and convenience of all the people, and it arises from our rapid population growth on a limited land area. We undoubtedly possess the technology which the answers demand—and the required sums of money too. But it is this latter which stops us. We do not wish to make the choice which faces us. On the one hand we could attack our problems now. During World War II we were willing to devote 60% of the GNP for 4 years to a task that faced us. If we elect such a course, then truly enormous annual expenditures are required now, in order to accomplish simultaneously a comprehensive and adequate transportation system, the construction and funding of equally adequate school systems, the cleaning up of our air and water, the maintenance for a growing population of an adequate supply of reasonable cost housing and the rest. These sums can come from only two sources—from public expenditure of tax funds and from private domestic investment. The latter is potentially 5 to 6 times larger than the former, but all of that is not available. A very large part must always be maintained in existing channels, simply to keep our industrial capacity growing as rapidly as the consumption needs of the society grow. The balance, which is not inconsiderable, may be directed by the government, through tax and administrative procedures, in the direction of the solutions we seek. What this all says, however, is that if we decide to solve our problems *now*, while they are still manageable, the sums of money are so great that we must *raise taxes significantly*. This increase will be big enough to lower visibly the standard of living which you and I now are accustomed to enjoy. This is a hard choice. When we raised our military commitments in Vietnam to war proportions, we did not act as we have in other wars, even the Korean War. We did not impose wage-price controls, rationing, excess profits taxes, and the rest. Instead we acted in the wishful way we often observe in our children. We pretended we could have both guns and butter. We pushed ahead of us our cancerous costly problems. Now we find that we are all living very much beyond our income. Because of inflation, solutions are becoming daily more costly. Because of simultaneous deterioration and population growth, problems are becoming daily more threatening.

We have been unwilling to bring our living standards into line with our long-term needs, and to set about repairing and rebuilding the national property. Instead we have actually cut taxes (More money will be pumped into consumers' hands this year as the surcharge is dropped) and we have stopped or slowed down the inadequate programs which did exist, aimed at the problems we have mentioned. Meanwhile, rigid wage increases already written into labor contracts, plus your and my conviction that we had better build that plant now because it will cost 10% more next year, will help guarantee a continued price inflation of considerable degree, even while we are laying off workers during the downturn.

I say all this, not as a political criticism, but in an effort to describe the full dimensions of the first of the two kinds of problems we have discussed.

In summary, expenditures of money, of wartime proportions, will be required to be spent in the next several years, if the decay in our physical plant is to be arrested, and if we are to be in any sense ready for the additional hundred million persons who will inhabit the land—and mainly its cities—within thirty years from this moment.

We are today living at a standard which we can neither maintain nor long afford. This is a serious matter, and up to now neither we as a people nor our leaders have been willing to face up to it. It is, however, not the most serious condition with which we are confronted. The next alarming fact is that, even if we were willing to tax ourselves as heavily as seems indicated, the money, applied in the same old way, would simply choke the system and probably accomplish little. Every city is composed of hundreds of small governmental units, with overlapping and competing authorities. Monies poured into them disappear with little trace of effective results. Attempts to administer the needs of a city as a whole, to relate and decide on priorities, to plan—most such efforts die in competing agencies before even much discussion takes place. And so, before the big sums may be safely spent in our cities, the system must be changed—to permit big solutions to big problems, simply administered: To permit local solutions to local problems, locally administered. We must become the kind of people who are flexible enough, foresighted enough, to alter, adapt, and reform our systems of government continuously; To make them responsive to changed conditions in a world where accelerating change is the order of the day.

Another example: Health care—costs of health care in recent years have been increasing at a rate of nearly 20% per year, the single most inflationary component in the GNP. Consider two of our best and most famous hospitals. The same service delivered at the same quality, after wage differentials have been eliminated, costs twice as much in one as in the other. Since private health plans, as well as Medicare and Medicaid, tend to pay demonstrated cost, it is our system to pay the inefficient hospital twice as much for the same service as the efficient hospital. Many of you have been on one end or the other of cost-plus contracts. Do you really imagine the exponential increases in the cost of health care will diminish so long as we continue to maintain a system of cost-plus compensation?

Another example: Long ago, when two men had a dispute, they fought it out—and the stronger man won. The winner depended on the relative strength of the adversaries, not on who was right and who was wrong. Men changed the system. They invented the concept of justice, and they established courts and rules of law to guide the settlement of disputes. Today you and I think twice about taking our case to court, unless we are pretty sure law and right are on our side. But management and labor still settle their disputes by means of the old system—by combat—by trial of strength. All parties suffer great losses—and perhaps the public most of all. Right or justice takes a priority second to strength. May we not have reached the time when we desperately need a better system?

Another example: How do we go about controlling inflation and preserving the value of the dollar? It is by slowing down business, which means simply throwing out of work those who are financially least able to survive. Do you seriously imagine we will be permitted to operate in this manner very much longer? Is not a better system long overdue?

Another example: Public Education. When your son goes to college, he conducts an agonizing analysis of his possible choices. He finds that college curricula, living rules, and conditions not only differ but are continuously changing. It is hard for him to make a choice—but it is important to note that he *can* choose. Colleges realize they are in competition, and higher education is rea-

sonably responsive to change. How does he choose which public elementary school or high school to attend? He has no choice. It is a monopoly—and the public secondary system of education in this country shows all the monolithic character and massive resistance to change which is part and parcel of any monopoly. Consider the kind of society our children will face, the skills, the knowledge they will require, the growing body of knowledge we are accumulating about the learning process, and the root American concern for each child to have his equal chance at the starting line. Do you imagine that quantities of money alone forced through a system, which was designed for another time, and which, if it changes at all, changes with glacial speed; Do you imagine such money through such a system will realize the American dream in education?

The American systems, private and public, were designed for a world which no longer exists—for a small, mainly agricultural people, remote from world pressures, with limitless room for expansion. Is it any wonder that the systems do not work well in a crowded urban technical society with finite borders? Our systems of government groan and frustrate us, from local to national. Our system of health care could collapse; our system of agriculture fights itself; our systems of transportation are daily on the edge of disaster; our system of conservation is losing the battle—nor are these the only examples. We can run similarly through the whole catalogue.

And so we come to a simple set of facts: Countries can collapse—and have. The survival of this nation is now at stake. Our survival, because of population growth such as the world has not seen, and because of an exponential rate of change in man's condition, demands immediate and continuing expenditures of monies unprecedented in amount save in wartime. Such expenditures will mean visible reduction in the standard of living of the affluent 80% of present society. These expenditures however will not accomplish their purpose, if forced through present systems unchanged. Nearly every existing system must be changed to serve well present needs, and must be continuously changed as rapidly as needs and conditions change. Yet it is our normal preference to rehabilitate the damaged products of our systems, rather than to reform the systems themselves. We have never in our history demonstrated the willingness and flexibility in respect to change such as now seems demanded.

Finally, all the above, even if accomplished, may come to naught unless the nation, and especially its most privileged majority, is not passionately concerned to see that each individual American born into this nation has an equal chance at the starting line *beginning now. . . .* No nation has come up against such a challenge. We have every means, every skill needed for the accomplishment. The world watches to see if we have the will.

The business community has very nearly as much influence as the young people think it has. If business voluntarily in the conduct of its own affairs accords the long-term public interest a priority equal to that assigned shareholders, and demanded by organized workers, the influence of such an example will be compelling.

If businessmen go to their city councils, to their state houses, to Washington, and lobby as hard and effectively for equal and adequate education, improvement of the environment, solutions to transportation, health care, and support the monies and changes required to make these possible—the country will turn around. Our example could be determining.

In six years we will celebrate our 200th birthday. What present ought we give ourselves at such a party? Celebrations and speeches about presents given *us* by those long dead? Or should we fashion, in our turn, a present for our children such as our fathers gave to us: A new land, and a people equally and sacrificially concerned for its smallest member! Should we accept a burden now, in order to present our children with a land whose water, air, resources, beauties, are treasured and enhanced rather than wasted, whose people, each of them, have access to learning, health, justice, and the chance to do what each has in him to do? Such a present we could very nearly give ourselves and our children by the time of our birthday party—if we have the vision, if we have the will to achieve the vision, and if we choose leaders dedicated to harness that will.

Business has a voice to raise in support of such a national act in such a short time, and business has freedom to provide free examples of such a will in action. "To every man his chance." Our fathers believed it. In our turn, we too are asked if we believe it.

---

## PRESTILE STREAM, MAINE

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, in recent weeks there has been discussion in the press and ir Congress about the sugar beet refinery in Easton, Maine, and its implications about the quality of water in the Prestile Stream.

The stories have contained misstatements, inaccuracies, and omissions of relevant facts.

For those who are interested in the whole story, I have prepared a statement which tells the story. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### HISTORICAL REVIEW

The Aroostook County economy has been plagued for generations by an unstable potato market. For many years the County and State have sought to broaden the economy to create more economic stability and opportunity. The potential for growing sugar beets as a second and compatible crop had been recognized for many years.

In 1962 the Congress amended the sugar act, and Maine sought to gain one of the six new sugar beet acreage allotments authorized by the amendment.

From the start, the Maine program to win one of the allotments was bi-partisan. Supporters included the farmers and business leaders of Aroostook County as well as industrialists and businessmen across the State. The Republican Governor and Executive Council, the majority and minority leaders of the Maine Legislature, agriculturalists from the University of Maine, the Maine Congressional Delegation, and the Maine Industrial Building Authority worked with the Department of Agriculture and the Area Redevelopment Administration in developing the State's proposal. For instance, the Legislature voted unanimously to raise the MIBA loan insurance limit from $2 million to $8 million specifically to accommodate the sugar beat project.

As the proposal developed, Great Western Sugar Company of Denver agreed to build the refinery and process the beets if the Department of Agriculture awarded an allotment to Maine.

In April, 1964, the Department approved a 33,000-acre sugar beet allotment for Maine. The refinery had to be built by the end of 1966 to comply with the 1962 sugar act amendments.

Late in 1964 Great Western withdrew from the project, thus jeopardizing the allotment and the sugar beet industry. The company said the results of its test plantings in 1964 did not reach expectations. Although agricultural specialists from Maine disputed Great Western's conclusions, the company would not reverse its decision.

Supporters of the project were forced to seek a substitute for Great Western. One possibility was the Pepsi-Cola Company which was building a sugar refinery in New York State. The Company, however, declined to undertake a second refinery.

Early in 1965, Fred Vahlsing, Jr., the owner of a potato processing plant on the Prestile, agreed to substitute for Great Western in the project. His idea was to build a refinery next to his potato processing plant. The sponsors welcomed him, and he was able to utilize the financing package arranged for Great Western. His decision to locate the refinery on the Prestile, however, was recognized as a water pollution hazard.

There was concern that the refinery would further degrade the quality of the stream and that the operation of the refinery would violate State water quality standards, thus jeopardizing the first mortgage loan guaranteed by the MIBA and the second mortgage loan made by the Area Redevelopment Administration.

As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution I was especially concerned about the environmental dangers of a sugar beet refinery. I also knew that the necessary technology existed to control and prevent pollution from the refinery.

As a condition of my support for the Vahlsing refinery proposal I insisted that the necessary technology be made part of the plant at the time of construction.

With a commitment from Mr. Vahlsing to build as clean a plant as possible, the immediate task was to find a way to permit construction to proceed as fast as possible in order to meet the 1966 plant construction deadline.

In an unprecedented appearance before a joint session of the 102nd Legislature, Republican Governor John Reed, acting on the advice of the lending agencies—the Area Redevelopment Administration and the Maine Industrial Building Authority, a State agency—urged temporary reclassification of the stream from B to D. It allowed the project to go forward immediately by giving the refinery a chance to work out any flaws in the treatment system without the risk of legal difficulties during the initial operations of the refinery. The measure passed by an overwhelming vote as an emergency measure on May 5, 1965. The reclassification, however, did not take effect until the refinery was completed at the end of 1966. The treatment system worked effectively from the start of operations and the stream classification was raised to C by the Legislature in October, 1967, the same classification given to the Aroostook River, on which other potato processing plants are located.

### CORRECTING SOME MISAPPREHENSIONS

The foregoing states the essential facts on the sugar beet refinery project and the Prestile. In addition, I think it is important to correct some misapprehensions about the Prestile.

First, contrary to some reports, the Prestile Stream did not change from a pure trout sream to a polluted watercourse in 1960, when the Vahlsing, Inc. potato processing plant was built, or in 1965 when construction began on the Maine Sugar Industries sugar beet refinery. Fish kills and blocked fish migrations were documented by State agencies as early as 1953. Long before either plant was built, the Prestile had been polluted by sewage discharges from the towns of Easton and Mars Hill, starch factory discharges and the dumping of potatoes along the stream. The B classification represented a goal, not a physical fact.

Second, the Vahlsing, Inc. potato processing plant has been a source of pollution, but, contrary to some reports, the reclassification

change did not take Vahlsing, Inc. off the hook with respect to its potato processing plant discharges. The temporary change in classification to D was in effect only from January, 1967, when the refinery began operation, until October, 1967, when the stream was reclassified to C. The change in classification from B to D was made at the insistence of the lenders. They would not let the project go forward without a temporary reclassification. The haste in the change was dictated by the necessity of having the refinery in operation in time to process the fall 1966 crop of beets. This was essential in order to retain the Maine sugar beet allotment. Otherwise, the loans for construction would not have been made, and the refinery could not have been built in time.

Third, I reluctantly supported the temporary change in classification on three grounds: (a) that the refinery would be designed and built with the most effective water utilization and waste treatment facilities; (b) that the reclassification would cover only the period of start-up for the plant; and, (c) that the refinery could not be financed without it. During the discussion about the reclassification, my staff and I pointed out on a number of occasions that the real problem on the Prestile was not the potential pollution from the sugar refinery but the existing pollution from the potato processing plant and the municipalities. At my insistence, the sugar refinery did include a recirculation system, plus a plan to apply water used to wash the beets in field irrigation. Then and since, I have pressed for more effective action to deal with the potato waste problem.

Fourth, a major problem in dealing with the Prestile and similar difficulties on other Maine streams has been the antiquated Maine classification law which requires legislative, rather than executive, action for improvements in water quality standards and which does not provide adequate enforcement authority for the Environmental Improvement Commission. Until 1957, the Maine water pollution program simply classified Maine waters as they existed. In 1957, as Governor, I initiated the first changes to upgrade the classification of Maine waters. On numerous occasions since that time I have uregd changes in the Maine law to give the State authority to upgrade water quality standards through administrative action and to enforce such standards.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act contains a provision developed and enacted at my recommendation which gives the United States government and the government of Canada a vehicle for enforcing water quality standards on the Prestile and other similar international waters.

My position on the Vahlsing potato processing plant and the sugar beet refinery remains what it has always been: the problem of wastes from the potato processing plant and municipalities should be dealt with promptly and efficiently as part of a regional water quality improvement plan, and the sugar beet refinery should be operated as it was designed in order to prevent any waste discharges into the Prestile.

## INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERSHIPS IN NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, the subject of institutional memberships in the New York Stock Exchange has lately become a point of sharp debate in the financial and investing world. Such institutions as mutual funds, pension funds, and insurance companies, with enormous securities portfolios of their own, could do their own trading without using independent brokerage concerns if they could gain such memberships, or gain control of members. Such memberships, in consequence, would give institutional members a lower commission rate within the existing fixed-commission structure—a structure which is presently the subject of SEC hearings. Indeed, the Justice Department has recently filed a statement with the SEC suggesting that institutional memberships, and/or a change in the current commission rate structure, ought to be considered. Also, in connection with the SEC's approval of exchange proposals to allow public ownership of members, the SEC has asked the exchange to report to it by July 1970 on the question of institutional membership.

On April 9, John L. Loeb, senior partner in Loeb, Rhoades & Co., one of the largest investment banking and brokerage houses and members of the New York Stock Exchange, issued a statement, in the form of a memorandum to members of the exchange, enclosing an open letter to the chairman of the exchange and a summary memorandum concerning the subject, in which he opposed any change in the stock exchange constitution or rules which would permit direct institutional exchange membership, or indirect control of a member by such an institution.

He argues that institutional membership: First, is inconsistent with the function and obligation of the exchange as a public auction market; second, would drive a number of broker-dealers out of business, eliminate direct access to the market by many smaller investers, and make it difficult for the specialist system to function; third, would decrease liquidity; fourth, would reduce the availability of financing to some American businesses; fifth, would give rise to grave conflicts of interest; and sixth, would compel noninstitutional members, as competitors of institutional members, to seek offsetting concessions from the exchange.

Mr. President, as the focus of this problem—indeed the focus of all securities problems—is in my State, I call attention to this important issue and ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the three documents setting forth Mr. Loeb's position.

I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a report of the controversy which was published in the New York Times of April 10, 1970.

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

LOEB BACKS LIMITING BIG BOARD MEMBERS—INSTITUTIONAL ADMISSIONS HELD FRAUGHT WITH PERILS

(By Terry Robards)

Loeb, Rhoades & Co., one of Wall Street's largest and best known investment banking and brokerage bonuses, took a vigorous stand yesterday against institutional membership on the New York Stock Exchange.

"It is our judgment that institutional ownership and control of members of the exchange would strike a damaging blow at the operations of the exchange and the securities industry and would be detrimental to the national interest," said John L. Loeb, senior partner.

Mr. Loeb's statement came in a letter to Bernard M. Lasker, chairman of the exchange's board of governors and chairman of a committee studying the institutional question.

It was issued a day after Howard M. Stein, president of the Dreyfus Fund, took a similar position.

Many Wall Street leaders are fearful that such institutions as mutual funds, pension funds and insurance companies may try to gain exchange memberships to do the trading for their own enormous investment portfolios, thereby draining commission revenues away from the brokerage concerns that presently execute transactions for them.

Mr. Loeb, considered an influential Wall Street figure, indicated that his fears about institutional membership run much deeper than any considerations about the loss of commission revenues for his firm. Loeb, Rhoades, with a net worth of about $78-million, is one of the four wealthiest houses in the securities business.

Changing the exchange constitution to permit institutional membership, Mr. Loeb asserted, would "seriously impair the exchange as a public auction market for securities in which prices are determined by the interplay of the independent judgment of a multitude of public investors."

He added: "It would drive out of business many independent broker-dealers, who are the main source of the business brought to the floor of the exchange and whose existence is essential to the free function of the securities market and availability of broad, public financing to the nation's business."

At a news conference, Mr. Loeb added: "In my opinion you'd wipe out all the little people in the business and you'd get a concentration of power. If you don't keep a network of small brokers, then you reduce the access for the individual investors who really makes up the liquidity of this market."

Clifford W. Michel, managing partner of Loeb, Rhoades and an official of the Association of Stock Exchange Firms, noted that unanimity of opinion rarely existed within the association's membership, but added that there was "no question that the majority of our membership is violently opposed to institutional membership."

The association consists of members of the Big Board.

Mr. Loeb's letter to Mr. Lasker was accompanied by a formal memorandum on the subject and by an open letter to all members of the stock exchange.

Some Wall Street sources interpreted the firm's publicly stated position as an effort to arouse general membership opposition to institutional membership.

Mr. Loeb said his firm was disturbed that little attention apparently had been given to some of the possible consequences that could arise from letting institutions join.

"Much more is at stake in the question of institutional membership than the sharing of commission dollars or the privileges of membership," he asserted.

PRESENT ROLE UPHELD

"The stakes are the very continuation of the exchange as basically an agency market for the public, operated by professionals whose interests lie primarily in the transacting of securities trading for the general public."

Mr. Loeb urged Mr. Lasker's committee to let stand the present provision in the exchange constitution stipulating that the "primary purpose" of an exchange member must be the brokerage business.

LOEB, RHOADES & CO.,
*New York, N.Y., April 9, 1970.*

TO: MEMBERS OF THE NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE:

We are enclosing a copy of a letter that we have today sent to Mr. Bernard Lasker relating to the subject of institutional membership. It is our position that opening the New York Stock Exchange to institutional membership will seriously injure the Exchange as a public auction market, drive many broker-dealers out of business, threat-

en the liquidity of the market, undermine the operations of specialists and other floor members, and result in serious conflicts of interest which will weaken public confidence.

In view of the great importance of this issue, we invite your consideration of these and other points that are set out in the enclosures.

Very truly yours,

JOHN L. LOEB.

---

LOEB, RHOADES & CO.,
*New York, N.Y., April 9, 1970.*

Mr. BERNARD J. LASKER,
*Chairman, New York Stock Exchange,*
*New York, N.Y.*

DEAR MR. LASKER: The Securities and Exchange Commission has advised the New York Stock Exchange that it intends at a later date to review the appropriateness of the "primary purpose" requirements in the Exchange's Constitution and rules which the Exchange has now made effective. The Commission has stated that it intends to conduct this review after consideration of the Exchange's study of institutional membership which is scheduled for completion by July 1 of this year.

The Commission's deferral of its comments means that the possibility remains open that institutional membership or ownership of member firms may be authorized. If this should occur, the consequences would be most damaging to the Exchange and the securities industry; and because of the New York Stock Exchange's crucial importance to the Nation's economy, as its central and largest securities market, the result would be highly prejudicial to the national interest.

As you know, a number of acquisitions of member firms by institutions have already taken place. Others are pending and many more will undoubtedly occur if institution-ownership and control of members does not continue to be a bar to membership in the Exchange.

The "primary purpose" provisions as to which the Commission has deferred comment, are the only provisions now in the Constitution and rules which would restrict institutional ownership and control of members. The Constitutional provisions require that the "primary purpose" of members and their parents must be the transaction of business as brokers and dealers in securities.

The implementing rules define these terms. Any company owning more than 25% of the total outstanding voting securities of a member is presumed to be its parent; and the "primary purpose" of a member or its parent is presumed to be the transaction of business as a broker-dealer if the gross income of each from broker-dealer activities, including interest charges on debit balances in customers' accounts, is at least 50% of its total gross income.

It is these provisions, and only these provisions, that provide a basis for preserving the Exchange as a public auction market primarily operated by members who serve the general public. These are the only remaining provisions that assure the preservation of a broad securities market which is composed of an adequate number of broker-dealers, which serves the general public, and which reflects the various trading judgments of the general investing public.

If these provisions do not remain in the Constitution and rules, or if they are substantially watered-down, the result will be domination of the securities market by institutions such as mutual funds and insurance companies, through acquisition and ownership of members, and domination of the floor by their representatives.

We do not disagree with the Exchange's view that access to permanent capital through public ownership of an appropriate type may be needed by some member organizations. But we believe that the Exchange must not permit public ownership to become a vehicle for private domination of the Exchange by organizations whose primary interests are inconsistent with the obligations and functions of the Exchange and its members.

As you know, the Exchange itself has taken the position that effective self-regulation of members is impractical unless the "primary purpose" of members and their parents is transacting business as brokers and dealers.

But fundamentally, it is our judgment that institutional ownership and control of members of the Exchange would strike a damaging blow at the operations of the Exchange and the securities industry and would be detrimental to the national interest.

It would seriously impair the Exchange as a public auction market for securities in which prices are determined by the interplay of the independent judgment of a multitude of public investors.

It would drive out of business many independent broker-dealers, who are the main source of the business brought to the floor of the Exchange, and whose existence is essential to the free function of the securities market and the availability of broad, public financing to the Nation's business.

It would undermine the activities and operations of specialists and other floor members.

It would subject the governing structure of the Exchange to dominance by a few vast institutions, and their representatives on the floor, and the institutions would have the power to shape Exchange rules and regulations to their own private needs.

It would threaten the liquidity of the market by concentrating trading in relatively few hands.

It would substantially impede access to new financing by American business enterprises by narrowing the market and reducing the number of firms through whom these securities may be marketed.

It would give rise to grave and recurrent questions of conflict of interest which would weaken public confidence in the securities markets and might lead eventually to more restrictive governmental control of the Exchange and the industry.

We are enclosing a memorandum detailing these points at greater length.

We are disturbed that, to date, so far as has appeared in the published accounts, little attention has been given to these considerations, although they go to the heart of the issue. They involve basic questions relating to the survival and continuation of the Exchange as a public auction market; its operation by professionals primarily acting as agents for the public as well as specialists and floor representatives; the survival of a strong, vigorous broker-dealer network in the Nation; public participation in the ownership of American business; the liquidity of the securities market; and its availability as an essential mechanism of the American economy.

Much more is at stake in the question of institutional membership than the sharing of commission dollars or the privileges of membership. The stakes are the very continuation of the Exchange as basically an agency market for the public, operated by professionals whose interests lie primarily in the transacting of securities trading for the general public.

We hope and believe that the Exchange's Committee on Institutional Membership will carefully consider these fundamental issues, and that it will concur with our view that the "primary purpose" provision as included in the new Constitutional amendments and as defined in the pending rules must be retained as a minimal safeguard.

We are aware, of course, that various regional exchanges have permitted institutional ownership of members. We believe that this is unfortunate and undesirable because the points which we have made against such membership are also applicable, in varying degrees, to the regional exchanges, despite their relatively small size and restricted operations. We believe that the undesirability of institutional control of members on the regional exchanges will soon become apparent, and that such membership will be terminated either by the regional exchanges, the institutions themselves, the SEC or, if necessary, by legislation. This is most likely to come about, we believe, if the New York Stock Exchange remains firm in its opposition to institutional membership and states the reasons for its opposition in a comprehensive and unequivocal report.

In any event, the position of the New York Stock Exchange as the broad, central market for securities trading, which most of the investing public utilizes and upon which the welfare of the securities industry and the Nation's economy so largely depends, is such that it cannot follow the lead of the regional exchanges without sacrificing its primary purpose and without severe loss and injury to the investing public, to itself, its members and the Nation. If any diversion of institutional volume to the regional exchanges takes place, we believe that it will be minor and temporary and that the undesirable consequences of institutional control of members will soon lead to corrective action.

We shall welcome an opportunity for full discussion of this entire matter with you and the Committee, and we believe that similar opportunities should be afforded to other members and interested persons.

We are sending copies of this letter and the enclosed memorandum to the members of the Committee on Institutional Membership, the President of the Exchange, the members of the Exchange and the members of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Very truly yours,

JOHN L. LOEB.

---

LOEB, RHOADES & CO.,
*New York, N.Y., April 9, 1970.*

SUMMARY MEMORANDUM CONCERNING INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERSHIP ON THE NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE SUBMITTED TO THE COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERSHIP

I. *Institutional membership in the Exchange, either directly or through controlled firms, is inconsistent with the function and obligation of the Exchange as a public auction market.*

(1) The Exchange is and must continue to be primarily an agency market for the investing public.

(2) Institutions as members or through subsidiaries which are members would necessarily engage in large-volume trading for their own account. This trading would affect, and might be engaged in with a view to affecting, their transactions off the floor of the Exchange. Institutions of all kinds accounted in the first half of 1969 for 54% of the total public share volume and 60% of the total public dollar volume on the Exchange. These percentages have been increasing.

(3) In 1969 transactions for members' own accounts originating off the floor (excluding activity of specialists, floor traders and odd-lot dealers) amounted to only 7% of all trading activity. This percentage indicates the predominance of the public agency function of the present membership. It cannot be substantially inreased without endangering the Exchange's basic and vital role as an agency market for the public.

(4) Institutions trading for their own account would dominate the market and its pricing mechanism. This would be contrary to the essential purpose of the Exchange which is to reflect in the pricing of securities, the judgment of multitudes of public investors and the actions of numbers of independent broker-dealers.

(5) Institutional membership, directly or through subsidiaries, might result in domi-

nation of the governing structure of the Exchange by a few vast organizations which would have the power to shape its rules and regulations, including its rate structure.

II. *Institutional membership in the Exchange, either directly or through controlled firms, would drive a number of broker-dealers out of business, eliminate direct access of many smaller investors to the market, and make it difficult for the specialist system to function.*

(1) At the present time, institutional trading is effected by and through the existing non-institutional members of the Exchange. Its volume is so large that the concentration of a substantial part of it in the hands of institutional members and their floor representatives would result in reducing the business available to independent broker-dealers and their representatives on the floor, and would eliminate numbers of them from the industry.

(2) The result would be to diminish or deny direct access to the marketplace to thousands of smaller investors who now trade through the broker-dealer network.

(3) The decrease in the number of the broker-dealers would remove from the marketplace the plurality and diversity of investment and trading judgment upon which the Exchange depends to fulfill its function as a public market.

(4) Concentration of the bulk of trading activity in the hands of members trading for their own account would make it difficult for the present specialist system to function. This system requires, as its basis, a multitude of small orders over a range of prices on both sides of the market, and could not deal effectively with a market dominated by large block sales.

III. *Institutional membership, directly or through controlled firms, would reduce liquidity.*

(1) Institutional membership, directly or through subsidiaries, would be a direct threat to liquidity. Liquidity depends upon the presence in Exchange trading of a multitude of investors whose individual decisions are arrived at by themselves and on advice of a large number and variety of independent broker-dealers. These individual trading judgments provide the volume and diversity of buy-sell orders which are the basis of liquidity. Domination of the business by a relatively few institutions and their controlled subsidiaries, and the reduction of the number of independent broker-dealers, will reduce the plurality of decision-making and the liquidity of the market.

IV. *Institutional membership, because it would eliminate a number of broker-dealers, would reduce the availability of financing to some American businesses.*

(1) The contraction of the broker-dealer network, with its direct access to the investing public, would substantially reduce the opportunity of many American business enterprises to obtain financing. It would tend to concentrate the sources of capital funds in fewer hands. It would tend to destroy the opportunity of businesses, particularly small businesses, to seek funds through a multitude of channels including independent broker-dealers.

V. *Institutional membership would inevitably give rise to grave conflicts of interest.*

(1) Institutions and their subsidiary broker-dealer members would be engaged in trading for the institutions' vast portfolios while having direct access to the machinery and information of the Exchange as members. At the same time, they would be acting as agents for public investors and would be advising them. If their actions as agents or advisers for the public are inconsistent with their own decisions, problems of conflict will obviously exist. If their advice to the public and their trading decisions for their own portfolios are uniform, the market power of the institution may be greatly augmented, their power to dominate trading and pricing greatly increased, and the liquidity of the market further seriously diminished.

(2) In voting as members with respect to such matters as commission rate schedules, institutions would be faced with a direct, unavoidable conflict between their interests as traders in large blocks and the public investors to whom they, as members of the Exchange, would have fiduciary responsibilities.

(3) These conflicts could threaten the continuation of the Exchange as a self-governing market subject only to a measure of governmental supervision. They would weaken investor confidence in the Exchange as an objective, public auction market. The conflicts could shake public confidence in the Exchange and the securities industry, and might lead to direct government direction.

VI. *Competitors of member institutions would be compelled to seek concessions from the Exchange and its members to offset the advantages that their competitor-members would obtain.*

(1) Institutions that cannot achieve membership but which compete with those that do would be compelled to demand special accommodations in terms of Exchange rates, rules and practices to offset the financial and other advantages obtained by their competitor-members. The result would be further disruption and distortion of the Exchange and the industry.

CONCLUSION

1. Institutional membership on the Exchange raises fundamental questions of public policy and of the survival of the Exchange and the securities industry as instrumentalities for the service of the Nation's economy and the investing public. Questions of the sharing of commission dollars cannot be considered as determinative of the issue.

2. The Exchange should continue to oppose institutional membership or ownership or control of members and should reaffirm the "primary purpose" provisions in its Constitution and the implementing rules without modification or dilution.

By: JOHN L. LOEB.

## OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF BOUNDARY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in connection with the remarks contained in last week's RECORD concerning the Outer Contintental Shelf boundary, I should like to draw the attention of Senators to a recent letter to the editor of the New York Times from Wolfgang Friedman, professor of International Law at Columbia University.

Referring to the administration's upcoming decision on this international boundary issue, Professor Friedman states:

There are few issues of greater importance and world-wide implications.

Having placed the boundary question in its proper foreign policy context and having attached to it the international significance which I think it deserves, Professor Friedman, sounding much the same warning that is contained in my remarks of Friday last, notes:

The U.S. will be in the forefront of a free-for-all grab in ocean-bed resources if the President follows the April 13 statement of Senator Lee Metcalf, representing his views as chairman of the special subcommittee on the outer continental shelf.

Professor Friedman then goes on to point out that neither the United States nor any other country has exclusive jurisdiction over seabed resources beyond the edge of the Continental Shelf, and he makes the point that the definition of the "Continental Shelf" contained in the Geneva Convention "is now being widened further by the combined pressures of industrial interests and narrow-minded nationalism." These forces, says Professor Friedman, "seek to open a major part of the ocean floor to national appropriation, as it becomes exploitable."

I ask unanimous consent that Professor Friedman's letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 19, 1970]

CLAIMS FOR OCEAN BED RESOURCES DISCUSSED

To the Editor: The Administration is about to formulate U.S. policy with regard to its continental shelf. There are few issues of greater importance and worldwide implications. The U.S. will be in the forefront of a free-for-all grab in ocean-bed resources if the President follows the April 13 statement of Senator Lee Metcalf, representing his views as chairman of the special subcommittee on the outer continental shelf. These include the claim that "the U.S. should not forfeit any of the legal rights, present or potential, to the natural resources of the continental margin it enjoys by virtue of the 1958 Geneva Convention on the continental shelf."

The subcommittee urges that the decision "should not be couched in terms prejudicial to development by U.S. nationals of the mineral resources of the deep-sea bed *beyond the continental margin.*" Nor should it be influenced "by excessive and unrealistic demands voiced in some segments of the international community."

The doctrine of the continental shelf—originally a limited extension of national sovereignty over sea-bed resources of to a maximum of 200 meters—was extended by the 1958 convention "beyond that limit, to where the depth of the superjacent waters admits of the exploitation of the natural resources of the said areas." This is now being widened further and further by the combined pressures of industrial interests and narrow-minded nationalism. They aim at the elimination of any vertical or horizontal limit, by using the concepts of the continental slope and the continental rise, which were never contemplated in the discussions and conventions on the continental shelf. They thus seek to open a major part of the ocean floor to national appropriation, as it becomes exploitable.

Nations without shelves respond with claims to 200-mile territorial water limits, and the landlocked nations—more disadvantaged than ever—may seek to appropriate sea shallows. Before very long the oceans will be studded with artificial structures and rival installations on the ocean bed thousands of meters under the surface. More likely than not, these will be accompanied by military bases and greatly increased dangers of pollution. United States' claims will, of course, be countered by other maritime nations. All this is no doubt called "realism," and the pleas for some international limitation and control are dismissed as starry eyed or unpatriotic.

The lesson belatedly learned from the uncontrolled use and pollution of national resources is not applied on the international level. In the name of "national interest," rival national claims are pushed to the point where the sea will become less and less open, and environment polluted on a worldwide scale. National interests will clash at the bottom of the oceans as on land. Here, as so

often, "realism" may turn out to be the way to disaster.

WOLFGANG FRIEDMAN,
*Professor of International Law, Columbia University.*
NEW YORK, *April 17, 1970.*

## ERA OF NEGOTIATIONS—PART V

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, in a series of brief statements during the last month I have raised questions about the administration's Vietnam policies—its overreliance on Vietnamization and neglect of diplomacy. I had hoped that these questions would be answered in the President's address to the Nation on April 20. Unfortunately, I do not find this to be the case. I find that many of the same inconsistencies remain between the administration's word and deed.

I listened to President Nixon, hoping that he might reveal the plan for peace that we have been promised since his campaign in 1968. I hoped that he might indicate a program that would bring our involvement to a speedy close. Instead, I heard a determination that the war must continue and that, at best, a year from today almost 300,000 Americans will still be fighting and dying in Vietnam.

The fact that our American forces in Vietnam have been reduced and that further reductions are contemplated is desirable, but it cannot be allowed to obscure the fact that, under present planning, more than half of the peak number of American troops will remain in Vietnam after 2½ years of the Nixon administration. Moreover, although President Nixon contrasts American casualties for the first quarter of 1970 favorably with first quarters of prior years, the fact is that the level of American casualties has remained high even as our troop strength has declined. Indeed, in recent weeks, the rate of casualties has increased. Continuation of the present rate would mean that by a year from now—when the current installment of withdrawals is scheduled to be completed—an additional 6 to 7 thousand American boys will have been killed.

President Nixon's hopes for peace appear to be based on the illusion that Vietnamization can in time bring about a military victory. Although the President speaks of a political settlement as being "the heart of the matter" he makes no move to bring about effective and productive negotiations in Paris. We continue to be represented there by a career foreign service officer whom the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong consider as a subordinate with whom they cannot and *will not* negotiate. In addition, the promise that almost 300,000 American troops will continue a year from now to shore up the Thieu Regime certainly removes any incentive for Saigon to negotiate a realistic political settlement. The President concedes that there has been no progress in Paris. But there can be no progress in Paris while we continue to downgrade diplomacy.

President Nixon offers only the prospect of further and futile military efforts to resolve an essentially political conflict. He tells us only that, over some indefinite period, all American combat forces are to be withdrawn. Are we to understand that noncombat forces will remain?

We are not told whether or how many combat forces are to be withdrawn during the next month or 6 months or during the balance of 1970. Are we to understand that the President has given in to military insistence on a delay in any further troop withdrawals?

We are told that what was previously described as a firm withdrawal plan was in fact a strategy of "cut-and-try." Is the new program, with the timing and pace of withdrawals to be determined by developments elsewhere, any different?

What we do know is that we are asked to support, and to support indefinitely, a war in which somewhat fewer American troops continue to fight on an ever-widening battlefield. We know too that the criteria for terminating American participation have now also been widened to include developments not only in South Vietnam but throughout Indochina.

Much has been made of the increased emphasis in the speech on the desirability of a political settlement of the war, but paying lipservice to diplomacy is not enough. This administration must take a variety of steps to reinvigorate the process of negotiation and to bring an end to the killing in Vietnam.

In this respect the speech was a disappointment.

The President failed to name a high-level replacement for Ambassador Lodge. It has now been 153 days since we had a high-level negotiator in Paris and North Vietnam's political representative at the talks has returned home. To let this post remain vacant for 5 out of the 15 months that the President has been in office is a poor way to give substance to the "era of negotiation" proclaimed by the President at the time of his inauguration.

The only new diplomatic initiative referred to in the speech was the French proposal to reconvene the Geneva Conference, and the NLF statement in Paris the day after the President's speech apparently killed that proposal. It has now been many, many months since this administration or the Government in Saigon restated our negotiating position or attempted a major new diplomatic initiative.

The President's speech stated that we favored a "fair political solution" that "reflected the existing relationship of political forces within South Vietnam." But our negotiating position and that of the Thieu/Ky regime do not contain specific proposals to achieve this end. As I shall spell out in a future statement, it is not hard to see why this proposal has not been the basis for a political settlement between the Vietnamese factions which have been at war with each other for so many years.

Finally, Mr. President, I would take issue with the extraordinary rhetoric which President Nixon put forward as the basis for his troop withdrawal announcement.

How is it possible under any stretch of the imagination to say, as the President told the Nation, that "the decision I have announced tonight means that we finally have in sight the just peace we are seeking." Negotiations are at a complete impasse. Today's meeting—the 64th—was a propaganda exchange. The war has widened in both Laos and Cambodia. Even if the President's highly optimistic statement that "pacification is succeeding" is accepted at face value, and few would do so, the best that can be said is that we are slowly disengaging from the war. But Vietnamization means only the continuation of Asians killing Asians, and it is hollow rhetoric to talk about a "just peace" now being in sight.

The time has come, and indeed is long since past, when we should move to create the conditions that will permit the political settlement which is the only hope for peace in Southeast Asia. It will require that we send to Paris a high-ranking negotiator with direct and acknowledged access to the President. It will require that we make clear to the Saigon government that they can no longer rely on American military power to postpone forever their need to recognize the realities of political power in South Vietnam.

There is today less stability in Indochina than there was 15 months ago, when this administration took office. In those 15 months, 11,000 Americans have been killed—more than one-quarter of all American deaths in Vietnam. Our national interest demands a plan for peace.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial and an article on this subject be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 23, 1970]

THE LESSON OF LAOS

At one point last fall in the Symington subcommittee's hearings on Laos, Senator Fulbright said, almost plaintively, "I have never seen a country (the United States) engage in so many devious undertakings as this." The administration-censored transcript of the hearings published the other day fully bears out his lament. Until President Nixon, under the Symington spur, last month revealed selected aspects of the American presence in Laos, the American people knew only journalistic bits and propaganda pieces of a role that has cost them a couple of hundred lives and some billions of dollars over the last six years. Despite the (deletions), which at times make the transcript read like a drunk with hiccups, the Symington hearings fill in important parts of the record. They contribute substantially to the public's knowledge both of the military in Laos and the bureaucracy in Washington.

The rationale of successive administrations for deceiving Americans about their government's violations of the 1962 Geneva Agreements, which neutralized Laos, was put by William H. Sullivan. A Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Sullivan helped write the 1962 agreements and then served as Ambassador to Laos. He said that North Vietnam violated the 1962 accord from the start. In "proportionate response" the United States followed suit. To have admitted its violations while the Communists denied theirs would have put the Russians, who for their own reasons favored the continued neutrality of Laos, on the spot. A "senior Soviet official" had said that Moscow could wink at unofficial reports of American violations but would have to take cognizance of official admissions. In that event, the Geneva

Agreements would have been demolished. Laos would have been "polarized." The Laotian government might then have invoked American aid under SEATO (sic) and thereby generated "a greater obligation and a greater immersion of American presence and pressure to go into Laos."

We note with some incredulity that the Senators interrogating Mr. Sullivan did not see fit to challenge the *substance* of the policy he was elaborating, as complicated and contorted as it is. They did, however, challenge the secrecy in which that policy was fashioned and implemented. Senator Symington tellingly noted the irony of an open society running a closed policy. Subcommittee counsel Roland Paul went a step further and asked if "the benefit to be gained by not acknowledging our presence in this area is, perhaps, outweighed by the credibility gap that is generated from the fact that our operations are so large and they are so widely reported by unofficial sources, which the administration either denies or evades?"

Precisely here, in our view, lies the heart of the Laotian matter: policy was woven out of strictly diplomatic considerations. Since the Congress and the people were not informed, they could not raise the questions and doubts that might well have exercised a restraining influence on single-minded policymakers. At the least, the exposure of American policy might have gained for it a more substantial measure of public support. It is a pity that Mr. Symington did not start probing the Laotian scene years earlier, when it could have made a difference.

---

THE PRESIDENT AND THE GENERALS

(By James Reston)

In announcing the withdrawal of another 150,000 American troops from Vietnam within the next twelve months, President Nixon said "this far-reaching decision was made after *consultation* with our commanders in the field and it has the *approval* of the Government of South Vietnam."

The distinction is clear. He "consulted" his commanders in the field but didn't get their "approval." In fact, there was bitter opposition to this move both by General Abrams and by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the President is now caught between the antiwar elements who want him to get out faster and his military chiefs who want him to slow the retreat.

THE CONFLICT

This is one of those situations where it would probably be wise to follow the Administration's slogan: Watch what we do rather than what we say. The main thing is that, despite the expansion of the war into Cambodia and Laos, despite the diplomatic, stalemate in Paris peace talks, and despite the warnings of his military advisers, the President is sticking to the schedule of withdrawals and committing himself to a flexible but faster pull-back in the next year.

There are risks in this for the President, not only in Vietnam but within the Pentagon and the command in Saigon. For General Abrams is known to feel that the President has now reached the point of changing fundamentally the combat forces in the field without changing Abram's mission.

What General Abrams is saying is that his troops are being taken from him faster than he thinks prudent in the present state of readiness of the South Vietnamese and the widening war by the North Vietnamese. What the President is saying, in effect, is what Senator George Aiken urged him to say long ago: "We've won, so bring the boys back home."

It would probably be a mistake for the antiwar elements at home and the North Vietnamese officials in Hanoi to ignore this increasingly difficult relationship between the President and his principal military chiefs.

He has not said when in the next twelve months he will cut the 150,000 but he has imposed his authority as Commander in Chief on his subordinates. He has given a somewhat rosier picture of the situation in Indo China than his commanders would make themselves, and therefore he is vulnerable to the charge—which President Johnson would never face—that he has given them an assignment but not the men to carry it out.

THE PRESIDENT'S WARNING

This was clearly in the President's mind in his latest report on Vietnam. "While we are taking these risks for peace," he said, "they [the enemy] will be taking grave risks should they attempt to use the occasion to jeopardize the security of our remaining forces. . . . My responsibiliy as Commander in Chief of our armed forces is for the safety of our men, and I shall meet that responsibility."

Here what the President *says* should be be taken with the utmost seriousness. For if he personally takes the responsibility for withdrawing troops against the advice of General Abrams, and the enemy then launches an attack that threatens a major military defeat or even the destruction of Abrams' command, it is not too much to say that he will use any weapons at his command—*any* weapons—to avoid destruction of his remaining troops.

Anybody who has watched Mr. Nixon over the years is bound to understand how reluctantly he would reject the advice of his military commanders, how careful he would be to avoid an open confrontation with them on a military judgment, and how violently he would react if he thought his decision was in danger of producing a massacre or even a humiliating defeat.

This is the new thing in the situation. He has left himself some leeway to keep most of the 150,000 in Vietnam until late in the twelve-month period. He has obliquely suggested a political compromise that would leave the Communists in charge of the areas they now hold, and he has surrounded it all with victorious rhetoric, which his commanders don't quite believe and even resent.

In short, Mr. Nixon is now approaching that delicate point of withdrawal which President de Gaulle faced in his retreat from Algeria. De Gaulle managed it only with the greatest difficulty, against the advice and, some thought, the honor of his responsible officers, and it was not accomplished without revolt among the officers.

President Nixon is not faced with anything so serious as this, but he is now coming into the most difficult part of his policy, and even those who might wish him to move faster, have to give him credit for sticking to the direction and pace of his retreat, even if he calls it by the name of victory.

---

[From the New York Times, Apr. 22, 1970]

POLITICAL NEED FOR PULLOUT IS BALANCED AGAINST GENERALS' WISH FOR FLEXIBILITY

(By Max Frankel)

WASHINGTON, April 21.—The first reactions here to President Nixon's latest report on Vietnam focused on his obvious effort to balance the political pressure for more troop withdrawals against the military's request for a show of strength on the battlefield in the next few months. The President found his compromise in the kind of annual timetable that he had refused to proclaim last autumn. He committed himself to the minimum withdrawal rate of 12,000 men a month over the coming year. But he left his generals free to argue for slowdowns and speed-ups as the course of battle changes, provided only that they scale down to 284,000 men by next spring.

Mr. Nixon's speech last night was also notable for its strong new appeal for negotiation of a political settlement.

Despite his optimistic reading of the military situation and his contention that a "just peace" was now in sight, Mr. Nixon went out of his way to encourage the Soviet Union and North Vietnam to join him on what he called "a better, shorter path to peace."

In this, he reflected the views of some his advisers who see no possibility of real disengagement from Southeast Asia without negotiation and of some who remain convinced that Hanoi is at this moment trying to choose between a painful war of attrition and a more forthcoming attitude at the conference table.

MOVEMENT IN "RIGHT DIRECTION"

Presumably, Mr. Nixon's choice of tactics at this stage will be sufficient to meet his immediate political problems. His minimum withdrawal schedule would still meet his basic desire to get American troops out of ground combat in Vietnam before the start of the 1972 election campaign. In the meantime, most Americans will probably endorse the view of the Senate majority leader, Mike Mansfield, that the movement at least "is continuing in the right direction—out."

Only a few of Mr. Nixon's potential Democatic rivals in 1972, led by Senator Edmund S. Muskie of Maine, publicly criticized the speech as too ambiguous and the troop withdrawal formula as too elastic. They were particularly disturbed by the President's resolve to base future judgments on the military action in Laos and Cambodia as well as in South Vietnam.

But it is precisely this concern here with the new situation in Cambodia and with the festering problem of Laos that has complicated the Administration's view of the war and kept alive the hopes of some leading officials for a settlement by negotiation.

Mr. Nixon has long heard suggestions from the Pentagon, for instance, that he forget about negotiations. Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird never has placed much faith in the Paris peace talks and has urged that everything be risked on a relatively rapid troop withdrawal and transfer of combat duty to the South Vietnamese Army.

COMBAT VICTORY FORESEEN

The Joint Chiefs of Staff and other military commanders have tended to view political compromise as unnecessary. They have felt that the allied forces were making considerable progress on the ground and have predicted frustration if not outright defeat for the North Vietnamese, if only American troops are not withdrawn too hastily.

The President has thus far managed with a combination of these approaches: "Vietnamization" of the war effort and American troop withdrawals to persuade Americans that the end was near, combined with "pacification" and other military activity to sap the strength of the enemy forces.

At the advice of his diplomatic advisers, however, Mr. Nixon has also kept open an invitation to serious negotiations. And though the words in which he discusses negotiation undergo only subtle changes, he appeared particularly eager to stress this approach in last night's statement.

The fear that Hanoi will extend the war deeper into Laos and Cambodia is one reason for this emphasis. Though judged here to be exhausted by war and overextended throughout Indochina, the North Vietnamese are respected in Washington for their tenacity.

PERIL OF WIDER WAR SEEN

If they widen the war, American disengagement will become even more difficult, no matter how successful the operations inside South Vietnam. Even if they were only to occupy Eastern Laos and Cambodia and threaten South Vietnam with massive in-

vasion, the costly American effort to disengage slowly could turn out to have been a waste.

Mr. Nixon is hesitating on Cambodia's request for military aid because he does not wish to provoke Hanoi into a wider conflict. He is being told that the North Vietnamese are probably facing difficult decisions at this stage and that he must combine a show of confidence with signs of interest in a political settlement to help persuade them to negotiate.

The conviction that Hanoi has not yet totally rejected the idea of negotiation accounts for the White House's eager interest last week in reports of a possible Soviet interest in a new Geneva conference. The President believes that Moscow will make no move on Vietnam unless authorized to do so by Hanoi. And though the latest report of Soviet interest in negotiation has since been officially contradicted, Mr. Nixon went out of his way last night to try to keep it alive.

Thus Mr. Nixon's speech was essentially a three-pronged effort. The first part dealt with his immediate problem of having to announce more troop withdrawals. His peroration exuded confidence that the end was in sight and that the enemy had miscalculated at every turn.

But the heart of the statement was a diplomatic appeal calling "upon our adversaries to join us in working at the conference table."

---

## MENTAL RETARDATION AND OTHER DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, last week, by the unanimous vote of 69–0, the Senate passed S. 2846, the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act of 1970. Because of the broad interest generated by the Senate's passage of this important legislation, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the committee report on the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Committee report: Senate Rept. No. 91–757, 91st Congress, 2d Session]

DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES SERVICES AND FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1970

(April 6, 1970—Ordered to be printed. Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, submitted the following report to accompany S. 2846)

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to which was referred the bill, S. 2846, to assist the States in developing a plan for the provision of comprehensive services to persons affected by mental retardation and other developmental disabilities originating in childhood, to assist the States in the provision of such services in accordance with such plan, to assist in the construction of facilities to provide the services needed to carry out such plan, and for other purposes, reports favorably on S. 2846 with amendments and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

### SUMMARY OF S. 2846

As recommended by the committee, S. 2846 would provide, for the first time in the field of mental retardation and other developmental disabilities, the basis for a State-Federal partnership comparable to those already developed in such fields as health, mental health, and vocational rehabilitation. Inasmuch as disabled persons may also benefit from certain other federally assisted programs in health, education, and welfare, S. 2846 would direct the benefits of the proposed legislation to areas of need not now covered by existing programs.

The committee bill would extend and modify parts B and C of the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act of 1963, as amended. The present act expires on June 30, 1970.

Part B of the 1963 act, which now authorizes project grants for the construction of university-affiliated facilities for the mentally retarded, would be extended for 3 years, and a provision would be added authorizing the expenditure of funds for operational support for programs in facilities of this type. The authorization for construction would be continued at its present level—$20 million—for each of the fiscal years 1971, 1972, and 1973. The levels of authorization for operational support would be $7 million for fiscal year 1971, $11 million for fiscal year 1972, and $15 million for fiscal year 1973.

Part C of the 1963 act, which now authorizes formula grants to States for the construction of community facilities for the mentally retarded, would also be extended for 3 years. The present part C would be replaced by a combined formula grant and project grant program covering both construction and services. In addition, the scope of part C would be broadened to include not only the mentally retarded, but also persons suffering from certain other closely related developmental disabilities, such as cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and related neurological handcaps. Of the funds appropriated for part C, not more than 20 percent could be reserved for project grants to be administered by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the remainder would be allotted by formula among the States for planning, administration, services, and construction, in accordance with an approved State plan. The levels of authorization for the new part C would be $100 million for fiscal year 1971, $135 million for fiscal year 1972, and $170 million for fiscal year 1973.

The existing authority under part D of the 1963 act, which now provides support for professional and technical personnel in facilities for the retarded, would not be extended. Part D would not be repealed, however, since it authorizes the continuation beyond June 30, 1970, of grants initiated prior to that date. In the future, the purposes of part D would be carried out under the broadened authority of the new part C.

### THE NEED FOR NEW LEGISLATION

Despite bipartisan support in both Houses of Congress, Federal assistance to States and communities in developing and maintaining appropriate services and facilities for the mentally retarded and their families has been uneven, inadequate, and inequitable. Citation of composite figures indicating an increasing overall investment by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in research, prevention, training of personnel, construction, services, and income maintenance programs conceals the fact that the increases are highly selective. They fall primarily in the areas of (1) income maintenance under social security and public assistance—a measure of the severe financial dependence caused by mental retardation—and (2) vocational training for young people—a laudable objective but by no means the only area in which Federal aid should be emphasized.

Today, there are many areas of need for the retarded and disabled in which too little Federal leverage has been applied. These areas include the improvement and diversification of out-of-home residential services; comprehensive diagnosis and evaluation of handicapped adults; day care tailored to the needs of the developmentally disabled, both children and adults; extended sheltered employment; itinerant services in sparsely populated areas; counseling of parents; information, referral, and follow-on services; and protective services. Resources are lacking to the disabled in every stratum of society, especially in areas of urban and rural poverty.

The developmentally disabled are the children and adults in our society whose handicaps originate in childhood and continue in some measure throughout life. They number in the millions. Although the mentally retarded form the largest group of the developmentally disabled, similar disabilities are also attributable to other neurological impairments, of which cerebral palsy and epilepsy are prime examples. Often, severe disability results from such conditions, even when the victim enjoys normal intelligence. As is the case in mental retardation, these chronic handicaps have been neglected for too long. Heretofore, the emphasis of society has been on short-term success—the cure, the closure—to the detriment of those whose disabilities are long term but whose well being and social contribution can be enhanced by appropriate early and continuing services. The goal of the committee bill is to foster such services.

### HEARINGS

The committee held 2 days of hearings on S. 2846, during which it heard testimony from administration witnesses and from numerous interested groups representing consumers, providers of services, both public and private, and universities which have undertaken to establish interdisciplinary training programs in this field.

### BACKGROUND

#### *1. Early Federal aid*

The first substantial program of Federal financial assistance to States and communities in developing services for the handicapped was inaugurated shortly after World War I, with the enactment of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1920. The purpose of the program, which is now celebrating its 50th anniversary, was to enable civilians to take advantage of the use of prosthetic techniques that had proved successful in rehabilitating many of those who had been wounded in the war.

At the outset, and for some two decades thereafter, the focus of the vocational rehabilitation program was on persons physically disabled as adults. In 1943, the act was modified to broaden its range of physical medicine and extend its counseling and selective job placement coverage to the mentally disabled. It is only in the past decade, however, that persons whose mental and physical disabilities originate in childhood have begun to represent a significant part of the vocational rehabilitation caseload. Even those who now receive assistance do so for only a relatively brief period. Moreover, the most seriously handicapped—those incapable of vocational success—are by definition excluded from the program.

The first substantial Federal program to provide assistance in developing services for handicapped children came with the Social Security Act of 1935. A series of provisions in the act created the so-called crippled children's program within the Children's Bureau, which is now located in the Maternal and Child Health Service of HEW. Although this program has existed for 35 years, it is only in very recent times that all the States have removed the limitations which barred mentally handicapped crippled children from participating in the benefits of the program. Moreover, the program is limited in application, because its services terminate when the child reaches 21, even though his physical handicap continues.

More recent is the program of Federal aid for educational services for handicapped children, which had its origin in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Although the States have been active in this field for many years, it is estimated that even now, less than half of the eligible

children of school age are receiving special education services.

*2. President Kennedy's program*

In 1961, in his first year in office, President Kennedy recognized the long neglect of both the mentally retarded and the mentally ill, and he directed that new approaches should be developed in both of these areas. In early 1963, he again emphasized the urgent need and recommended major new programs to Congress in these fields, in spite of the serious fiscal crisis—then, as today—facing the Nation. As he stated:

In an effort to hold domestic expenditures down in a period of tax reduction, I have postponed new programs and reduced added expenditures in all areas when that could be done. But we cannot afford to postpone any longer a reversal in our approach to mental affliction. * * * We can procrastinate no more. The national mental health program and the national program to combat mental retardation herein proposed warrant prompt congressional attention. (Message to Congress, Feb. 5, 1963.)

President Kennedy's program to combat mental retardation was based in large part on the report of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation, which he appointed in 1961. As a result of the recommendations in that report, two significant pieces of Federal legislation for the retarded were enacted by Congress in 1963:

a. Public Law 88–156 launched a special Federal program of comprehensive maternity and infant care projects aimed at high-risk mothers. In subsequent years, this program has demonstrated spectacular success in reducing infant mortality, and has achieved a presumptive reduction in the incidence of mental retardation and cerebral palsy. At the same time, in another important series of provisions, Public Law 88–156 also authorized grants to the States for comprehensive planning in the field of mental retardation.

b. Public Law 88–164—the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963—launched the first major Federal program for the construction of facilities for the mentally retarded and the mentally ill. Title II of the 1963 act, the Community Mental Health Centers Act, dealt with mental health, and established the basic ongoing Federal program in this area. Title I of the 1963 act, the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act, dealt with mental retardation.

On March 16, 1970, President Nixon signed legislation (Public Law 91–211) extending the mental health program. The committee bill (S. 2846) would carry forward the parallel effort for the mentally retarded.

Title I of the 1963 act originally contained three major parts, and it generated a three-pronged attack on mental retardation in the areas of research, training, and facilities for service:

Part A authorized a program of grants for the construction of centers for research on mental retardation and related aspects of human development. The authorization for this program was allowed to lapse in 1967. In all, 12 research centers were constructed with Federal aid under part A, and a number of these centers are now fully operational. However, their full impact will not be felt for several years.

Part B authorized a program of project grants for the construction of so-called "university-affiliated facilities" for the mentally retarded—clinical facilities affiliated with universities in a position to develop programs for training professional personnel in the field of mental retardation.

Part C authorized a program of formula grants to the States for the construction of facilities for the mentally retarded.

In 1967, title I was amended to add a new part D, which authorized a program of project grants to pay part of the cost of compensation of professional and technical personnel in community facilities for the mentally retarded for periods up to 51 months.

The heart of the 1963 act was part C, and the essence of part C was its call to conform contruction of facilities for the retarded with State-determined priorities. President Kennedy's Panel on Mental Retardation had reported special needs for construction in the areas of day care and residential care, for which the Panel also strongly advocated innovation, modernization, and decentralization.

As the studies carried out under President Kennedy in the early 1960's substantiated, the development of facilities for the retarded could not be successfully promoted under existing Federal health programs such as the Hill-Burton Act.

Subsequently, the President's Committee on Mental Retardation which was created by President Johnson in 1966 and has been continued by President Nixon, confirmed the need for massive Federal assistance for both the construction and the operation of such facilities, with special emphasis on adapting them to modern program concepts.

Although the 1963 act fell short of these goals—only $72 million has been appropriated for the entire six years of the part C the act has provided a beginning. The annual levels of funding are indicated in the accompanying table. Today, some 300 facilities have been or are being constructed with Federal assistance provided under part C. They are to be found in every State.

The hearings held by the committee brought out a number of the constraints under which the act has been operating since 1963. In addition to the serious underfunding, it was noted that certain arbitrary restrictions on matching, on transfer of funds in accordance with priorities, and on eligibility for staffing grants have deterred rather than stimulated the most effective use of the limited Federal funds. The committee bill addresses itself to these problems.

MENTAL RETARDATION FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION ACT—PUBLIC LAW 88-164, TITLE I

HISTORY OF FUNDING, FISCAL YEARS 1964-70

[In millions of dollars]

| | 1964 | 1965 | 1966 | 1967 | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 | Total 1964–70 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Part A—Research centers: | | | | | | | | |
| Authorization | 6.0 | 8.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | | | | 26.0 |
| Appropriation | 6.0 | 8.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | | | | 26.0 |
| Part B—University-affiliated facilities: | | | | | | | | |
| Authorization | 5.0 | 7.5 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 82.5 |
| Appropriation | 5.0 | 7.5 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 0 | 9.1 | 0 | 41.6 |
| Part C—Community facilities: | | | | | | | | |
| Authorization | | 10.0 | 12.5 | 15.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 50.0 | 147.5 |
| Appropriation as enacted | | 10.0 | 12.5 | 15.0 | 18.0 | 6.0 | 12.0 | 73.5 |
| Appropriation as administered | | 10.0 | 12.5 | 15.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 10.2 | 71.7 |
| Part D—Staffing: | | | | | | | | |
| Initial grants: | | | | | | | | |
| Authorization | | | | | 7.0 | 10.0 | 14.0 | 31.0 |
| Appropriation | | | | | 0 | 8.4 | 7.4 | 15.8 |
| Continuing grants: | | | | | | | | |
| Authorization | | | | | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Appropriation | | | | | | 0 | 3.6 | 3.6 |
| Total appropriation | 11.0 | 25.5 | 28.5 | 31.0 | 12.0 | 29.5 | 21.2 | 158.7 |

[1] Such sums as may be necessary.

*3. State planning for the retarded under Public Law 88–156*

Although the amount of money made available for State planning under Public Law 88–156 was small—$7.7 million over 5 years—every State participated in a cross-disciplinary, interagency effort that focused broad attention on the full range of social and legal needs of the mentally retarded, including the areas of health, education, welfare, rehabilitation, employment, and recreation. Seldom has the Federal Government engendered so much productive activity for so small an investment. As a result, the States have reached a condition of readiness to act on a much broader front, and with much more precision and expectation of effectiveness that could have been foreseen a decade ago.

One of the most significant characteristics of State plans for the retarded is their individuality. The 50 States have their own priorities, based on historical, geographical, or other differences. Each State plan has its strengths and its weaknesses, but all the States are ready to move forward. To nurture this potential and realize its fulfillment, the Nation needs evidence of a continuing Federal commitment to the idea of State-Federal partnership in this area. That commitment must be at least as strong as has been manifested in other major areas of Federal involvement, such as health, education, and rehabilitation.

*4. Other related programs*

Each of the currently authorized programs in parts B, C, and D of the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act of 1963, as amended, is administered by the Division of Mental Retardation in HEW. Since 1967, the Division has been located in the Rehabilitation Services Administration, which in turn is part of the Social and Rehabilitation Service in HEW.

The Division of Mental Retardation also administers several other small but successful programs that are related to its role of fostering the delivery of improved services for the retarded. The principal programs are:

The hospital improvement program (HIP), a program of special project grants to State residential facilities for the retarded to demonstrate improvements in patient care;

The hospital inservice training program (HIST), a program of special project grants to provide inservice training; and

Rehabilitation service project grants under section 4(a)(1) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (the "section 4" authority), under which demonstrations can be funded for the delivery of services to retarded children and adults who are not eligible for vocational rehabilitation. This authority also covers project grants for training personnel.

The HIP and HIST programs together are funded at the level of $8,390,000 for fiscal year 1970, before the recent budget reduction. The administration's budget request for these programs for fiscal year 1971 is $9,300,000. The rehabilitation service project grants program is being funded at the level of $4,100,000 for 1970, and the budget request for 1971 is $4,500,000.

Testimony in the hearings before the committee suggested that the usefulness of the funds currently appropriated for the HIP and HIST programs could be enhanced by incorporating them in the general formula grants to States under part C of the 1963 act.

The "section 4" authority, which will ex-

pire in 1971, represents the type of flexible project grant program that can effectively supplement a formula grant authority, as has already been demonstrated in the fields of vocational rehabilitation, health services, education, child welfare services, crippled children's services, and maternal and child health services. The committee notes that the scope of the "section 4" program already covers most of the areas incorporated in the new project grant authority requested by the administration and included as part of the committee bill.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR PART C

The authorizations for all aspects of part C of the committee bill—for formula grants and project grants, for planning, administration, services, and construction—begin at $100,000,000 for fiscal year 1971, and rise to $135,000,000 for fiscal year 1972, and $170,000,000 for fiscal year 1973.

These authorizations are modest, considering the need and intended scope of the act. As long ago as 1962, the President's Panel on Mental Retardation estimated that a minimum amount of $50 million a year should be made available in Federal aid for at least 10 years to stimulate the construction of modern facilities for the residential care and day care of mentally retarded persons who are so handicapped as to need specialized facilities. The original 1963 act authorized less than this amount for a broader range of facilities, including diagnostic and evaluation units and sheltered workshops. In the 6-year period 1965–70, a total of $71.7 million was appropriated, or only slightly more than the President's Panel had recommended should be spent each year.

At least $100 million in Federal aid will be needed within the next 2 years alone for urgent construction projects which have been conceptualized in the States but not yet submitted because of the growing disillusionment as to the Federal commitment to this program. When the committee adds (1) the need for new services apart from construction, as revealed by State planning, and (2) the real need to revolutionize residential care in accordance with "MR 68" (the 1968 Report of the President's Committee on Mental Retardation), $100 million for fiscal year 1971 seems modest indeed as an authorization for the program. Substantially increased funds will be needed in subsequent years for the retarded alone. It will eventually be necessary to augment the funds even more in order to bring adequate help to other developmentally disabled persons.

The committee recognizes that the administration is pledged to increasing the Federal commitment to solving domestic problems. The problem of serious mental retardation, cerebral palsy, and similar developmental disabilities should share in this commitment. The committee is convinced that the administration can, if it will, find enough funds to support a Federal grant program for the developmentally disabled at a level that will have a significant impact and that will apply significant leverage in all States, large as well as small.

FORMULA GRANTS TO STATES AND SPECIAL PROJECT GRANTS

It was emphasized during the hearings that the program under the 1963 act was still only in its infancy, and had by no means been fully primed at the time the current fiscal restrictions began to be imposed on the Federal budget. Had the program matured as expected, obligations for construction under part C and for staffing under part D might reasonably have totaled some $75 million for fiscal year 1970. As things stand, only $21 million has been appropriated for 1970, and the administration has requested only $19 million for 1971.

Notwithstanding the fact that the program has never reached equilibrium with the need, the Assistant Secretary for Legislation of HEW advised the committee that the administration intended to level off the Federal contribution for construction and staffing of facilities for the retarded at the 1970 level of about $20 million a year. Therefore, in the hearings, the administration proposed the substitution of a simple project grant authority in place of the State formula grant authority, either as now contained in part C or as expanded in S. 2846.

By contrast, the public witnesses in the hearing gave strong support to the State formula grant approach of S. 2846 as originally introduced, which would have provided a single allotment for State planning, administration, services, and construction. Their testimony called attention to the very significant response by every State in the past 6 years to the formula grants of part C of the 1963 act, with its emphasis on Federal initiatives and incentives to strengthen State planning and responsibility for the retarded. The committee believes that regression in the Federal commitment and repudiation of confidence in the States and support for the States as they move aggressively toward reform in this long-neglected area would have a severely demoralizing effect, not only on State leadership in the field, but also on voluntary efforts now underway in all the States. In fact, the demoralizing effect of using only the project grant approach at this time would be greater than if there had been no evidence whatever of Federal leadership in recent years.

The committee recognizes the merit of project grants, but believes they should continue to be subsidiary to formula grants, which have worked well in stimulating new State effort. The committee bill therefore recommends a combined formula grant and project grant approach, with authorizations commensurate with the need.

The committee believes that the States are ready to assume greater responsibility for carrying forward a planned program to expand and improve services to the retarded and others with developmental disabilities by a combination of direct action and cooperative assistance to other agencies, public and private. Accordingly, the bill provides that part C of the present act, which authorizes formula grants for construction only, would be replaced by an expanded program of comprehensive formula grants to the States. The bill would enable the States to develop and maintain new or improved resources and services. It would give the States authority to use Federal funds to construct facilities and to plan, administer, develop, deliver, purchase or otherwise foster the services that are needed.

In addition, the committee bill incorporates the project grant authority recommended by the administration. The bill would authorize the Secretary of HEW to reserve up to 20 percent of the total appropriation under part C for grants for projects of special or national significance. The committee expects that this project grant authority will eventually replace the essentially similar authority now exercised by HEW under section 4(a)(1) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. The committee urges, however, that during the transition, the "section 4" authority, and especially the successful student work experience and training program, should be maintained in a continuing active status.

The committee intends that special attention will be given under the bill to the improvement of residential services through the development of new patterns of care and a major redistribution of facilities. In addition, the committee urges improvements in existing facilities by eliminating the overcrowding, oversize, and inadequate or inappropriate staffing and environment that now exist. For example, the committee believes there is a need to develop appropriately staffed, community-based, nonmedical day care and residential care facilities under both public and private auspices. These facilities will complement the long-term medical care facilities that can and should be made available to certain of the developmentally disabled under other Federal programs, such as the health facilities provisions of the Hill-Burton Act.

SPECIAL NEED IN AREAS OF URBAN AND RURAL POVERTY

A principal defect of the present act is that it does not give the States more than a passive role in implementing the priorities in the State plan for construction. As a result, many high priority areas are still without facilities for the retarded.

The major portion of funds under Public Law 88–164 has tended to flow to communities with the greatest resources in terms of matching funds, community initiative and know-how, or professional and technical competence. Too often, the unfavorable matching ratio for construction funds available under part C of the 1963 act has meant that urgently needed facilities could not be built in poverty areas. Too often, the States, with fiscal problems of their own, have had to depend on local private initiative, with the result that facilities for the retarded have tended to be concentrated in the more privileged geographic areas, to the neglect of poverty areas.

To offset this tendency for the poor to get poorer, the bill would require the States to give special consideration to the needs of urban and rural poverty areas, as well as require technical and financial assistance to such areas. The committee believes this approach will be more effective than requiring a specified portion of the funds for services and construction to be earmarked for "model cities." The latter type of requirement was superimposed by administrative order in fiscal 1969. The provisions in the committee bill are designed to meet the recognized need in a more efficient and effective way.

The problem of maldistribution of new facilities also exists in the mental health field. The newly enacted Community Mental Health Centers Amendments of 1970 (Public Law 91–211) seek to meet this problem, in part, in an additional way by giving the States greater latitude in determining the Federal share in accordance with local needs. The Federal share provisions of Public Law 88–164 apply equally to mental health and mental retardation. As a result of the recent enactment of Public Law 91–211, therefore, a federal share of up to 90 percent is now permitted for construction of facilities for the retarded under part C in areas of urban and rural poverty. In other geographic areas, a maximum Federal share of 66⅔ percent or the so-called Federal percentage, whichever is lower, would be permitted for the construction of facilities.

It should be noted that these ratios for the Federal share do not affect the total amount of Federal funds that will be available to a State. What they do accomplish, however, is to encourage the States to use discretion in assigning favorable matching ratios to areas most in need.

SUPPORT FOR PLANNING, ADMINISTRATION, AND SERVICES

As noted, the 1963 act was amended in 1967 to add limited-term project grant support to staff facilities for the retarded. Unfortunately, these staffing grants under part D—which were first awarded to mental health centers in 1966 under earlier companion legislation—did not, in fact, become available to community mental retardation facilities until the fiscal year 1969. Indeed, the first mental retardation staffing grants were not actually awarded until last July, less than 9 months ago. Thus the amounts which have been obligated reflect no more than the first step toward meeting the need

for such assistance. Although the authority for staffing grants under part D expires in June 1970, the authority for continuing the grants approved prior to that time (expected to number nearly 500) remains, and is unaffected by the committee bill.

Under part D, support for services is limited to expenditures for professional and technical personnel in facilities specially designed for the retarded. In many instances, more efficient use of Federal funds will result if a broader range of services, including planning and administration, can be supported, and if personnel can be assigned to work in settings other than specialized facilities. The committee bill explicitly provides broad latitude in these areas, under both the formula grant and project grant provisions.

In the case of State expenditures for purposes other than construction, the overall Federal share is set at 80 percent in the formula grant program. This is the same Federal share available in the parallel vocational rehabilitation program in section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, and is close to the 75 percent Federal share available for comparable social services in the welfare program, which is also administered by the Social and Rehabilitation Service in HEW. The 80 percent Federal share is also comparable to the range of 50 percent to 83 percent authorized in the medicaid program, and the 75 percent to 90 percent authorized for the development of children's mental health services in the recently enacted community mental health amendments, Public Law 91–211.

In evaluating the Federal share, it should be borne in mind that the States are already investing large amounts of their own revenues in services for the retarded—at least a billion dollars a year. The committee bill requires the States to maintain these expenditures at their current level in order to participate in the Federal program. At best, the Federal contribution to services for the retarded will remain small, compared to present State and community effort. However, the purpose of the committee bill is to give that small Federal contribution the maximum leverage and visibility.

CONSTRUCTION OF UNIVERSITY-AFFILIATED FACILITIES

Part B of the 1963 act spoke to the need to provide an environment for the interdisciplinary training of personnel to expand the resources for service to the retarded and persons with related neurological disorders. It also spoke to the need to bring students, trainees, and fellows into direct contact with the disabled in the sort of exemplary setting that can be established in a university atmosphere. Such centers can have an important impact on programs for the retarded in the surrounding communities.

Part B's authorization of project grants for the construction of service facilities affiliated with teaching institutions was extended in 1967, but the extension came so late in the fiscal year that it brought about an unfortunate lapse in funding. At the present time, some 18 projects have been funded under part B, and many more are awaiting funds:

One additional project has been approved but remains unfunded. The committee is informed that if funds are not soon forthcoming, the medical school involved will have to redesign its proposed new children's hospital and substantially curtail the space that was to have housed the program for the retarded and handicapped.

Eight projects are in the final stages of application under part B, and most of these would have been in line for funding 2 years ago if the appropriations had not been interrupted. Several of the universities involved are already enrolling students, and are at a disadvantage in not obtaining their facilities.

Another 28 projects are in an intermediate stage of development.

Twenty other universities have expressed an interest in the program when funds become available.

Of the 18 university-affiliated centers that have already been funded, only six have had sufficient time to complete construction, and all of the projects are still being phased in. Under the circumstances, it is not yet possible to evaluate their full effectiveness. Moreover, several of the centers have been severely crippled by the cutbacks in anticipated training funds available to the universities from maternal and child health services, the Office of Education, and other Federal sources. The demand for the training these centers can provide is great, and the waiting lists for services are already far too long.

Three years of Federal budget stringency have come at a particularly critical time for these university centers. Nevertheless, the committee was impressed with the imagination, enthusiasm, and perseverance demonstrated by the directors of these pioneering projects, five of whom appeared before the committee. It was also clear that professional students and technical trainees are responding enthusiastically to the challenges posed in these centers.

During the hearings on S. 2846, several multiply handicapped children who had greatly benefited from the university-affiliated facility at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore appeared before the committee with their parents. The committee was able to compare their prior condition, as recorded on film, with their present functioning. None of these children is expected to recover completely from his disability, but each is now living a happier, more nearly independent life than could possibly have been foreseen a few years ago. The appreciation of their parents for the help they received in the face of great and continuing tragedy brought vividly before the committee the direct human values at stake in this legislation.

The committee believes it is urgent that the existing university-affiliated facilities be brought to their point of maximum productivity, especially in terms of manpower delivered to the field. It is also urgent for areas of the country not now within reach of such centers to be given priority, once the existing applications in an advanced state of preparation have been funded. Today, there are only three university-affiliated centers in the entire area between the Mississippi River and the west coast. Accordingly, the committee bill would extend the authorization for construction of university-affiliated facilities under part B at the rate of $20 million a year through 1973.

The great hardship suffered by those half-dozen or so universities, which in good faith programed construction starts for 1969–71, deserves prompt assistance to bring their plans to fruition. In order to restore the confidence of prospective sponsors in a good program that has been unusually plagued by uncertainty, the committee recommends that $20 million for such construction should be included in the 1971 HEW appropriations bill, even though the actual funds might not in fact be obligated until early in fiscal year 1972.

DEMONSTRATION AND TRAINING GRANTS FOR UNIVERSITY-AFFILIATED FACILITIES

The committee also finds that there is a need to assure Federal participation in the basic operational costs of the university-affiliated facilities. Such support should be administered by the same agency making the construction grants for the facilities and should permit more effective use of funds from other appropriate sources, both Federal and non-Federal. Consonant with general current policy, the Federal agencies having service responsibilities in the various areas represented in the center should continue to take some part in funding the training activities there, as they do in other segments of the universities.

However, the costs of direct services to clients should, where practical, be derived from the same sources (including Federal) that pay for these services in other settings—for example, from State and local boards of education, from health insurance or medicaid, or from State agencies responsible for residential care, vocational rehabilitation, crippled children's services, or social services.

Basic Federal operational grants should be used primarily for administrative and overhead costs not attributable solely to delivery of service, for dissemination of information, for technical assistance to service agencies, for evalulation, and for startup costs on new ventures in keeping with the centers' mission to lead the field. Basic operating grants should be budgeted firmly, and should not be subject to subsequent adjustment on account of income from patient fees.

The committee also expects that the basic Federal support funds will be used to cover training of professional and other categories of workers for whom Federal support is not otherwise readily available. The committee was pleased to learn in the hearings that some centers are already involving attorneys, architects, sociologists, anthropologists, city planners, public administrators and others in their composite activity. Part of the basic Federal support under the committee bill should also be available for bringing students in these subjects into the orbit of the centers.

The provisions for extending the construction authority and adding the basic operating assistance for university-affiliated facilities are contained in title II of the committee bill, along with certain clarifying amendments designed to emphasize the interdisciplinary character of the training effort.

The committee intends that universities receiving support under the bill should contribute to the effective implementation of their respective State plans, and should be responsive to State and regional needs for personnel.

Because of the potential for positive interaction between the university-affiliated training program under part B and the State planning and programs under part C, the committee believes that efforts should be made to permit eventual establishment of at least one university-affiliated facility in every State with a receptive major university.

The committee bill is broad enough on its face to authorize support for the construction and operation of university-affiliated facilities under part C as well as part B. However, because of the present maldistribution of university-affiliated facilities and the relatively large costs involved in funding them, the committee believes that such facilities should not be placed in the position of competing for limited funds with service and training projects under part C. Therefore, the committee urges adequate funding for university-affiliated facilities under part B.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

*Section 1.*—States the short title of the bill—"The Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act of 1970."

*Title I.—Grants for planning, provision of services, and construction and operation of facilities for persons with developmental disabilities*

*Section 101.*—This section writes a completely new part C into the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act of 1963. Under the old part C, grants were available only for the construction of facilities for the mentally retarded. Under the new part C, grants will be available not only for construction, but also for comprehensive plan-

ning and for services. Those eligible for services include not only the mentally retarded but also children and adults with other developmental disabilities, such as cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and other closely related neurological handicaps.

The new part C consists of 11 sections, numbered 130–140. Each of these sections is described in the following paragraphs.

*Section 130—Declaration of Purpose.*—This section states that the purpose of the new part C is to authorize grants to assist the States in *both* developing *and* implementing a comprehensive and continuing plan for providing services to persons with developmental disabilities; to assist public or nonprofit private agencies in the construction of facilities and the provision of services; and to provide for demonstrations, technical assistance, local planning, specialized professional training, and related purposes. The purposes are intended to be comprehensive They are the same for both the formula grant authority and the project grant authority established by section 132(a) to carry out the purposes under part C.

*Section 131—Authorization of appropriations.*—This section authorizes a total of $405 million to be appropriated for a 3-year program under part C. The authorizations for the respective fiscal years are:

1971—$100 million.
1972—$135 million.
1973—$170 million.

*Section 132—State allotments.*—Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) allocates funds among the States according to (A) population, (B) the need for facilities and services for the developmentally disabled, and (C) the financial need, of the respective States.

At the present time, the State allotments under part C are computed by the Department of HEW as follows: Two-thirds of the total appropriation is alloted on the basis of State population, weighted by State financial need as measured by State per capita income; and one-third is allotted on the basis of need for facilities for the mentally retarded, as measured by State population under age 21.

Paragraph (1) also continues the provision in current law that no allotment to a State may be less than $100,000 in any fiscal year. However, the committee bill requires the minimum State allotment to be increased if the level of appropriations in future years rises above the level of authorization for fiscal year 1971. The percentage increase in the minimum allotment would be the same as the percent by which the appropriations in that year exceeded the fiscal year 1971 authorization. For example if the fiscal year 1971 authorization is $100 million and the fiscal year 1972 appropriation is $117 million, the minimum State allotment would be raised from $100,000 to $117,000 for fiscal year 1972. The provision would have no effect on the minimum State allotment for fiscal year 1971.

Paragraph (2) of subsection (a) authorizes the Secretary to adjust the "need" factor in section 132(a)(1)(B) in the future to reflect the extent to which a State provides facilities and services for categories of developmental disabilities other than mental retardation.

The formula for State allotments in the committee bill is essentially the same as in part C under the present law, except that paragraph (2) is added to permit a State which provides facilities and services for disabilities other than mental retardation to enjoy a proportionate increase in its allotment. This provision is included to avoid penalizing the retarded in States willing to broaden the coverage of their programs.

Paragraph (3) provides that construction funds allocated to a State during a fiscal year are to remain available to the State in the following fiscal year. If a State's plan calls for the construction of a facility whose Federal share will exceed the State's maximum allotment for the fiscal year, the funds may remain available for two additional years.

The provision making construction funds available to a State for 1 year following the year for which they are appropriated is similar to provisions in the Hill-Burton Act and in the present part C of Public Law 88–164.

It is necessitated by the time needed to process construction applications, especially in view of current delays in the enactment of appropriations bills. The provision permitting additional carryover of such allotments in exceptional circumstances is included in response to the experience with States and territories having low annual allotments. For example, a State could pool its allotments for 3 years in order to obtain funds to construct a single facility.

Under subsection (b), a State may apportion its allotments for services (but not for construction) among more than one State agency, in accord with the responsibilities assigned to each agency in carrying out the State plan. The purpose of this provision is also reflected in section 134(a)(1)(B).

The authority for a State to apportion its allotment among several State agencies reflects the fact that the provision of comprehensive services for mental retardation and other developmental disabilities calls for a combined effort by several State agencies, representing areas such as health, welfare, education, and rehabilitation. The States vary widely in the way they assign responsibility for the disabled among State agencies, and they should be permitted to adjust the use of Federal funds to carry out the purpose of the bill in the most efficient manner. For example:

In one State, the department of health provides a range of community services for the retarded, while the department of mental hygiene handles the bulk of residential care. In addition some community services are also assigned to the department of social welfare in the State. Under the committee bill, the State plan could specify a reasonable division of funds between these three State agencies. In turn, each of these agencies could make funds available to local public and private agencies.

In many States, the department of welfare provides social services to disabled persons receiving public assistance. Similar services are needed by—but are often not available to—many mentally retarded persons and other disabled persons who are not on welfare. The most efficient method of supplying such services could be for the State to assign some of its allotted funds under the committee bill to the State welfare department, on condition that the department extend its social services to additional persons with developmental disabilities.

However, no State would be compelled to follow a pattern of multiple agency allotment if its plan calls for a single agency structure to accomplish the purpose of the bill.

In order to make further functional consolidation possible, subsection (b) also specifically authorizes funds to be combined with other State or Federal funds, so long as the benefits to the disabled are proportional and explicitly protected.

Subsection (c) authorizes States to pool their allotments to carry out cooperative interstate efforts. At the present time, for example, a pilot tristate consortium is already underway in Kentucky, Ohio, and Indiana as a result of a planning grant approved by the Division of Mental Retardation in 1966.

Subsection (d) provides a formula by which funds not used by one State may be allotted to other States. The present reallotment formula under Public Law 88–164 has proved to be cumbersome and artificial. The provision in the committee bill is patterned after section 314(a)(3)(B) of the Partnership for Health Act.

Subsection (e) establishes a project grant program to be administered by the Secretary. Under this program, the Secretary is authorized to reserve up to 20 percent of the total annual appropriation for part C to make grants for projects of special national significance, including those directed to the needs of the disadvantaged with developmental disabilities. The Federal share of such projects, including construction projects, may be up to 90 percent of their cost. Although no specific requirement is written into the bill, the committee intends that project grants under this subsection shall be consistent with the State plan required by the act.

*Section 133. National Advisory Council on Services and Facilities for the Developmentally Disabled.*—This section establishes a National Advisory Council on Services and Facilities for the Developmentally Disabled. The Council will consist of 20 members, to be appointed by the Secretary. The members may not be otherwise in the regular full-time employ of the Federal Government.

Members of the Council are to be chosen from leaders in the fields of service to the mentally retarded and other developmentally disabled persons, including leaders (1) in State or local governments, (2) in institutions of higher education, and (3) in organizations representing consumers of these services. At least six members of the Council must represent State or local public or nonprofit private agencies, and at least six must represent consumers.

The Council will advise the Secretary on regulations and study and evaluate the effectiveness of programs under title I of the 1963 act. The Council may receive technical assistance, and the Secretary is required to make available such assistance and data as may be required for the Council to carry out its functions.

The committee intends the Council to assess the effectiveness of the act in accomplishing its objectives. The Council will replace the various ad hoc advisory groups now used to advise the Division of Mental Retardation in HEW. It should also take over the advisory functions with respect to the construction of facilities for the retarded. These functions are currently assigned to the Federal Hospital Council, a body primarily concerned with administering the Hill-Burton Act and only secondarily related to the purposes of Public Law 88–164.

The provisions establishing the National Advisory Council are comparable to those for similar bodies created for other HEW programs. The bill requires representation of the groups most directly affected by the act and by the actions of the Secretary, especially State and local agencies and consumers. These groups are not appropriately represented at present.

The number of 20 members for the Council was chosen to permit an appropriate diversity of membership among lay and professional personnel, public and private agencies, State and local agencies, and representatives of the various categories of developmental disabilities.

The Council is not intended to duplicate the functions of the President's Committee on Mental Retardation, which has both a nationwide and a governmentwide mission. Nor will it duplicate the functions of the Secretary's Committee on Mental Retardation, whose duties involve intradepartmental interagency coordination and the dissemination of information. Neither of these committees is associated with an operating program.

*Section 134. State plans.*—This section provides that, in order to receive its allocation under part C, a State must submit to the

Secretary a State plan that meets a number of requirements.

Under paragraph (1) of subsection (b) the State plan must designate (A) a State planning and advisory council; (B) a State agency or agencies to administer the plan; and (C) a single State agency to administer grants for construction. The plan may designate either an existing council or agency, or a council or agency newly established for the purpose. Paragraph (10) requires the designated agencies to keep appropriate records and make periodic reports to the Secretary. Subparagraph (B) permits separate agencies to administer separate portions of the State plan.

Under paragraph (2), the State plan must describe the scope of activities under other State-Federal programs requiring State plans, such as vocational rehabilitation, maternal and child health, education of the handicapped, medicaid, title XVI (welfare) of the Social Security Act and the partnership for health. The plan must also show how the present act will supplement these other Federal programs and fill in the gaps which exist between them, so far as they affect the developmentally disabled.

Paragraphs (3) and (4) require the State plan to set forth effective procedures for the expenditure of funds under the plan, to contain assurances that the funds will be used to strengthen services for persons with developmental disabilities on a statewide basis. It must also assure that part of the funds will be made available to other public or nonprofit private agencies, and that Federal funds will be used to supplement, rather than supplant, non-Federal funds that would otherwise be available. Paragraph (4) specifically requires that the State itself must bear a reasonable share of the non-Federal cost of implementing the plan.

Paragraph (5) requires that a State plan *must* provide services and facilities for the mentally retarted, and *may* provide services and facilities to persons with other types of developmental disabilities.

The committee intends that, at least at the beginning, the State plan will be an updated version of the comprehensive mental retardation plan developed by the State with Federal aid during the period 1965–67. To the extent a State chooses to cover other developmental disabilities in its plan, it will modify its plan accordingly. Because of the short time schedule, the committee anticipates that plans submitted as the basis for grants for fiscal year 1971 will be substantially those now operative for mental retardation alone, rather than for other forms of developmental disabilities.

Paragraphs (6) and (7) provide for the maintenance of standards with respect to the scope, quality and administration of facilities and services under the State plan.

Paragraphs (8) and (9) require the State plan to assure that the State planning and advisory council is adequately staffed. The council must include among its members representatives of each of the principal State agencies, as well as representatives of local agencies and other groups concerned with services for the disabled. At least one-third of the membership of the State council must consist of representatives of consumers of such services. The council must review the State plan annually.

It is expected that in defining adequate staffing in regulations the Secretary will take account of the differing needs of the States, depending on their population and size. The requirement should not impose a disproportionate burden on any State, but it should assure that the citizen body—the State planning and advisory council—is truly effective in influencing State policy. The committee feels that it is necessary to assure that the State planning and advisory councils are provided adequate clerical and technical staff assistance. However, the committee recognizes that, particularly in smaller States, such assistance may be provided by part-time or contracted personnel.

Under paragraph (11), the State plan must provide that special financial nad technical assistance will be made available to provide services and facilities for persons with developmental disabilities in poverty areas. The correlation between mental retardation and poverty is highest in cases involving persons who are mildly retarded or moderately retarded. These persons need the help of special programs in their schools and community health centers.

There is also a correlation between poverty and certain forms of severe retardation. These persons need a wide range of services, including the sort of services best provided in specialized facilities. In addition, there is a strong responsibility to insure equal access for persons in poverty areas to high quality care and training.

The committee therefore believes that a special Federal and State effort is needed to bring adequate facilities and services for the retarded into areas of urban or rural poverty. The requirement of paragraph (11), together with the recently enacted higher Federal share—up to 90 percent—of the cost of constructing such facilities in urban or rural poverty areas, offers a major new incentive to alleviate the existing inequity.

Paragraph (12) requires the State plan to describe the methods that will be used to assess the effectiveness of State programs for the developmentally disabled.

Paragraphs (13), (14), (15), and (16) establish special planning requirements for construction projects. They continue the requirement that the State must survey its existing facilities and prepare a comprehensive program for the construction of facilities, including a determination of the priority for proposed projects.

Latitude is given to each State to apportion its allotment under part C between construction and services according to its own priorities. Thus, it might be reasonable for a smaller State to devote the major share of its allotment to the construction of a single facility. However, the Secretary is authorized to limit the proportion of any State's allotment that may be used for construction.

Paragraph (17) requires the State plan to contain appropriate accounting procedures to assure the proper disbursement of funds under the act. Paragraph (18) authorizes the proper disbursement of funds under the act. Paragraph (18) authorizes the Secretary to establish such additional planning requirements as he finds necessary. These paragraphs continue provisions of existing law.

In sum, the numerous State plan requirements are designed to assure that funds under the act are directed toward accomplishment of its purpose, which is to extend and improve programs for the developmentally disabled. The requirements give the States considerable discretion in pursuing this goal, within general guidelines for accountability. The requirement of a single comprehensive State plan for services and construction will avoid the anomaly in the present act, which encourages dual plans that are not necessarily fully coordinated. The committee emphasizes that the act is not intended to duplicate or supplant any existing continuing Federal program which significantly benefits the target group.

*Section 135. Approval of projects for construction.*—The section specifies that for each construction project to be carried out under the State plan, an application must be submitted to the Secretary. The application must include a description of the site and the plans and specifications for the project, and a reasonable assurance that adequate financial support will be available, not only for the construction of the facility, but also for its maintenance and operation. The application must also meet labor standards in conformance with the Davis-Bacon Act. These are requirements of existing law that remain essentially unchanged in the committee bill.

The Federal share of the cost of construction projects will be the same as for mental health centers. The provisions establishing the Federal share for such projects are contained in title IV of Public Law 88–164, as amended recently by Public Law 91–211, the "Community Mental Health Centers Amendments of 1970." In general, these provisions will apply equally to the construction of facilities for the mentally ill and facilities for the developmentally disabled, and are not affected by the committee bill. Thus, the Federal share for the cost of constructing such facilities will be up to 66⅔ percent or the so-called Federal percentage, whichever is lower, except that the Federal share for construction projects in poverty areas may be up to 90 percent.

*Section 136. Withholding of payments for construction.*—This section permits the Secretary to withhold payments to a State agency for construction projects if there is inadequate compliance with regulations, or if any assurances required to be given under section 134 or 135 are not being carried out. Payments for construction projects may be withheld, in whole or in part, until the failure to comply is removed.

The provisions of sections 135 and 136 for administering funds for construction projects are essentially the same as for construction projects under part C of the present law, and for the construction of facilities in other areas, such as health, mental health, and vocational rehabilitation.

*Section 137. Payments to the States for planning, administration, and services.*—This section sets forth the procedures and basis for payment to the States of the State allotment for expenditures other than construction. This section also provides an 80 percent federal share for such expenditures incurred by the State during each year under its State plan. As determined by regulations, and subject to section 134(a)(4)(B), which requires reasonable financial participation at the State level, the non-Federal share may consist of State funds, local funds, or expenditures by nonprofit private groups. As already noted, the provision for a Federal share of 80 percent for services is comparable to the Federal share in the most nearly equivalent State-Federal programs.

Today, the States are already spending between $800 million and $1 billion annually on residential care services and specialized day care services for the retarded and multiply handicapped, exclusive of public school and welfare services. There is very modest Federal support for these services through project grants for day care and residential care, but there is no Federal participation on a formula grant basis for developing such services.

Continuation of the present basic expenditures by the State at this current level is required by the maintenance of effort provision in Section 134(b)(4)(C) of the committee bill. Therefore, even the proposed 80 percent Federal share for services will represent out a very small proportion of the overall State effort with respect to the large range of services not now significantly benefiting from Federal aid.

*Section 138. Withholding of payments for planning, administration, and services.*—This section incorporates provisions for withholding of payments for planning, administration, and services if there is substantial failure to comply with the act or with regulations under it. In general, the section parallels section 136, which provides for the withholding of payments for construction, and contains standard sanctions for noncompliance.

*Section 139. Regulations.*—This section requires the Secretary, after consultation with the National Advisory Council (established by section 133) to issue general regulations applicable to all the States no later than July 1, 1970. The regulations shall cover the kinds of services and categories of persons which may be included; standards as to the scope and quality of services; the general manner in which a State shall determine priorities for services and facilities, with special consideration for poverty areas; general standards of construction and equipment for facilities; and other necessary matters.

The committee does not intend that regulations promulgated under subsection (a) will be used to limit the definitions of "developmental disability" or "services," except to the extent required to avoid duplicating authorizations under other State or Federal programs, or to interpret definitions and plan requirements, such as the phrase "substantial handicap" in the definition of "developmental disability."

*Section 140. Nonduplication.*—This section, the final section of the new part C proposed by the committee bill, prohibits counting as State or local matching funds any portion of the costs of services or construction financed by Federal funds under any other law, or the amount of non-Federal funds required for matching such other Federal funds. This is a standard provision in Federal grant legislation.

*Section 102. Definitions.*—This section of the committee bill deals with definitions. Its principal provisions amend section 401 of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 by:

Defining "facility for persons with developmental disabilities" as a facility designed primarily for the delivery of one or more services to persons affected by one or more developmental disabilities.

Defining "developmental disability" as mental retardation, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, or other neurological handicapping condition of an individual which originates before the age of 18, which continues indefinitely into adult life, and which constitutes a substantial handicap; and

Defining "services for persons with developmental disabilities" to include diagnosis, evaluation, treatment, personal care, day care, domiciliary care, special living arrangements, training, education, sheltered employment, recreation, counseling of the individual and his family, protective and other social and socio-legal services, information and referral services, follow-on services, and transportation of clients.

The new section 401(m) modifies the definition of "services" to include a number of services which are not now specifically covered under Public Law 88–164, such as specialized living arrangements, recreation, counseling of the individual and his family, protective and other social and socio-legal services, information and referral services, follow-on services, and transportation. Recent experience has shown that a number of such services are underrepresented in State planning for facilities for the retarded, due in part to the lack of a specific statutory authorization. All such services are types of services which might well be offered by general or multipurpose facilities, or which might even be offered outside any facility. By contrast, the present "staffing" grants under part D of the act are available only for services in specialized facilities primarily designed for the retarded.

The revised definition of "facility" in section 401(b) does not require preference to be given to facilities which offer comprehensive services under one management. Such preference might well run counter to optimum community planning. For example, diagnostic services for the target group might be provided under the auspices of a community hospital, while specialized living arrangements would be better placed in a residential section of town under the direction of a social agency.

*Section 103. Effective date.*—This section sets appropriations for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1970, as those to which the bill applies. As a result, funds appropriated prior to that date under part C of the existing act will remain available for obligation during fiscal year 1971, in accordance with present law. The effective date protects the carryover of funds for construction. Also, funds for the continuation of staffing grants awarded under part D before June 30, 1970, will not be affected by the committee bill.

*Title II—Construction, demonstration, and training grants for university-affiliated facilities for the mentally retarded*

*Section 201. Caption.*—This section amends the caption of part B of the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act of 1963 to read: "Construction, Demonstration, and Training Grants for University-Affiliated Facilities for the Mentally Retarded." The present law applies only to construction of clinical facilities.

*Section 202. Construction grants.*—This section amends section 121(a) of part B of the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act by striking out the term "clinical training" and inserting "interdisciplinary training." The section also extends the authorization for appropriations for construction of university-affiliated facilities at its present level of $20 million per year through 1973. The term "mentally retarded" is defined, as in present law, to include mental retardation and other neurological handicapping conditions related to mental retardation.

*Section 203. Demonstration and training grants.*—This section adds a new section 122 to the present part B. The new section authorizes grants to cover costs of administering and operating demonstration facilities and interdisciplinary training programs for personnel needed to render specialized services to the mentally retarded. Such training programs are to include both established disciplines and new kinds of training to meet critical shortages in the care of the mentally retarded. The section authorizes appropriations of:

$7 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971;

$11 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; and

$15 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973.

The committee estimates that at full operational capacity, these grants should average from $300,000 to $500,000 annually per center. The committee does not intend grants under part B to preclude other Federal grants to the facilities for other purposes.

*Section 204. Applications for demonstration or training grants.*—This section specifies that demonstration and training grants under section 122 may be given only to colleges or universities operating a facility of the type described in section 121, or to a public or nonprofit private agency or organization operating such a facility.

The committee intends operating funds to be made available to universities which have organized and are operating eligible facilities, even though they did not receive construction grants for the facilities. Several such centers are already in existence and the amounts authorized in section 203 of the committee bill are conservative to carry out the important purposes of this provision.

*Sections 205 and 206.*—Conforming changes.

*Section 207. Maintenance of effort.*—This section adds a new "maintenance of effort" provision stipulating that grants to university-affiliated facilities may be approved only if there are reasonable assurances that the grants will not result in any decrease in the level of State, local, and other non-Federal funds for mental retardation services and training which would otherwise be available to the applicant. Grants under this part are to be used to supplement and increase the level of such funds.

---

## DRUGS AND THE DRUG CULTURE

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, most of us who are deeply concerned about the spreading use of drugs in our society are aware that education is of vital importance in overcoming this drastic problem.

One organization which is making a useful and conscientious attempt to inform adults and youngsters alike of the dangers of drug abuse is the Massachusetts Council of Churches. The council is at present giving wide circulation to a report prepared by the Committee on Drugs and Organized Crime of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts.

In the belief that many other religious and civil organizations might benefit from a knowledge of their approach and their findings, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRUGS AND THE DRUG CULTURE—A REPORT BY THE COMMITTEE ON DRUGS AND ORGANIZED CRIME OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF MASSACHUSETTS

(The Rev. G. Harris Collingwood, chairman; David L. Brynum, Elizabeth H. White, The Rev. W. Gilbert Dent, The Rev. Canon Herbert S. Stevens, consultant, Boston, Mass., January 1970)

INTRODUCTION: FOCUSING THE CAMERA

Scene I: My daughter. Let me tell you about my daughter. She sees flying saucers and monsters and all sorts of these things. And now she's floating around in that San Francisco somewhere . . . and all because of these pills. "Hair."

Scene II: Stamford, Connecticut: Today the publisher of Reader's Digest was stabbed by his sixteen-year-old son. He had just returned from a businessman's luncheon in which he delivered what was termed an "anti-hippie" speech. Abbie Hoffman, Woodstock Nation.

The picture one gets of the drug scene depends largely upon the lens through which one looks. Each viewer, of course, claims to have his own solid base of "objectivity"—the objectivity of the Beacon Hill brahmin, the policeman on the beat, the "hippie" on the Boston Common, the "junkie" in the ghetto. The list could go on; there are as many "objective" views as there are people to hold them. And it has become painfully obvious that the efforts of authors and committees to demonstrate their "objectivity" rarely produces more than a list of their biases. But such a list is useful, for it at least makes it possible to identify the platform from which they made their observations and to list those factors which may have distorted their view. This introduction makes no pretensions to anything more.

At the outset, it should be noted that everyone on the committee is a member of what in the jargon of the day would be called "straight" society; before commencing this study they had little more than a newspaper knowledge of illicit drugs. This is not to say that the members of the committee were necessarily hostile to all aspects of the drug culture, but it is to say that the report

is written from the standpoint of observers and not participants in that culture. It is rather an attempt to make clear to those outside it what that enigmatic phenomenon is all about. As members of the hip community would put it, then this report is by "straights" and for "straights."

Most so-called "reliable" reports on drugs strain to provide a thoroughly "balanced" view throughout—a sort of muddled application of a misconceived "via media". Each sentence relentlessly hammers away with the theme that while one can sympathize with some of the reasons for taking drugs, they are nonetheless dangerous, and besides, it is going too far to "drop out" of one's social responsibilities. As a value judgment this may be defensible, but one wonders whether a reader who has been repeatedly hit over the head with it is not so much enlightened as stunned. The questions in his mind are reduced to the single one of wondering why everyone does not see with the same sweet reasonableness as the report he has just read.

To come to any understanding of why people take drugs or adopt certain life styles, it is occasionally necessary to suspend judgment and to attempt to look at the issue from the standpoint of the partisan on the other side. Granted, one can never do this completely, but if one cannot do it at all, then any semblance of genuine understanding is impossible. For this reason, several sections of this report, notably the one dealing with motivations for taking the psychedelic drugs and the one analyzing the deep alienation of young people, have been heavily slanted toward an "anti-establishment" point of view. The purpose was not to justify taking LSD or "dropping out", but rather, to make comprehensible to the reader the intensity of feeling which lies behind those acts and the complexity of the issues which they raise. Once that is grasped, it is then possible to see that to focus on the question of whether such action is "justified" is to be concerned more about one's own guilt than with the problem of how society can deal with the alienation of its young people.

And finally, it should be kept in mind that there is an important limitation which is inherent in any report on illicit drugs, namely, that it is very difficult for someone who has not used a drug to gain a clear understanding of what the experience is really like merely from a verbal description of it. Regardless of how many people one talks to who have taken LSD, for example, trying to conceive of what an "acid trip" is really like, if one has never taken the drug, is a bit like the problem of a man who has been blind since birth trying to understand what is meant by the color "blue". This does not mean that no understanding is possible, nor that everyone should try to take the full range of illicit drugs in order to find out. But it does mean that one should guard against feeling omniscient about the subject just because he has digested numerous accounts of what others have experienced.

### II. PRELIMINARY INFORMATION: A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE MAJOR DRUGS

It is common for drug reports to begin with short descriptions of the major drugs, and some knowledge of this sort is clearly necessary if one is to have any understanding of what the drug culture is all about. Still, a certain risk is involved, for when drugs are lifted out of the social setting in which they are used and looked at in clinical isolation, some degree of distortion is inevitable. The following clinical report of what, for the moment, will be referred to only as "Drug X", is offered as an example. The report is adapted from material prepared by Dr. Helen Nowlis.[1]

Footnotes at end of article.

"Drug X has effects on almost every major system in the organism. It acts on the central nervous system to influence the balance between the production and loss of body heat, and has a selective depressant effect by mechanisms not yet understood.

"In statistics reporting hospital admissions classified as resulting from drug-induced disturbances, Drug X is often the most frequent cause. In all of the poison cases reported in one Florida county in 1966, for example, nearly one-quarter were from Drug X.

"At excessively high dosage levels or as a result of individual idiosyncrasy, acute poisoning may occur. Headache, dizziness, ringing in the ears, difficulty in hearing, dimness of vision, mental confusion, lassitude, drowsiness, sweating, thirst, nausea, vomiting, and occasionally diarrhea may occur. As poisoning progresses, central stimulation is replaced by depression, stupor, and coma, followed by respiratory collapse and convulsions. Drug X poisoning is considered an acute medical emergency and death may result even when all recommended procedures are followed."

That, dear Reader, is a clinical description of the common aspirin. It is with that cautionary note in mind that the following descriptions are offered.[2]

#### *Opiates (Opium, Morphine, Heroin, and Codeine)*

All of the opiates are derived from the unripe pods of the opium poppy. The pods are slit, and the milky substance which comes out is allowed to dry and is then scraped off and processed into a powder. The opiates are true narcotics under the medical definition of the term, being depressants which both produce sleep and relieve pain. Opium, morphine, and heroin are all highly addictive, although it is the strongest of these, heroin, that is the most widely distributed through illicit channels. Overdoses of heroin can cause death immediately, and injections with a dirty needle frequently cause hepatitis. Users develop a tolerance for the drug which makes them require increasingly high doses for the same effect. For an addict, this means an ever-mounting cost of maintaining his habit. Abrupt withdrawal results in severe physical reactions and may even cause death.

#### *Barbiturates*

Amobarbital (Amytal)
Pentobarbital (Nembutal)
Secobarbital (Seconal)
Phenobarbital (Luminal)

Barbiturates are all derived from barbiturate acid and are prescribed by doctors as sleeping pills or sedatives. Like the opiates, barbiturates are physically addictive and produce a tolerance in the user. When mixed with alcohol, even fairly small doses can produce violent illness or even death.

#### *Tranquilizers*

Meprobamate (Miltown and Equanil)
Chlordiazepoxide (Librium)
Methyprylon (Noludar)
Glutethimide (Doriden)

Tranquilizers are prescribed by doctors for their calming effects, and when taken as directed are safe. Overdoses can cause drowsiness and depression, while prolonged usage may result in dependency. When combined with alcohol, they can be quite dangerous. Tranquilizers are also used to counter the effects of LSD.

#### *Amphetamines (benzedrine, dexedrine, methedrine)*

Amphetamines are stimulants used as diet pills and for treatment of depressions. Known as "speed" in the drug culture, it is taken illegally to produce feelings of alertness, energy, and power. The strongest by far is methedrine (methamphetamine), which has a power physical effect on the body and may even cause death in cases of an overdose. Chronic users frequently become irritable and paranoid and sometimes suffer psychotic reactions. Though not physically addictive, psychological dependency is common.

#### *Psychedelic drugs (hallucinogens)*

There are a number of psychedelic drugs, but the most popular are psilocybin, mescaline, and LSD (lysergic acid diethylamide). Psilocybin and mescaline are the synthesized active ingredients of the Mexican mushroom and the peyote cactus, respectively. In many, though not all, users they produce distortions of time and space, hallucinations, and images of extremely vivid colors. In a certain percentage of users they produce psychotic reactions. Not enough is known about the drugs to determine whether they have any medical usefulness, but some tests have suggested that they may be of aid in treating alcoholics and narcotic addicts, as well as relieving pain and anxiety for terminal patients. These drugs are treated extensively in a separate section of this report.

#### *Cocaine*

Cocaine is an alkaloid extracted from the leaves of the coca plant which grows in abundance in the Andea Mountains of South America. The drug is a stimulant with an effect similar to that of amphetamines and precisely the opposite of that of the opiates. Occasionally, however, it is mixed with heroin, but because each drug affects the body in an entirely different way, the effect is more harmful than if either drug were taken separately. Cocaine is also similar to the amphetamines in that it is not physically addictive, but frequently results in dependency. Cocaine is a white powder which may either be inhaled or mixed with water and injected. Overdoses may cause death.

#### *Cannabis drugs (Marijuana and hashish)*

Both marijuana and hashish come from the Indian hemp plant known as cannabis sativa. Marijuana consists of the dried top leaves and flowers of the female plant, which, when ripe, are covered with a sticky resin. Hashish is made only from the resin itself and is five to eight times stronger than marijuana. In this country, both marijuana and hashish are usually smoked, although they may be mixed with food and eaten, and in India what is roughly the equivalent of marijuana, known there as bhang, is available in liquid form and is consumed as a beverage. The physical effects of smoking marijuana are slight, and it apparently only results in a reddening of the eyes and an increase in the pulse rate. Inexperienced users find their coordination affected, but tests have shown that motor skills for experienced users are unimpaired. Neither marijuana nor hashish are physically addictive, although some degree of psychological dependency may result.

### III. MOTIVES FOR USING DRUGS

The four sections which follow attempt to set out and examine the major reasons for the use of illegal drugs. But it would be a mistake to assume that every drug user would fit neatly one of these headings. Reasons are frequently mixed and confused and change from time to time in any given user. To focus only on the confusion, however, is to remain confused oneself. To achieve even a minimal degree of understanding, some classification and analysis is necessary and even useful—provided one does not attempt to apply the categories to human beings as if they were so many giant cookie cutters.

#### *A. As an escape from problems*

The most frequent charge made against the use of drugs is that they are merely a chemical "cop-out", an easy means of escaping from problems. The heavily-loaded and pejorative term "cop-out", however, is one more useful for polemics than clarity. The difficulty is that people use the term indiscriminately to cover two very different phe-

nomenon: (a) the use of some drugs as a means of escaping from and failing to work through serious personal problems; and (b) the use of other drugs as a temporary means of alleviating tension. It is doubtful whether the second of these can really be called drug abuse at all, since society clearly has a need for a certain number of "cop-outs" in that sense of the term. A highly technological society requires its members to operate at a fast pace and under considerable tension. Not only an individual's work, but his personal relationships as well, are affected. Under such conditions, it is absolutely that people be able to gain some periodic and temporary release from the pressure which society's web of entanglements exerts upon them. Social drinking, a trip to the movies, a vacation, or even a dinner party are means of "copping-out" for a brief period of time. Merely to say that something fulfills that function, therefore, is not necessarily to condemn it as undesirable.

It is admittedly bad, however, to use drugs as a means of escaping from the necessity of meeting and dealing with serious personal problems. But even here it is doubtful that the harm resulting from use of drugs for this purpose can be rectified by legislative prohibitions. While some people may take drugs to escape, others do such things as practice law or work in an office fourteen hours a day in order to avoid going home to face a bad marriage. And even so far as drugs are concerned, there is little doubt that those which can be obtained legally far outstrip the illicit drugs as a means of satisfying this desire. Alcohol, which has produced six million alcoholics in this country, leads all the rest by a good margin. In addition, students, executives, and distraught housewives consume a truly amazing number of prescribed tranquilizers, while American drug companies also produce enough sleeping pills each year to provide approximately twenty-four doses for every human being of every age in the United States.[3] In short, if people do not want to work out problems, it is unlikely that merely making a few specified drugs illegal will force them to do so.

Any valid argument for making certain drugs illegal cannot be based on the fact that the motive for taking them may be to escape from facing problems, but must rest instead on the physical or psychological reaction they produce in the user. Heroin should remain illegal, not because it is taken to blot out a painful reality, but because of its debilitating effects. Conversely, however, a drug which does not produce such physical or psychological harm should not be made illegal simply because it may be used as an escape. Since that objective may be obtained by so many other means, to do so is to divert a portion of society's resources into the enforcement of a law which cannot be shown to produce any demonstrable social gain.

But if the motive of the user is not a valid rationale for the legal prohibition of a drug, it is of crucial significance in another way. Even for drugs which do cause serious physical or psychological harm, law enforcement alone cannot solve the whole problem of drug abuse. Because such drugs are so available to virtually any person who wishes to use them, drug counseling and education must carry a large part of the burden—indeed, a much larger portion than they have carried to date. To make these effective, it is necessary to be sensitive to the reasons which motivate people to take the prohibited drugs. Convincing them that the drugs are harmful in some way may not necessarily induce them to stop using them, for the simple reason that they may fear greater psychological or even physical harm from the painful reality they would then be forced to face.

Perhaps the most dangerous illicit drug used in this country as an escape is heroin. Until about ten years ago, heroin was almost exclusively a ghetto drug which gave the user a pleasant, euphoric feeling and blotted out the unbearable reality of rat-infested tenements and grinding poverty. It was generally estimated that there were about 60,000 heroin addicts in the country, 90% of whom lived in New York City. During the past decade, the situation has changed drastically. Today there are approximately 120,000 heroin users, and the greatest number of new ones are now white. In fact, the past year has seen a dramatic increase in the amount of heroin used by white, emotionally disturbed adolescents from middle and upper-middle income families in Boston and the surrounding suburbs. The interesting observation made by a number of people who have worked in a counseling relationship with these adolescents is that in spite of their much more affluent background, they have an attitude toward themselves and toward life which very much parallels the attitude of heroin users in the ghetto. In almost all instances, these white teenagers have deep feelings of depression and an inability to change the quality of their lives. As one counselor put it, "They feel almost totally worthless."

No reliable statistics exist on the extent of this increase in heroin use by white adolescents, largely because the use is much more hidden than it is among people in the ghetto. Some indication of the rate at which use is increasing is indicated, however, by the fact that Project Place (a drug counseling and drop-in center in Boston) estimates that it makes contact with approximately ten to fifteen young people each day who have had experience with heroin. Virtually all of these young people are white, and about half are still using heroin at the time contact is made. Before this past summer, in contrast, Project Place averaged only about one young person per day who had had experience with heroin. Similar increases in heroin use are reported by drug counselors in other sections of the Boston metropolitan area, especially Cambridge. A good portion of the use in Cambridge, however, is not by local residents or students, but rather, by the flood of teenagers who are attracted into Harvard Square as if by some colossal magnet.

It should also be noted, as directors of Project Place point out, that there are important differences between the use of heroin in the ghettos and by suburban young people. Teenagers from the suburbs do not come from an environment in which heroin use is a part of the landscape, as it is in the ghetto. As a result, they tend to seek help at a much earlier stage in addiction, thus making it easier for them to "kick" the habit. There is very little heroin use in the colleges or in the older hip community, where its dangers are clearly appreciated. The committee did discover, however, one case of a college student in the Boston area who hung himself because he was unable to "get a fix."

How the increasing use of heroin and other drugs should be dealt with is covered in another section of this report, but suffice it to say that one should not immediately fall into the hysteria which tries to solve all problems by calling for an increase in "vigorous" law enforcement. The problem is so serious and so widespread that society can no longer afford to just keep "passing the buck" to the man in the blue uniform.

### *B. As Chemical Assistance in Meeting and Dealing With Daily Problems*

The use of chemicals as assistance in meeting and dealing with daily problems is a basic feature of American life. Chemical fertilizers are used to produce bigger and better crops; chemicals are dropped in clouds to control storms; chemical and biological agents have been developed for warfare; and chemicals such as tear gas and mace are frequently used to control crowds of people. Indeed, America seems firmly committed to the doctrine of "better living through chemistry." It should come as no surprise, then, that many people also look to chemistry as a means of dealing with personal problems.

The motive behind the use of drugs in this instance is precisely the opposite of "copping out"; rather, it is to gain additional strength to meet and deal with problems and anxieties which the individual faces. Unquestionably the most widespread and dangerous drugs used for this purpose are the amphetamines, commonly known as "speed" in the drug culture. The two most popular are dexedrine and methedrine, with the latter being many times the stronger. Most often it is taken in the form of pills or capsules, although by far the most powerful form is crystal methedrine, which is melted in a spoon and injected with a hypodermic needle (a procedure known as "mainlining crystal meth"). Crystal methedrine is the drug of choice of those who are really heavy amphetamine users—in common parlance, the "speed freaks".

"Speed" gives the person who takes it a tremendous feeling of power; he is suddenly alert, capable, and in control of the situation. For this reason, it is an alternative to heroin in dealing with depression. One does not need to "blot out" a painful situation when "speed" offers a means of acquiring sufficient resources to overcome it. Some sense of the effect of this drug can be gained by keeping in mind that "No-Doz" tablets, or even a cup of coffee, are mild forms of the same thing. Many adults who are horrified at the idea of teenagers taking dexedrine think nothing at all of drinking a cup of strong black coffee to make them more awake and alert for some task. Yet the motive of the teenager is no more than an extension of the motive of the adult.

It should also be kept in mind that numerically the largest number of users, and even abusers, of this drug are not members of the drug culture at all. Truck drivers trying to stay awake on long trips and students studying for examinations frequently take amphetamines, and virtually all studies of the problem indicate that the greatest amount of amphetamines are used by suburban housewives, who know them better as "diet pills." Such pills have the purpose of reducing the appetite, while at the same time preventing the person from feeling tired and lethargic because of the reduction of food. As a result, even after their diet is over, many housewives continue to take a maintenance dosage of such pills because they feel that they keep their appetite down to a desirable level as well as make them feel better, although they may attribute the "good" feeling entirely to the loss of weight instead of to the pill. Many such matrons of respectable society would be thunderstruck to know that they were just as much "on speed" as their hippy sons and daughters.

To say, however, that the use of amphetamines is wide-spread and is reinforced by certain general attitudes of society is not to say that such use should be taken lightly. As is true for all drugs, the amount of harm involved in using them must be looked upon as a sliding scale, depending upon the dosage, strength, and frequency of use. While small doses of the milder amphetamines can be taken at infrequent intervals without serious risk, frequent doses of the stronger amphetamines cause severe physical and mental effects. To understand the effect of "mainlining crystal meth", for example, one merely needs to imagine the effects of diet pills magnified many times over. What in a diet pill—properly used—produces alertness during the regular daylight hours and a reduction of appetite, produces in the crystal methedrine user a complete loss of sleep and appetite for as long as he stays "high" on it. One person interviewed by the committee who had used "speed" regularly for about a year and a half described in detail one instance in which he had stayed "high" for twenty-eight days, during which he injected

four spoonfuls of crystal methedrine each day.

While amphetamines are not addictive, psychological dependency of a very serious nature can result. When a user comes down from a "high" (called "crashing"), he is usually extremely depressed and thus tempted to take another dose immediately. Because the dangers of amphetamines are widely known and because heavy users become quite irritable and paranoid, the use of "speed" is generally condemned in the hip community. "Speed kills," the hippies repeat—almost as frequently as a television commercial. And the really heavy users, the "speed freaks," are usually ostracized by the rest of the drug culture. Nonetheless, most drug counselors in the Boston area agree that the use of amphetamines is increasing, primarily among adolescents who are not members of the hip community and who are not well acquainted with the risks involved. The only encouraging factor is that there seems to be some decrease in the use of crystal methedrine, the strongest of the amphetamines.

*C. The Adolescent Syndrome: Just for "Kicks," Group Pressure, and Rebellion Against Parents*

The adolescent years are always ones of great emotional turmoil and change for the young person involved. One disturbing feature of life at this age is that adolescents will do the most incredibly dangerous things "just for kicks". Even before the current increase in the use of illicit drugs, parents, police, and the public at large were quite familiar with the phenomenon of the teenage driver careening through the streets at a high rate of speed. Nor is the use of drugs in this connection something entirely new; for decades teenagers have used alcohol and tobacco illegally because it seemed a daring thing to do.

During the past few years this same motivating factor has led adolescents to take a great variety of things, some very harmful and some with no effect at all. These can be broken down into two general groups: (a) those substances which one ordinarily thinks of as "drugs", e.g., amphetamines, LSD, heroin, etc.; and (b) things which are not usually thought of as "drugs" but which are converted into such by enterprising, though improper, use of them.

The most common example of the latter is probably glue sniffing, which has resulted in death in a number of well documented instances. The current fad seems to be the use of various containers with a spraying device, particularly whipped cream cans and hair spray, which by being held in a certain manner, can be made to produce carbon dioxide, which is then sniffed to get high. Like glue, all this really does is to produce an oxygen shortage. One can get the same effect by putting a pillow over one's head or breathing deeply and exhaling for a prolonged period of time.

This past summer the great rage, strangely enough, was peanut butter. Supposedly one could get high by mixing peanut butter with water, melting it in a spoon, and then injecting it into the arm with a hypodemic needle. While almost every teenager encountered inquired about this with great excitement and interest, the members of the committee never met anyone who had actually tried it. If tried, it is highly doubtful that it would have any effect at all, except possibly to clog the veins.

Some of the strange things which are taken clearly do have no effect other than a psychological one on individuals firmly convinced beforehand that it will have a certain effect. The best known example of this in the past few years was the belief that one could get an hallucinogenic trip from smoking banana peels. Chiquita Banana stickers and posters suddenly popped up everywhere. People eventually learned, however, that banana peels have no hallucinogenic agents at all.

This is not to say that adolescents are entirely unaware of the role of psychology in getting high. Indeed, placebos are frequently sold as real drugs by teenagers in order to laugh at people who claim to get high from taking them. One group of boys interviewed by the committee related with obvious delight how on one occasion they had sold Lipton's tea taken from tea bags as marijuana to a number of gullible buyers on the Boston Common. About half of the kids who purchased and smoked the tea claimed to get "a really good high."

Unlike the older hip community or more experienced drug users who take specific drugs because of the particular effect they produce, many adolescents do not clearly distinguish between different drugs. As one drug counselor put it, they simply associate drugs in general with the youth culture, and the youth culture in turn they see as defining what it means to be young. In order not to be left out, they take whatever drugs are available to get high and feel a part of the "scene." Group pressure is an extremely powerful force in such a setting. It is, moreover, this indiscriminating acceptance of all drugs that explains why there is a considerably greater use of amphetamines and heroin among this group than among the older hip community.

The most striking example found by the committee of the mixing of different kinds of drugs was the case of one young man who decided that by combining a number of drugs and then taking an overdose of the whole thing he would be so "freaked out" that he would be rejected when he appeared to take a physical examination for induction into the Army. The concoction he decided upon was a mixture of, among other things, LSD, amphetamines, and bella donna (a drug used in the treatment of ulcers; an overdose produces hallucinations in the true sense of the word). In an effort to assure himself that it would succeed at the appointed time, he made a trial run one weekend and described the results in some detail. Particularly because of the bella donna, there were frequent and vivid hallucinations: chairs sprouted eyes and mouths and began to talk, and several long and intense conversations were held with people who weren't really there. Whether the young man actually repeated the whole thing at the time of his Army physical is unknown.

Rebellion against parents is also a strong motive, though not always a conscious or at least admitted one, for drug use by adolescents. It should be kept in mind, however, that such rebellion is not entirely a bad thing. To some extent it is a normal and desirable part of the development of any teenager, which is necessary in order for him to establish his own identity as something separate from his parents. If a person knows that his parents would be horrified at the idea of his using drugs, he quickly comes to see—quite correctly—that flouting their use can be an extremely effective way of striking back at his parents. He knows and wants them to be shocked.

Here again, the seriousness of the problem should be seen as a kind of sliding scale. Use of comparatively mild drugs such as marijuana seem comparable to the attempt of prior generations to shock their parents by use of alcohol or cigarettes. At the other end of the scale, however, the use of heroin may involve strong self-destructive impulses. It is not always true that adolescents use heroin because they do not appreciate its dangers. They may use it precisely because they are aware of the danger. Heroin, they know, will shock their parents more than the use of any other drug; and if they should become addicted or die of an overdose, the impact will be even greater. Their parents are bound to feel enormously guilty. Though tragic, this phenomenon is not by any means new. It is simply the current manner in which many adolescents act out their suicidal impulses. But because the manner is different, new techniques are needed to deal with it. This problem will be dealt with in the section on recommendations.

*D. Self-discovery and mystical experience*

To raise the question of the use of drugs for self-discovery and to attain a mystical experience is to focus on motivations which are on an entirely different level from those discussed above. It is also to move into an area where credibility for the non-drug user is a considerable problem. One tends to doubt that it is possible to gain a "true" insight into one's personality or to have a "true" mystical experience merely by taking a capsule or pill of some sort. But in considering this issue, it is necessary at the outset to be clear about what precisely is being claimed. The proponents of the use of drugs for this purpose do not allege, for example, that such benefits are gained from the use of any drugs, but only from the psychedelic drugs such as LSD, mescaline, and psilocybin. Nor is it claimed that one gets a "quickie" result merely by "popping a pill". A great deal has been written emphasizing the necessity of a proper "set" and "setting", the former being the expectations and attitudes of the user, and the latter being the environment in which the drug is taken. In short, what serious drug users are claiming is that if taken under the right circumstances by someone who has been properly prepared, certain drugs will enable that person to arrive at valuable insights about himself and the world around him. The lasting effects of these insights will depend on the use made of them afterward by the person involved, much as they do when one has been exposed to great literature or music. Even if one is skeptical about such claims, it is necessary in order to do effective counseling to come to some understanding of what motivates people so strongly to use these drugs.

In conducting field research on the psychedelic drugs, moreover, one is struck by several facts which it is extremely difficult for the complete skeptic to explain. First, a significant number of heavy users report that they have never gotten any hallucinations at all from these so-called "hallucinogenic" drugs, while still others report that they ceased having hallucinations after the first few times. Second, even people who have quite unpleasant experiences while under the drugs—usually called a "bad trip"—insist that the result was worthwhile. "You can learn a lot from a bad trip," is the almost universal response. But third, in spite of the fact that hallucinations might not occur and that "bad trips" are not uncommon, it is clearly the psychedelic drugs which hold the pre-eminent place in the stable hip community. It is these, and these alone, which are really taken seriously as something integrally related to their life style and worldview. Marijuana is used in much the same way beer is used in the "straight" society: as something mild and relaxing which serves a recreational purpose. Heroin and amphetamines are strongly discouraged, and their use is tolerated only on an experimental basis. Chronic users are almost always ostracized. But a number of people were interviewed who have taken LSD over 150 times, and who take it once a week on a regular basis in much the same manner and for much the same reasons that a suburbanite goes to an analyst. Clearly, there must be something which is peculiar to the psychedelic drugs and which is qualitatively different from the effect of other drugs.

The explanation of this "something" lies in the phenomenon usually referred to as "consciousness expansion", which is the means by which such insights are said to occur. The term has reference to seeing oneself, other people, and the world in general in ways which are very different from

the way in which they are usually seen. In an often quoted section of *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, William James writes of his own experience of this sort in connection with nitrous-oxide (laughing gas) intoxication:

"One conclusion was forced upon my mind at that time, and my impression of its truth has ever since remained unshaken. It is that our normal waking consciousness, rational consciousness, whilst all about it, parted from it by the filmiest of screens, there lie potential forms of consciousness entirely different. We may go through life without suspecting their existence; but apply the requisite stimulus, and at a touch they are there in all their completeness . . ."

The important point to notice about the quotation from James is that the different forms of consciousness are a natural part of the human mind as it exists in every human being. They are not "created" by the drug, nor would it even be precisely accurate to say that the drug "expands" the consciousness of the mind as a whole. Consciousness "expansion" only occurs in the sense that limitations to the full functioning of the mind are removed.

Some afficionados of psychedelic drug use explain what happens by means of a computer metaphor. The human mind, it is said, is an organism with approximately ten to thirteen billion cells. Only a few of these are utilized, however, because of the barriers built in by the society in which each man exists. As Aldous Huxley put it.[5]

"Trobriand Islander or Bostonian, Sicilian Catholic or Japanese Buddhist, each of us is born into some culture and passes his life within its confines. Between every human consciousness and the rest of the world stands an invisible fence, a network of traditional thinking-and-feeling patterns, of secondhand notions that have turned into axioms, of ancient slogans revered as divine revelations. What we see through the meshes of this net is never, of course, the unknowable 'thing in itself'."

Because of this filtering out process, which involves only limited structural patterns of thought and which allows into one's consciousness only a portion of the sensory data, the human mind becomes somewhat like an enormously underutilized computer. Consciousness "expansion", then, is nothing more than the removal of these artificial barriers, so that the mind can operate at a more optimal level.

The most lucid description of what is involved in the experience of consciousness expansion is undoubtedly Huxley's *The Doors of Perception*, an account of his first trip under mescaline. It is worth quoting in some detail.[6]

"To see ourselves as others see us is a most salutary gift. Hardly less important is the capacity to see others as they see themselves. But what if these others belong to a different species and inhabit a radically alien universe? For example, how can the sane get to know what it actually feels like to be mad? Or, short of being born again as a visionary, a medium, or a musical genius, how can we ever visit the worlds which, to Blake, to Swedenborg, to Johann Sebastian Bach, were home?

"From what I had read of the mescaline experience I was convinced in advance that the drug would admit me, at least for a few hours, into the kind of inner world described by Blake and AE.

"Half an hour after swallowing the drug I became aware of a slow dance of golden lights. A little later there were sumptuous red surfaces swelling and expanding from bright nodes of energy that vibrated with a continuously changing, pattern and life.

"I took my pill at eleven. An hour and a half later, I was sitting in my study, looking intently at a small glass vase. The vase contained only three flowers—a bunch of flowers shining with their own inner light and all but quivering under the pressure of the significance with which they were charged; . . . what rose and iris and carnation so intensely signified was nothing more, and nothing less, than what they were—a transience that was yet eternal life, a perpetual perishing that was at the same time pure Being, a bundle of minute, unique particulars in which, by some unspeakable and yet self-evident paradox, was to be seen the divine source of all existence.

" 'This is how one ought to see,' I kept saying as I looked down at my trousers, or glanced at the jeweled books in the shelves, at the legs of my infinitely more than Van-Goghian chair. 'This is how one ought to see, how things really are.' "

But if one sees, with the aid of the drug, through the eyes of a Blake or a Bach, why is it, one is inclined to ask, that so few of these insights are translated into new works of art of genuine quality? On this point Huxley is probably right when he answers that the production of a great work of art depends not only on having vision, but on possessing the technical skill to translate it into an objective form. And that talent is possessed by only a few men in any age. And why, after all, would one want to translate it into an objective form? Is not the vision itself enough? Is not the objective form but a crude imitation of the vision, a sacrilegious monument? Or at least, so the drug user might argue. It is certainly difficult to refute the argument that the demand for objective art as "proof" of the authenticity of the vision is an attempt to apply the standards of the conventional world to the inner world of the psychedelic experience. To the drug user, that world provides its own authenticity directly to those who experience it.

While the teenagers and even the older members of the hip community with whom one comes in contact are by no means as articulate or poetic as Huxley in describing their reactions to psychedelic drugs, the basic content of their accounts bears a striking similarity. The reactions vary, of course, over a broad spectrum, but what people seem to get out of using the drugs can be looked at under the two general headings of self-discovery and mystical experiences. In the area of self-discovery, the drug used almost always talks in terms of seeing himself from a different vantage point and frequently emphasizes the feeling that his body has become separate from his mind. Huxley says of this experience, ". . . my body seemed to have dissociated itself almost completely from my mind. . . . It was odd, of course, to feel that "I" was not the same as these arms and legs "out there", as this wholly objective trunk and neck and even head. It was odd; but one soon got used to it."[7] The significance of this separation of mind and body is that it gives the individual the impression of being able to view himself from a detached position. It's just as if you were looking in through a window, a drug user will frequently say, and saw yourself inside with a group of people.

This points to both the pleasant and the unpleasant effects of psychedelic drugs; they at least give the impression of stripping away illusions and defenses and of confronting the individual with what he "really is". For a stable personality with a high degree of self-awareness, this may come as no great shock, while for others it may be a truly shattering experience. One young lady in her late twenties described such an experience by saying that before she took LSD, she thought she had changed a great deal since graduating from college. While looking in the mirror under the effects of LSD, however, she saw that she was really just the same person with just a few more wrinkles, which upset her a great deal because she didn't like the kind of person she had been during her college years. But here, as in many cases, because the nature of the unpleasant experience involves what is felt to be some kind of self-knowledge, the drug user will insist that even a "bad trip" can be valuable.

For some, it must be said, the use of psychedelic drugs brings tremendous relief. One teenage girl who was interviewed extensively both before and after taking LSD showed a remarkable change in personality. Before taking the drug, she viewed herself as almost totally worthless. Under the influence of LSD, however, she saw herself, though not perfect, as at least having some good points, just as other people have. The realization that she may not be completely without value was reflected in a self-confidence and a self-acceptance that she had never exhibited before.

This factor of personal insight is also an important element in building group cohesiveness among drug users. This operates on two levels. First, the individual user frequently feels that he gains insight not only into himself but into other people as well. A common occurrence is an intense concentration of the details of some object; and when this is directed toward another person, it operates in much the same way as Huxley's concentration on the three flowers in the vase. The details are seen as avenues through which a new and more penetrating view of the other person is opened up. And this feeling that one has come to a deeper understanding of one's friends makes the bonds of attachment seem even tighter. Second, users of psychedelic drugs in general feel that they have something important in common by virtue of the fact that in using the drugs they have all gone through the same kind of intense experience, even though the details may have differed widely from user to user. Because of the fact that the drugs are illegal, this is reinforced by common feelings of persecution and alienation, which are in turn reflected in common patterns of speech and dress—of which in turn reinforce each other.

In addition to increasing self-discovery, psychedelic drugs are said to be a significant aid in achieving mystical experiences. Judging from the accounts of drug users themselves, this seems to be primarily a difference in the intensity of the experience rather than a completely different reaction to the drug. Instead, the quotation above from Huxley's *The Doors of Perception* is an account of a mystical experience of a sort in that he claims to see some kind of ultimate reality exhibited in the details of three flowers in a vase. It is this sense of a direct contact with "ultimate reality" which seems to define what the term "mystical experience" means to the users of psychedelic drugs.

When asked what precisely is involved in having "contact with ultimate reality", most drug users make some sort of reply stressing the "unity of life and nature" and the "death of the ego". This is the type of language employed by Timothy Leary in his published works, and one suspects that more than a few drug users have latched onto his catchy phrases to explain their own emotional responses. In any event, when pressed for details, most people say that they do not mean literally that all reality appears as a complete unity or that their own egos totally cease to exist, but rather, that they have some sense of how everything fits together, of some unity behind the multiplicity which exists in the world. As one young man in his early twenties put it, "You see why everything is just exactly the way it is, how every piece fits into place." It is in connection with this that the term "death of the ego" is also explained. What really "dies" is not the ego, but an egocentric view of the universe. The person no longer subjectively experiences the external world as something which revolves around him, but rather, sees himself as being

Footnotes at end of article.

somewhat like a single stone placed in the midst of a giant mosaic.

What must also be added is that such a vision is accompanied by extremely positive feelings—one has a strong, virtually irresistible, desire to fit into the mosaic and become a part of a larger reality. This leads to the passive nature of many members of the hip community, for the mosaic is, after all, complete and perfect in itself. It is significant that after writing, "This is how one ought to see, how things really are," even Huxley went on to say: "And yet there were reservations. For if one always saw like this, one would never want to do anything else. Just looking, just being the divine Not-self of flower, of book, of chair, of flannel. That would be enough." [8] And for many members of the hip community, that is indeed enough.

But before one judges too harshly, before one writes them off as totally worthless for not wanting to engage in the great American game of producing an almost endless supply of consumer products, one would do well to remember the great Christian mystics. What would they say was the most important "work" a man could engage in? It would clearly not be the production of a Chevrolet. One even begins to wonder, in spite of the separation of time and culture, whether there is really all that much distance between the way in which some members of the hip community speak about the movement of the individual mind toward a place in a greater reality and the way in which St. Bernard speaks of the movement of the soul toward God.

In any event, the attitudes noted above are reflected in the whole life style of the hip community. Personal property loses its significance, since such a concept is based on the assumption that mankind is a multiplicity of egocentric universes, each of which "owns" a number of particular objects. The official line is thus that one should not become upset over stealing, since all objects are part of the one great mosaic and are there for whoever has need of them. Many also feel no "ego need" to "win" an argument. What, after all, would be the *point* of winning an argument? Thus they meet hostility with passive indifference or silence and talk only to those whose "heads are in the same place."

One must be very careful in evaluating the religious claims made in connection with LSD. Such claims cannot be written off as completely phoney merely by saying that the religious experience is no more than a drug created illusion, much like a mirage appearing to a thirsty traveler in the desert. The argument advanced by its proponents is not that LSD creates any religious experience itself, but rather, that it frees the mind to have the religious experiences that it is naturally capable of having.

This leads to another important point, namely that virtually all heavy users of psychedelic drugs point out, that it is possible to have the same experiences without drugs. Indeed, they go to some lengths to point out the similarity between the insights obtained through LSD and those of traditional mysticism, particularly of the Eastern variety. Some of the very early users of psychedelic drugs have, in fact, stopped using them, claiming that they have "gone beyond" drugs to some form of Oriental meditation. The initial decision to use the drugs is defended on the grounds that they were a valuable shortcut to achieving the insights which Oriental mystics arrived at only after years of disciplined contemplation. As Alan Watts, a former Episcopal clergyman and the author of *The Way of Zen*, put it: [9]

". . . the Orient has dozens of varieties of meditation and yoga that yield the same basic experience as LSD. The trouble is, it takes an awfully long time to get anywhere with these methods, and most Westerners just don't have the patience. But if you take a few psychedelic trips first, then you're ready to use meditation fruitfully. You have the hang of it. Certainly, LSD has made meditation much easier for me."

Surprisingly enough, some scientific studies have been conducted in an effort to determine whether and how a mystical experience is possible under psychedelic drugs. Two series of such tests have been conducted by Dr. Walter N. Pahnke, a teaching fellow of the Harvard Medical School and a resident in psychiatry at the Massachusetts Mental Health Center.[10] The first involved twenty theological students and was carried out on Good Friday in 1962. Half of them were given 30 mg. of psilocybin, while the others (the control group) were given an active placebo of 200 mg. of nicotinic acid, which causes only warmth and tingling of the skin. All those who got only nicotine acid thought, however, that they were receiving psilocybin. Of the ten who actually received psilocybin, three or four had what might be called a mystical experience, while none of those receiving the placebo reported any such reaction.

The second series of tests was conducted at the Massachusetts Mental Health Center in 1965 and 1966. Forty carefully screened volunteers were used, most of whom were professional people over thirty. Psilocybin was administered to the subject in groups of four specially prepared rooms containing cut flowers, pictures of nature scenes, and candlelight, as well as places for each subject to relax. As for the results, Dr. Pahnke reports that "20% to 40% of the subjects had a mystical experience, depending on the level of completeness desired." [11] As a general observation, Dr. Pahnke also reports that, "Most researchers who have worked with LSD in either therapeutic or a supportive setting have reported the occurrence of mystical experiences in varying degrees of frequency." [12]

A number of psychedelic churches have been founded since 1958, including the League for Spiritual Discovery (L.S.D.), The Church of the Awakening, and the Neo-American Church. In addition, and not to be confused with the last of those is the Native American Church, a centuries-old Indian religious organization numbering somewhere between 50,000 and 250,000 members which uses peyote mushroom buttons as a sacrament (psilocybin is the synthesized active ingredient). The Church's use of the buttons was challenged when a group of Navajo Indians were convicted of illegal possession of peyote under a California statute.[13] The California Supreme Court, however, in the case of *People* v. *Woody*, reversed the trial court and held that the church's use of the peyote buttons was protected under the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States. There is considerable doubt, however, as to whether this indicates that the courts will uphold the use of psychedelic drugs by other "churches". As Boston attorney Joseph Oteri (who has an appeal pending in the U.S. Supreme Court in which he is attempting to overturn the Massachusetts marijuana law) has pointed out. "The Supreme Court upheld the right of the Native American Church to use peyote, but only because it has been part of Indian religion since Aztec days. It won't buy the same argument for a religion only a few years old." [14]

To focus on the legal issues, however, is to miss the broader impact of peyote use by the Native American Church. The real problem is occasioned by the fact that the vast majority of teenagers know that peyote has been used for centuries by the Native American Church, and they reason that if it has not resulted in dire consequences for the Indians after all that time, there is little likelihood that taking psilocybin (the active ingredient) will be harmful for them. And if adults are lying or mistaken about the effects of psilocybin—so the argument is extended—what reason is there to trust what they say about mescaline or LSD either? Almost every group of teenagers interviewed on Beacon Hill this past summer raised precisely this argument. It is not easy to answer. It is indeed true that the prosecution was unable to show that any significant damage had resulted from prolonged and regular use of the drug, although the court was undoubtedly correct in saying that this was due only to the extremely strict conditions under which it was used. Indiscriminate use by teenagers has been shown to result in a disturbing number of psychotic reactions. But that, unfortunately, is not the end of the argument for that particular defense of abstinence carries with it the implication that Dr. Timothy Leary and his disciples were right after all in declaring that what is really important is the proper "set and setting". If taken by the right people under the right circumstances, the chances of harm are negligible. The Indians have done it; so can other people.

This plunges one right into the heart of the debate over the legalization and use of psychedelic drugs, but before one can even begin to approach "objectivity," a certain amount of factual information is necessary. Unfortunately, because of the restrictions which present laws impose on clinical research, the amount of information available is not all one would hope for. There are two types of harm which, from time to time, have been attributed to the psychedelic drugs. The first is that LSD causes chromosome damage which may result in either illness or birth defects. There are, in fact, a few tests tending to show that LSD causes a change in the blood chromosomes. The difficulty, however, as Dr. David Walters of the Harvard biology department points out, is that there are an equal number of tests showing precisely the opposite, and serious limitations have been shown in the way all the tests were set up.[15] In addition, there is serious question as to what significance the chromosome damage would have even if it occurs. As Dr. John Fort of the University of California at Berkeley points out, "similar evidence of damage to blood chromosomes has been reported in connection with such widely used products as coffee, alcohol, nicotine, DDT, and aspirin." [16] Some serious risk has been raised, however, regarding birth defects caused by LSD when taken by a pregnant woman. But it is rather difficult to sustain the argument that a product should be denied to the entire population simply because it is not good for pregnant women. Male teenagers have been particularly unimpressed by the point.

It is not in the physical, but rather, in the psychological area that serious risk of harm has been shown. As noted, above, the real problem is that in a certain percentage of individual psychedelic drugs produce psychotic reactions. The situation is described by Dr. Donald B. Louria, head of the Infectious Disease Laboratory of Bellevue Hospital in New York City.[17]

"Among normals who are given LSD under medical aegis after careful screening, few serious reactions occur (estimated at 0.08%: Cohen, 1964). The adverse reaction rate is considerably higher in patients given LSD as an adjunct to psychotherapy—0.2% to 2% developed prolonged psychiatric disorders, one in 830 attempted suicide and one in 2,500 was successful (Cohen, 1964; Fink Simeon, Hague & Itil, 1966).

"The incidence of untoward reaction among those using LSD illicitly in uncontrolled circumstances is not known, but clearly it is substantially greater than that observed when LSD is prescribed for a specific medical or psychiatric illness."

The number of "bad trips" in uncontrolled situations is also increased by the fact that drugs purchased on the black market may frequently contain impurities or be cut with

Footnotes at end of article.

other unknown, but dangerous drugs. A recent study of drugs purchased on the street in New York City indicated that 60% of the capsules did not contain what the purchaser thought he was buying.

Another unfortunate side effect of psychedelic drugs is what is known as a "flash back". Some users have experienced sudden and unexpected recurrences of the psychedelic "trip" even without taking another dose of the drug. As one might expect, such experiences can be quite frightening. At the moment, medical science is totally unable to explain why or how this occurs.

Still another difficulty about taking psychedelic drugs in an uncontrolled situation is that the user may seriously harm or even kill himself because of hallucinogenic misperceptions about his immediate environment. Dr. Duke D. Fisher reports the following incidents from his clinical experience with LSD patients in California:[18]

"Some deaths occur because of the perceptual changes that occur after using LSD. One young girl leaped to a rocky beach thinking that the ocean had turned into a silk scarf. There were two young boys who felt they were having a religious experience and wanted to "become one" with several cars on Wilshire Boulevard. I had to restrain one young student who felt he had the new power to fly and attempted to leap from a window in a Hollywood apartment."

There are a sufficient number of cases where the drug user was successfully restrained and could be interviewed afterward to give credibility to accounts such as this one by Dr. Fisher, but one should still be somewhat skeptical in examining obviously sensational reports of this type. The main credibility problem is easily stated: if the person succeeds in killing himself, how can anyone possibly discover whether he did so because of a visual distortion caused by LSD? One is inclined to ask how, for example, Dr. Fisher knows that a girl lying dead on a rocky beach got there because she thought the ocean had turned into a silk scarf. It is a skillful interviewer indeed who can get a statement from a corpse. It is always possible, however, that the girl made a statement to someone standing nearby just before she leaped, or perhaps even after she leaped but before she actually died; but one should look carefully at the accounts of the death to see whether such circumstances were reported. The problem is complicated by the fact that LSD leaves the body very quickly and thus would frequently not show up in an autopsy. Some suspicion is warranted by an incident which occurred a few years ago in which several boys were said to have been permanently blinded by looking directly into the sun for a prolonged time while under the effects of LSD. The incident proved to have been completely fraudulent and to have been fabricated by an individual who wanted to scare people out of using the drug.

With this information in mind, it is now possible to return to a consideration of the public controversy over the use of psychedelic drugs and to see that there are in fact three separate, though interrelated and frequently confused, questions: (a) should the use of psychedelic drugs be legalized; (b) are people justified in using them at present, even though they are illegal; and (c) if they should not be legalized, how should society deal with the fact that illegal use of the drugs is so widespread? As society gropes toward some answer to these questions, the information presented in this report suggests several conclusions which need to be kept in mind:

1. An almost irrefutable case can be made for the position that psychedelic drugs should not be legally available to whoever might want to use them in an uncontrolled situation. The number of psychotic reactions resulting from such use is simply too high. In fact, contrary to popular conceptions, very few of even the strongest proponents of the use of these drugs would go that far.

2. Society must realize, however, that in choosing to make the drugs illegal it has taken action which substantially increases the percentage of "bad trips" and psychotic reactions among those who decide to take them anyway. This is true for two reasons: first, because people can only get the drugs on the black market and thus get a high percentage of adulterated products rather than the pure drugs which were formerly available through Sandoz Laboratories. And second, because driving the drug use underground means that they are frequently taken in uncontrolled situations. And it should not be forgotten that this is the largest single factor in producing adverse reactions. Not only does the proper screening, guidance and follow-up of a controlled situation greatly reduce the chance of a psychotic reaction, it also prevents people from acting out dangerous impulses, e.g. leaping onto a rockey beach or "becoming one" with cars on Wilshire Boulevard. In short, many of the dangers of using the drugs today are really artificial risks created primarily by the fact that the drugs are illegal. On the other hand, legalizing the use of the drugs even in controlled situations may greatly increase the total usage with the result that there may be no decrease or even an increase in the absolute number of serious psychotic reactions, even though they decrease on a percentage basis. The problem is one of deciding when illicit use of the drug has become so widespread that continuation of the present severe restrictions on them has become counter-productive.

3. In attempting to decrease illicit use, society should realize that it is very difficult to develop a convincing argument as to why a person who is already a heavy user should cease taking the drugs. Such an individual will readily admit that they cause psychotic reactions in a number of people, sometimes even after the drugs have been taken thirty or forty times. But a person who has taken LSD 100, 150, or even 200 times usually feels that he is demonstrably not one of that unfortunate group. In any event, it is only a risk and not a certainty that harm will result; and everyone takes many such risks during the course of his daily routine. Driving a car, for example, involves a great chance of bodily injury or death, but people do it because it is sufficiently useful to be worth the risk. Likewise, the drug user will say, the personal insights gained from LSD make it worth any risks of a "bad trip". And even a "bad trip", they go on to point out, can be full of valuable, though painful, insights. It is true that one may be arrested and sent to jail, but many are willing to accept even that risk, while others simply turn the argument around to say that such laws only prove the hypocrisy of society (there are six million alcoholics in this country, but centuries of Indians in the Native American Church have not been hurt by psilocybin). In other words, achieving a significant decrease in the level of drug use is not as simple as uttering a few legal admonitions or hurling a few moralistic thunderbolts—or even being "concerned". And one wonders how many people in society—the clergy of the Episcopal Church, for example—are really capable of doing drug counseling on an intensive and sophisticated basis.

4. It is impossible to eliminate the use of psychedelic drugs by legal sanctions, even with the most effective law enforcement imaginable. While it is not as easy as many people think to produce LSD, it can be produced by someone with a graduate school knowledge of chemistry and with no more equipment than what will fit into a large basement in an ordinary house. An undergraduate who was arrested during the past year was making it in a suburban house he had rented. The LSD produced under such conditions is no doubt of poor quality, but it is still sufficiently potent to produce an effect and would be readily marketable. Furthermore, as Dr. Helen Nowlis points out, a dose as small as 25 micrograms can produce an effect in some people, while a "normal" dose is only 100 to 250 micrograms. "The tremendous potency", she states, "can be dramatized by pointing out that an amount of LSD equivalent to two aspirin tablets would provide 6,500 100-microgram doses."[19] And how far would 6,500 doses go? Professor James T. Carey of the University of California at Berkeley gives some indication when he writes, "The effects are so strong that there is little desire to take it more than once a week, even among 'acid heads'. More than twice a month is considered very heavy usage."[20] Putting these facts together, it should be clear that one well-equipped individual can easily supply an entire metropolitan area. The situation will probably get worse, moreover, when one considers that the future will undoubtedly see the development of drugs which are even easier to synthesize. And as one Boston doctor points out, there may be dozens of natural plants which, like the peyote mushroom and the mescal cactus, will produce hallucinogenic effects.

If all this does not point to clear and obvious solutions, it may at least be said that there is some truth in the old maxim that an understanding of true confusion is better than a false simplicity.

IV. ALIENATION AND THE COUNTER CULTURE

As anyone with even minimal insight recognizes, the drug problem is not merely a "drug" problem. While drug abuse is not confined to any age group or income bracket, it is clearly not the pill-popping middle-aged housewife which has society upset. And while the existence of six million alcoholics may be of concern to the W.C.T.U., most Americans accept it with the same bland indifference with which they listen to statistics about highway fatalities. Nor has society suddenly become sensitive to the most serious kinds of drug abuse. For decades the most tragic cases have been those of heroin addicts in the ghettos; yet the most affluent nation in history has callously refused to allocate the necessary resources for solving the problem. (Dr. Donald B. Louria: "Either we do something about slums, or we don't get rid of the heroin problem. It's that simple.").[21] The junkie in the South End still is of little concern to the inhabitants of Boston's well-heeled bedroom suburbs.

The current furor has arisen because suddenly it is the sons and daughters of middle and upper-middle income parents who are taking drugs and because they are doing it, not merely as some kind of adolescent fling, but as members of what is a kind of informal "movement" of deeply alienated young people. Marijuana and LSD are more than drugs; they are also powerful symbols of the rejection of parental values. To think of them is also to call to mind other powerful symbols: long hair, beards, beads, and the bizarre clothing of the so-called "hippies". But such symbols go beyond even the rejection of parental values. As Dr. Walter N. Pahnke has put it:[22]

". . . opinions, pro or con, usually have a deep emotional basis. Certainly the reason is more than just an abhorrence of drug taking . . . A deeper reason may lie in the nature of the profound emotional experiences, often considered religious, which seem to have the power to change a person's values and to generate enthusiasm and inspiration in a direction perhaps not shared by society in general. Such consequences may be seen as a threat when considered logically, but felt even more powerfully to be so at a subliminal or non-rational level."

What is involved is nothing less than a re-

Footnotes at end of article.

jection of some of the most basic values of established society, and society has responded in the ways one might expect—with fear, hatred, and repression. Most adults have been so blinded by their emotions that they have failed to see the most obvious point of all: that a bitterly hostile response only adds fuel to the fire of alienation and makes the flames of the youthful rebellion leap higher. What, then, is the proper response? Before one can answer that one must first make some analysis, however tentative, however difficult, of the reasons for the alienation.

At the outset of such a task one is bombarded with a mass of confusing and, seemingly at least, contradictory bits of information. On the one hand, the alienation of specific young people seems related to specific causes: a reaction to a particular family situation, a particular school, or a particular personal problem. On the other hand, the alienation seems to be an almost world-wide phenomenon, occurring not only all across the United States, but in Europe and even Asia as well. A mistake which many people make is to assume that the second phenomenon cancels out the first. If what is happening is some kind of world-wide phenomenon, then, so it is argued, the rebellious act of a particular young person must not "really" be related to specific problems in his family or school. (President Nathan Pusey of Harvard is fond of this argument as a means of explaining undergraduate upheavals to the alumni). The feeling is that if all young people are alienated, it must be due to some common "defect" which they share: "What is wrong with young people today?" But this approach is based upon an assumption which may not be valid. It may be that the common "defect" is shared, not by the young people, but by the institutions against which they are revolting. It is only this latter hypothesis, in fact, which is capable of explaining several important pieces of information—namely, that the "hippie" phenomenon is not really world-wide at all, but is limited almost exclusively to the technologically highly advanced countries. And even within those countries it occurs predominantly within the middle, upper-middle, and upper income families, particular the latter two. There are very few black "hippies." Strangely enough, the basic trouble seems to have something to do with the quality of life in what many would call the most "successful" sector of society.

As the enormous pile of literature on the subject amply demonstrates, there are many ways in which one can analyze the "causes" of the alienation of the affluent young. What follows is an attempt to describe that alienation with reference to the three levels on which a young person relates to his social environment: the personal and family level, the national political level, and, in a sense, the "international" level of the technological society. Before going into these, however, it is necessary to make an important preliminary observation. What is presented here is an analysis of what might be called the "healthy" alienated young person. Adolescence is a time of great emotional turmoil, and there are a number of young people who, at this point in life, go over the edge into mental illness—frequently this is temporary, although sometimes permanent. While this may be acted out in the life style of the prevalent youth culture, it would be quite erroneous to assume that all cases of mentally ill adolescents could be explained by the points which follow. Some confusion is caused by the fact that the "hippie" subculture is far more tolerant of bizarre behavior than is the rest of society and thus frequently shelters people who are mentally ill. The rationale usually given for this is that mental illness is culturally defined; whatever varies from the usual middle-class norm is called "sick." There is more than a little truth in the statement; many who are venerated as saints in one age would be locked up in hospitals as "crazy" in a different age. But as a total explanation for the phenomenon of mental illness, the argument is untenable. One young person who was interviewed this past summer and who took that position quickly backed down when asked to defend its obvious implication: if mental illness is *only* a relative, culturally defined term, then it must follow that there is no one in the entire world or in the whole history of mankind who can be called "mentally ill" by any absolute standard. No one who has visited with the more disturbed patients in a mental hospital can possibly accept such a statement.

*A. Alienation from the family*

To an alarming extent, economic success seems to have created a situation in which the American family is victimized by its own affluence, which in a number of ways undermines personal relationships within the family unit. Having a good bit of money means that no one needs to do unpleasant tasks since someone else can be paid to do them. Thus no one makes any sacrifices for anyone else in the family, with the exception of paying money to have things done. Money, then, either as gifts or the purchase of services or appliances, becomes a substitute for personal relationships. The first major effect of this is to cut the father out of the family, since he is frequently caught up in his own profession, and his daily routine naturally makes him more insulated from contact with the children. Rather quickly, the busy and absent executive comes to think of himself as a "good" father if he buys things to express his love for his children. New cars, stereo sets, and any of a thousand other "things" take the place of personal involvement and interaction, with the result that in time even the father himself comes to be seen as a "thing," a self-propelled robot who dresses in a three-piece suit, carries an attache case, and on occasion produces expensive gifts. And the mother fares little better. Because of this country's overly rigid definition of the roles of men and women, she will usually not have a career of her own, but will play at life with a mass of dilettantish activities in an effort to be an "interesting" person. But the perceptive adolescent sees very quickly that "interesting" and "authentic" are by no means the same thing.

This situation is compounded by the gap which a child from an affluent family sees between his own life style and that of other people. The point is well made by an extremely perceptive Harvard undergraduate honors thesis submitted last spring by Harrison G. Pope, Jr.[2] Pope points out that young people from wealthy families are aware that the other 90% of the population doesn't live the way they do. They see well-cushioned life as insulated from hardship and thus not "real". To try to come to some understanding of life while living in an affluent suburb is like trying to construct a world-view from the inside of an economic and social cocoon. The subjects taken in school, moreover, seem increasingly technical and to have as their primary purpose equipping the student to enter the insulated life of his parents; thus school too is "unreal". Such students are attracted to drugs like LSD because they think they are capable of allowing them to see what their lives are "really" like. They also become hippies and imitate lower class life because that group, not being insulated, is thought to have a more first-hand acquaintance with what life—"real life"—is about.

*B. Alienation on a national political level*

The alienation of young people over political issues has filled more pages in newspapers and magazines and consumed more hours on television than one could possibly calculate. As a result, the issues around which the alienation centers are well known, but what mystifies many adults is the intensity of the feeling. How often one encounters the middle-aged parent with a quizzical, uncomprehending look on his face asking, "Why can't they work through the system?" "Isn't it better to try to change the system than just to drop out?" "Since this is a democracy, why can't they abide by the decision of the majority rather than trying to start a revolution?"

What follows is an attempt to explain why many young people feel they can't do any of these things. Since the War in Vietnam is unquestionably the central political issue for most young people, an attempt will be made to examine the reasons for their intense alienation with reference to two aspects of that war.

First, there is the question of the impact of that war on domestic political issues. Young people see very clearly the contradiction between America's affluence and America's poverty. Being products of the former, they feel very guilty about the latter. During the administration of John F. Kennedy, it was possible to deal with that guilt by participation in the "New Society" programs, such as the domestic Peace Corps. Not a great deal of money was allocated for those programs, but it was said that poverty couldn't be solved overnight, and it was important to make a beginning. Besides, the call to action came in the stirring Kennedy rhetoric which made it all seem a kind of noble gradualism.

But when President Johnson decided upon a significant escalation of the War in Vietnam, necessitating large increases in the federal budget for that purpose, American young people experienced a tremendous crisis of faith in the "system." Suddenly this country was willing to mobilize hundreds of thousands of men and spend from twenty-four to thirty billion dollars per year to conduct a war half way around the world in a country few Americans had even heard of. Prior to the Vietnam build-up, if one had suggested that comparable manpower and money be immediately allocated to the eradication of poverty, he would probably have been referred to a psychiatrist. But the sudden large increase in expenditures for war exposed the meagre "New Society" programs as a big joke, a colossal put-on. The real reason for the gradualism was not that America could not have allocated the resources—the War proved that—but rather, that people weren't really serious about alleviating human suffering. In short, the men who ran the "system" had acted in *bad faith*. Kennedy himself was not blamed, but was seen as a victim like all the rest. He was martyred in principle as well as in fact. But for the young people of today, what he stood for was over. With one swift stroke the whole Liberal Creed was reduced to a valley of dry bones, and only a fool could think they would ever rise again and only an even greater fool could see any point to it if they did.

The other major impact of the War centered around the problem of the selective conscientious objector. Many young people were morally opposed to this particular war, although not to all wars, and thus could not legitimately claim to be conscientious objectors under existing law. A young man in this position who was called for induction was thus faced with a terrible set of alternatives: either he had to lie about the most important moral decision in his life, or participate in the killing of other human beings when he was morally opposed to doing so, or go to jail as a felon, or flee the country as a fugitive.

One should be under no illusions as to what is asked of a young man when he is

Footnotes at end of article.

called to participate in a war, for war is nothing more, nor less, than a giant conspiracy to commit homicide. Even when it is morally justified, it is a grave undertaking; when it is not, it is inhuman. Nor is the possibility of non-combatant service a solution to the problem. The Army operates on what is sometimes referred to as a "pyramid" theory: as any young recruit quickly learns in basic training, the primary purpose of every soldier, whether he serves as a clerk typist, a cook, or a medical corpsman, is to support the infantry man at the front who fires the shell that shatters the skull of another human being. Many young men have felt that any society which callously tried to force a man to participate in that kind of act when he was morally opposed to doing so was nothing short of diabolical. To them, it was another clear example that the adults who were running the "system" were acting in bad faith.

"Why can't they work through the system?" "Isn't it better to try to change the system than just drop out?" "Since this is a democracy, why can't they abide by the decision of the majority rather than trying to start a revolution?" All these questions have behind them the unstated assumption that one can *trust* the system, and it is precisely that which many young people no longer feel they can do. To them, the plaintive cries of their parents are like voices out of another century—an age of innocence long since passed.

*C. Alienation from the Technological Society*

The intense alienation of young people is expressed in two very different ways which it is important not to confuse. One is that of the student revolutionary who emphasizes political action to over-throw existing institutions so that more equitable and just ones can be erected in their place. The most notable representative of this viewpoint is, of course, the Students for a Democratic Society, with its almost constantly proliferating factions. The most radical, doctrinaire and disciplined of these factions is the Progressive Labor Party (Work-Student Alliance) faction of SDS, which insists that its members wear short hair (so as not to antagonize the working class) and strongly opposes the use of drugs, on the grounds that they dull the revolutionary mentality.

The second way in which youthful alienation is expressed is that of the "hippie", who argues that the present society cannot be redeemed even by revolution, and thus the only solution is not to revolt but to drop out and start a new society based on entirely different principles. The social criticism of the hippie strikes at a much deeper level than that of the student revolutionary. The problem is more, he argues, than merely the fact that one cannot trust the people who run the system, or even that material goods are not equitably distributed. The real problem lies in the quality of life which emanates from the technological society. Political action and even revolution are thus futile gestures which merely change the people who run the system, while leaving intact the dehumanizing technological structure. "Real" change comes, not by toppling the political edifices of society, but by transforming the lives of the specific individuals who make up that society.

The revolutionary and the hippie each view the other as reactionary, and, in a sense, both are right. From the standpoint of the former, the hippies deprive the revolutionary forces of an enormous supply of manpower, and by political inaction give passive support to the present structures. From the standpoint of the hippie, however, it is the building of the new society which is important, and the revolutionary is merely draining of manpower into a diversionary and futile endeavor. Because it has been more associated with drug use, it is the hippie subculture, and not the revolutionary movements which is of interest for this report.

Because the mass media tends to play up the colorful clothing, the loud music, and the sometimes shocking or even obscene language, there is a temptation among adults to treat the hippie movement as if it were either a mere fad or else evidence of the total degeneracy of youth. What is actually involved, however, is something far deeper, something which represents nothing less than a shift of values on a very fundamental level. The people who have gravitated toward the hip community and have become its hard core are characterized by a deep-seated feeling that in the great technological innovations of modern industrial society something spiritual was being lost. As they looked at the long assembly lines, the ranch-style houses in the suburbs, and the very proper three-piece suits—as they saw masses of men whose total productive hours seemed oriented toward bringing them more new cars, more television sets, more gadgets of every kind—and as they encountered a school system blatantly designed to give them greater speed in the big materialistic marathon, the much-heralded technological society began to look more like a bunch of hamsters running through a maze than a group of human beings living in a community. What foolishness to talk of loyalty to such a system. How silly to speak of a revoltuion to change the leadership. The corruption ran too deep for all that.

All that was left was to withdraw, to start over again at the beginning. Perhaps if one stripped away all the hypocrisy and useless customs with which man had become encrusted by his social environment—perhaps, just perhaps, one could find, hidden beneath all the layers, something left of that basic emotion: human love. There would be bright colors and flowers, and people would be open and honest with each other. If it were not possible to change established society, it was at least possible to "liberate" one's own mind. Drugs would help, but they were an aid, not a solution. With marriage and school and all the other phoney institutions thrown away, one would be free to experiment with new life styles and new ways of living in which the worth and dignity of every human being was preserved.

The number of "hard core" members of the hip community those who have permanently dropped out of the established society is fairly small. But there is a large and growing number of young people who attach themselves to the hip community for a certain period of time, frequently even for several years. They immerse themselves in it in varying degrees, hoping to find some new values and new life styles by which to order their lives. In addition, there are the "teeny boppers", young people between the ages of 13 and 16 who float into whatever they think is the hip "scene" on weekends and in the summer (they are frequently referred to as "plastic" hippies).

Many of the "hard core" hippies and those who have joined the hip community for some period of time have begun to enter into communal living arrangements on a fairly large scale. People who are deeply involved in the communes which are springing up around the country estimate that there are approximately 150 of them in the Boston metropolitan area, each containing anywhere from about 6 to 25 members. The Modern Utopian, an underground newspaper circulated among cummunes and published in Berkeley, California, lists the following communes as being the major ones in Massachusetts:

| *Name* | *Location* |
|---|---|
| ASD | Boston. |
| Fort Hill Community | Roxbury. |
| Gould Farm | Great Barrington. |
| Harrad | Cambridge. |
| Kushi | Brookline. |
| Leyden | Leyden. |
| Nordeca | Bellingham |

Joseph Moreau of Project Place, who has personally visited over 50 communes in the Boston area, states that the greatest concentration is in Cambridge, although a significant number are also located in such places as Jamaica Plain, Roxbury, Beacon Hill, Allston, Brighton, and some sections of Dorchester.[24] Another source indicated some contact with communes in Newton.

The word "communes," however, can be a rather misleading way of describing these living arrangements. They are clearly not "communes" in the usual sense of the word, since very few involve any sharing of wealth or income, except for some of the rural communes. In most of them the basic expenses (rent, food, etc.) are just divided equally among the members regardless of individual income, and for that reason they appear on the surface to be little different from an extension of the traditional idea of roommates to include a larger number and both sexes. What differentiates them as "communes" seems to be factors more psychological than organizational. Of great importance is the motivation for joining the group. Unlike the usual roommate situation, it is not primarily to cut expenses and provide a little casual companionship, but rather, to engage in a certain life style involving intense personal relationships on a group level. Contrary to many popular conceptions, these communes are not great hedonistic dens where a lot of wild people are constantly "high" on drugs or engaged in a continuous sexual orgy. (One is reminded immediately of the incredible rumors which surrounded meetings of the early Christians.)

To add some historical perspective to this phenomenon, it is important to remember that the hippies are not the first individuals in Western civilization to be involved in a shift of values away from the predominant culture. A number of people have noted the similarity with the rise of monasticism in Christianity, a movement which also involved a conscious rejection of the material benefits of society on the grounds that they interfered with deeper, more spiritual concerns. Nor should it be forgotten that many of the very greatest leaders of the early Church were monks who came from noble or wealthy families and who made precisely that kind of decision: Gregory the Great, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine, to name only a few. And as one Church historian has pointed out, if one were to encounter St. Francis today, he would undoubtedly appear as a very dirty and smelly individual.

What is perhaps even more important is to think of what might have happened if the Church had tried to squash all the various monastic movements which have appeared in her history. What, for example, would have been the result if the Church in the Middle Ages had refused to give any sanction to the powerful emotional thrust behind the formation of the Cistercians, the Carthusians, the Franciscans, and the Dominicans? There is little doubt that the Church would have been torn assunder. The problem today is that society has no recognized institutions which can play the role which monasticism did in the Church. But as the rise of the communes indicates, the hip community—what Theodore Roszak calls the "counter culture"—is beginning to offer its own alternatives. And when one considers that there were 400,000 young people at the Woodstock Rock Festical, one begins to wonder whether it is not time to call a halt to the "cold war" (and sometimes not so "cold") between the hip community and established society. One wonders, in short, whether it is not time to call for a detente.

One thing is certain—the alienation which many young people feel is deeper and more wide-spread than many adults are aware of or are willing to admit. Many families have already been tragically and bitterly pulled apart, and there are few parents who are entirely at ease about the problem. If it is not yet midnight, it is clearly past eleven—

Footnotes at end of article.

and it has been a long time since anyone looked at his watch.

V. THE MARIJUANA QUESTION

The most striking fact about the present laws dealing with drugs, is the remarkable extent to which they are self-defeating. In general, the laws, both state and federal, attempt to provide a shotgun blast aimed at everything from marijuana to heroin and from amateur users and dealers to the highly professional activities of the mafia. The least harmful end of the spectrum of drug use is clearly represented by marijuana and (until recently, at least) the amateur dealers who peddled it. But because marijuana is by far the bulkiest of the illegal drugs, and because amateurs are much less skillful than the mafia, any overall crackdown on drugs inevitably has its greatest impact on the end of the spectrum they represent.

The result is graphically demonstrated by the Nixon Administration's illfated Operation Intercept, which attempted to seal off the flow of drugs across the Mexican border. Because of the government policy, marijuana had become quite scarce at least a month before any public announcement of the government's new program. The rumor which spread like wildfire around Beacon Hill was that the scarcity was due to the fact that the mafia had put the amateur marijuana dealers out of business in an effort to protect and increase its own sales of stronger drugs. The falsity of the rumor was exposed of course, by the Administration's grandiose announcement of its new drive against illegal drugs. But the interesting thing is that if one put together the rumor with the later discovered fact, it becomes clear that the Nixon Administration did for the mafia what the mafia could never have done for itself.

The mafia moved swiftly to capitalize on government policy in two important ways. First, as recent Congressional hearings have demonstrated, it moved to take over a much larger portion of the marijuana trade. The only reason organized crime had not moved into that area to any great extent in the past was that there were so many amateurs involved, many of whom sold it to friends at low prices, that it was not profitable to do so. When many of the amateurs were eliminated, however, a vacuum was created, and the mafia was quick to fill it.

The second way the mafia took advantage of Operation Intercept was to greatly strength its heroin trade. The government was never able to completely shut off the marijuana traffic, but the limited supply which remained went to those who had the best connections for getting it—college students and older members of the hip community. But there were still many younger, less sophisticated, less discriminating adolescents who were anxious to take drugs of some kind in order to feel a part of the youth "scene". In response to this, the mafia made available a large number of smaller, less expensive bags of heroin, which could be purchased for as little as three dollars (there were reports of some bags being sold for as little as two dollars). "Doing skag" (taking heroin) quickly became the "in" thing to do if one really wanted to be part of the "scene".

Far from leading to the use of heroin, marijuana had actually been a significant and valuable buffer between the adolescents and harder narcotics. Even young people who knew little about drugs had heard of marijuana, and since it was the least harmful drug available, they usually began by taking that. It was even possible to be a part of the "scene" and use little or nothing else. Eventually some did go on to stronger drugs, but even then there was a significant delay in their doing so, with the result that most of them were not heavily involved in the drug culture before returning home. When the marijuana supply dried up, however, the buffer was gone. Other drugs, by definition, became the least harmful drugs available—but they were a good bit stronger than marijuana. The result was that adolescents went much more quickly to the harder drugs, and the use of heroin rose sharply.

This is but one illustration of the reason why the time has come to legalize the sale and possession of marijuana. The reason is not that marijuana has been proven to be "absolutely" harmless, but rather, that use and demand for the drug have become so widespread that it is counter-productive to continue its illegal status. Dr. Stanley F. Yolles, director of the National Institute of Mental Health, testified before a Congressional committee on September 17, 1969, that "A conservative estimate of persons in the United States, both juvenile and adult, who have used marijuana at least once is about eight million and may be as high as twelve million." [25] Dr. Joel Fort, of the University of California at Berkeley, states that, "The World Health Organization has estimated that there are at least 250,000,000 regular Cannabis users in the world. We have between 12,000,000 and 20,000,000 of them right here in the United States, according to my own surveys and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the number is increasing." [26] And Boston attorney Joseph Oteri points out that, "Today, pot is smoked at every college campus, from Maine all the way across to Oregon." [27] *Time* magazine reports that "for all the massive expenditures of police time and money, pot smoking is so widespread that there are roughly 25 times as many users as there are places to hold them in all the nation's prisons." [28] As Prohibition demonstrated in an earlier era, when use of a drug becomes that great, society loses more than it gains in resorting to legal suppression.

Many government apologists try to give the impression that very little is known about marijuana, and thus proposals for its legalization are premature. In fact, however, quite a great deal is known about marijuana. There are records of its use dating back as far as the reign of the Chinese Emperor Shen Nung in 2737 B.C.,[29] and the drug has undergone far more tests than most of the drugs one can purchase in an ordinary drug store. An excellent summary of all the experiments, including the latest research, is contained in an article on marijuana in the December, 1969, issue of "Scientific American" by Dr. Lester Grinspoon,[30] an associate clinical professor of psychiatry at the Harvard Medical School and director of psychiatry (research) at the Massachusetts Mental Health Center. It is certainly true that not everything is known about marijuana, but there are very few drugs about which medical science can be said to know "everything". A good capsule summary of what is known is contained in the following statement by Dr. Lawrence Hartman, clinical instructor in psychiatry at the Harvard Medical School.[31]

"Marijuana is a mild drug, capable of giving many people mildly pleasant experiences, and of doing some social and psychological harm to some users, probably especially to those teenagers who use it in ways that help avoid the necessary anxieties and tasks of growing up.

"Let us help teenagers know it is not an entirely safe drug.

"But let us not be so hypocritical as to pretend it belongs with heroin, dexedrine, or LSD—

"Let us not be so hypocritical as to deny that there is a good bit known about marijuana (the NIH radio commercials overstate our ignorance), and what is known puts it in a category comparable to those other mild but not harmless drugs about which our society is ambivalent but far more tolerant: alcohol, tobacco, caffeine."

The intolerance, in the form of stiff prison sentences, is in fact so great that Dr. Yolles, cited above, concludes that, "I know of no clearer instance in which the punishment for an infraction of the law is more harmful than the crime." [32]

Before turning to the serious disadvantage of continuing to make marijuana illegal, there are two totally fallacious, but frequently voiced, arguments which need to be dealt with. The first is that use of marijuana leads on to heroin addiction. People who make this argument are never able to explain one very important phenomenon—namely, that the greatest increase by far in the use of marijuana during the past few years has been among college students, and yet there is still hardly any heroin use at all among this group. In addition, the study of the effects of Operation Intercept, noted above, indicates that marijuana frequently has precisely the opposite effect for many adolescents. And Dr. Grinspoon, in answering the question of whether use of marijuana leads to the use of hard narcotics, writes: [33]

"No such relation has been found in several studies that have looked into this question, including the La Guardia study and a U.S. Presidential task force investigation of narcotics and drug abuse. It is true that the Federal study showed that among heroin users about 50 percent had had experience with marijuana; the study also found, however, that most of the heroin addicts had been users of alcohol and tobacco. There is no evidence that marijuana is more likely than alcohol or tobacco to lead to the use of narcotics."

And Federal Judge Charles E. Wyzanski adds wryly, "One might as well say that because most users of heroin once imbibed milk, milk leads to heroin addiction." [34]

The other old chestnut frequently hauled out during discussions of legalizing marijuana is that even if it is no more harmful than alcohol, marijuana should not be legalized since the nation already has 6 million alcoholics and it would be horrible to add to that another 6 million marijuana-addicts. The first, and most important, fallacy in this argument is that it amounts to no more than playing a game with numbers. There is only a certain percentage of the population willing to take drugs of any kind, whether alcohol, marijuana, heroin, of whatever. Under a situation in which alcohol is legal and marijuana is not, the overwhelming majority of those individuals have chosen alcohol, which has resulted in 6 million alcoholics. If marijuana were legalized and became as popular as alcohol, it is possible that those individuals who seek to escape personal problems through chronic drug use would divide themselves equally between use of marijuana and alcohol. Under present population figures, this would mean three million alcoholics and three million people dependent on marijuana. To assume that there would still be 6 million alcoholics, with an additional 6 million people dependent on marijuana piled on top of that is to assume that the entire drug-taking population would immediately be doubled by the mere legislative act of legalizing "pot".

In addition, if the number of chronic drug users were to become equally divided between users of alcohol and marijuana, this in itself would be an enormous improvement, since: (a) marijuana is not physically addictive as is alcohol, and therefore dependent persons could be more easily rehabilitated; (b) experienced users of marijuana do not have the loss of motor skills associated with alcohol, and there would thus be fewer automobile accidents due to drunken driving, as well as a reduction in home accidents (alcohol accounts for ¼ of all home accidents requiring hospital emergency room treat-

Footnotes at end of article.

ment), and perhaps most important of all, it would still be possible for many dependent persons to function in jobs; (c) marijuana is much less expensive than alcohol, and thus a much smaller percentage of the chronic user's income would go toward meeting this need; and (d) chronic use of marijuana does not produce the violent behavior which frequently results from excessive use of alcohol.

Against the medical risks and costs of legalizing marijuana must be weighed the risks and costs of keeping it illegal. These are substantial and are at least five number:

(1) It diverts police resources away from more dangerous drugs. The police resources of any city or governmental unit are limited and when a segment of it is directed toward one problem, it becomes unavailable as a means of meeting other problems. During 1968 alone there were 80,000 arrests for violations of the marijuana laws, a figure which represents a significant expenditure of time, money, and manpower. At a time when heroin use is rapidly increasing, along with virtually all other forms of serious crime, there is no justification in devoting such enormous resources toward arresting people for possession and sale of a product no stronger than alcohol or tobacco.

(2) Strict enforcement of the marijuana laws simply consolidates control of the drug in the hands of organized crime. Amateur dealers are the first ones to be caught by efforts to "crackdown" on marjuana, and as they are eliminated, the mafia moves in to supply the market. During the investigation conducted by James Southerland, executive director of the House Select Committee on Crime, one source reported that, "Before Operation Intercept, the Mafia handled 40 percent of marijuana coming into the U.S. Now they control and distribute the great bulk of it."[35] Some people might dispute whether the mafia's control was in fact that great,[36] but nearly everyone would agree that it has increased enormously as a result of government law enforcement policy. As was true in the Prohibition era, one of the greatest foes of legalization is organized crime.

(3) Keeping marijuana illegal seriously undermines the credibility of drug education and drug counseling efforts. A vast number of young people do not believe that marijuana is any more harmful than the martinis their parents drink, and because they do not feel that adults are being honest about marijuana, they see no reason to trust what they say about other drugs either.

(4) The marijuana laws promote disrespect for the law among a large number of young people. This is true for several reasons:

(a) They feel the laws have no rational basis since marijuana is not harmful. This leads them to wonder what other laws lack a rational basis.

(b) Due to the large number of marijuana users, the laws are inconsistently applied. Less than one in 1,000 are actually caught and jailed,[37] and the penalties for those who are vary tremendously. This is looked upon as evidence of the irrationality of the whole judicial system.

(c) The marijuana laws are sometimes used as instruments of repression against individuals whose political views or life styles are repugnant to police and judicial figures. The classic case of this, which is known to many young people, is that of John Sinclair, who was a political activist in Ann Arbor, Michigan. After pretending to be his friends for a period of two months, a couple of plainclothes policemen induced Sinclair to sell them two marijuana cigarettes, for which he was promptly arrested. He is presently in jail on a 9½–10 year sentence while he waits for his appeal to be heard.

Footnotes at end of article.

(5) And finally, as noted in the example at the beginning of this chapter, cutting off the supply of marijuana increases the use of harder drugs. Because it is so much bulkier than other drugs, marijuana is much the easiest drug to enforce the law against. But wiping out the supply means that those young people who are attracted to the drug culture find only much stronger drugs awaiting them when they get there.

Such costs make the continued prohibition of marijuana unjustifiable. No one, of course, would advocate that all restrictions be removed, so that children of any age could purchase it. Just as is true for alcohol, some minimum age would be necessary. But what is needed is a comprehensive approach to all drugs, which does not discriminate against the drugs preferred by those in any particular age group or life style, and which has as its goal reducing the use of the stronger drugs while discouraging the use of all drugs. A sensible law would be one which legalized the use of marijuana for people over a minimum age and provided for its production under government supervision, and in addition prohibited all advertising for liquor and cigarettes as well as marijuana.

### VI. CONCLUSION

Until now the "drug" problem has been seen primarily as a "law and order" problem. The answer to any increase in the use of drugs usually takes the form of a "crackdown" or demands that the police "do something". But if the history of drug abuse has proved anything, it has shown fairly conclusively that even the most vigorous and efficient law enforcement cannot eradicate the problem. The most common results, in fact, are an increase in the alienation of youth and a consolidation of the illegal market in the hands of organized crime.

Another example of the self-defeating nature of present legal approaches to the drug problem is that laws are used, not merely against drug abuse itself, but as a means of driving drug users out of a particular geographical area. The classic example of this has been the effort of the Boston Police Department to drive the "hippies" off Beacon Hill and the Boston Common. Aggressive police action succeeded in driving many hippies away from the area, which satisfied many of the Beacon Hill residents. But from a larger perspective, it only moved the problem from one section of the city to another, and, in fact, increased the scope of the problem by feeding the alienation which many young people feel. As the experience of the early Church made clear, martyrdom only increases the size and strength of a movement, and the hip community has been no exception to the rule.

Police action of this nature has also had an unfortunate effect in another way as well. As noted in the section of this report describing heroin use among teenagers, many adolescents have strong self-destructive impulses. Those who gravitate to the hip community have trouble not only with the police, but with juvenile gangs and other antagonistic individuals as well. But such antagonism satisfies a deeply felt, though unhealthly, need. When widespread police action is taken against young people like these, it merely gratifies their self-destructive impulses. As such, it is a bit like running a mental hospital in which free razor blades are distributed to patients who exhibit suicidal tendencies.

It is rather safe to predict that if the response to the increase in adolescent heroin use is a comparable increase in law enforcement and action taken directly against the young people themselves, the only results will be to move them from one section of the metropolitan area to another and to vastly increase the alienation which local young people feel—which will, in turn, only increase the number of runaways and heavy drug users among them. And while one can understand the desire of a parent on Beacon Hill to have constant police harassment used to drive the drug scene away to somewhere else, such as Kenmore Square, one wonders how he would feel about a parent in Kenmore Square who wanted the same techniques used there to drive it back to Beacon Hill.

But if law enforcement methods of dealing with the drug problem are frequently counter-productive, that situation is compounded many times over by the fact that as soon as the point is raised most people assume that the central issue revolves around attacking or defending the attitudes and actions of the police themselves. In fact, however, it is the police who are caught in the most difficult position of all and who usually end up being knocked back and forth by both sides like a ping pong ball. Contrary to what many people think, police departments are quite sensitive to public opinion, and, by and large, they give the general public whatever kind of law enforcement it wants. And all too often, what the public really wants is to use the police department as a scapegoat for its own failure to deal with complex, social and political problems. The drug problem is precisely such a case. When a difficult issue defies easy solutions, the general public resorts to its own special "cop-out"—a law is passed and the issue is redefined as one of "law and order". To pull off such a colossal fraud, it is necessary, of course, to pat the police on one hand while handing them the leash to the great white elephant with the other.

All this is not to say that all drugs should be legalized, but it is to say that a practice of relying almost totally on law enforcement to solve the problem is a policy which has become bankrupt. If progress is to be made, a significant shift in emphasis will have to be made toward competent drug counseling and the development of sophisticated, sensitive and intelligent drug education programs. Harmful drugs are so available, and will continue to be so available, that in the final analysis only the individual decision of the user will prevent widespread abuse. And no progress will be made until the socalled "shotgun approach" is eliminated and an effort is made to isolate and reduce the use of more dangerous drugs. The legalization of marijuana under the conditions indicated in this report would be an important step in the right direction.

And finally, it must be emphasized that drug abuse can never be totally eliminated or even significantly reduced until society comes to grips with the underlying causes, the motivating forces, which lead people to take drugs. In the ghettos this will mean massive expenditures of money to alleviate the grinding poverty which constantly presses down on people and which creates an almost irresistible desire for an escape—*any* kind of escape. In the case of the deeply alienated youth of the middle and upper middle classes, it will be necessary to examine honestly some aspects of family life, the political structure, and the technological society which are indeed painful to face. It is not easy for adults to apply the sharp scalpel of analysis to those aspects of life by which they have defined themselves. "These young people did not have to go through what we went through," many adults will be inclined to say. And that will be true. And because they did not, the vision of many young people will be different—but it may be none the less true. Prophetic voices always speak from a different vantage point. And one should not be deaf to the fact that the most dominant theme in the cries of young people is some intense longing for a new spiritual dimension to life. If it is sometimes confused, sometimes inarticulate, sometimes misdirected, it may still prove, in in the long run, to be the force which makes living in this complex civilization human and bearable. If the outlines of the "New

Jerusalem" are not yet clear, one can at least take hope in the fact, as one middle-aged Harvard professor recently put it, that, "We seem to be moving drunkenly—almost blindly—toward Meaning."

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Because of the rapidly changing nature of the drug scene, another report should be made to the Diocese next year, bringing the present report up to date.

2. Drug education programs should be undertaken on a parish level. Because many drug education programs rely more on "scare techniques" than solid knowledge, they are frequently self-defeating and end up encouraging more drug use than they discourage. A welcome exception is the material developed by Dr. David C. Lewis, head of the outpatient clinic of the Beth Israel Hospital. His program, which is being produced by City Schools Curriculum Service Inc. (60 Commercial Wharf, Boston, Mass.), is being tested in several parishes in the Diocese, and further information on it will be available at the Diocesan Convention.

3. A program should be set up to provide training in drug counseling for both the clergy and laity in this Diocese.

4. On both a parish and Diocesan level, financial support should be given to drug counseling programs, such as Project Place, which are directly involved with the drug culture. Because drug abuse is frequently intertwined with the whole problem of alienated youth, many young people refuse to come to the usual type of medical center or counseling service for help, and only something which fits in with the new life style to which they are attracted has any chance of success. Project Place has done an excellent job of meeting this need, but because it depends for the most part on local funding, it has had a precarious financial existence. It needs and deserves the Church's support.

RESOLUTIONS

1. Therefore, be it resolved that the Committee on Drugs and Organized Crime be continued for another year; that it be charged with providing continuing information on drugs; that it be encouraged to provide information on existing drug education programs, and if necessary to develop its own programs; that it explore the feasibility of establishing a drug counseling center both for direct work with individuals and for training clergy and laity in drug counseling.

2. And be it further resolved, that while the feasibility study is in process, financial support be given to such existing drug counseling and educational programs as those operated by Project Place.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Helen H. Nowlis, *Drugs on the College Campus* (Doubleday & Co.: Garden City, New York, 1969), pp. 108–9.

[2] Most of these summaries are based on material in the following sources: Nowlis, *Drugs on the College Campus;* Margaret O. Hyde, ed., *Mind Drugs* (McGraw-Hill: New York, 1968); and Taini, Smith, Englund and Curran, *Drugs Among the Young* (Central City Poverty Program: San Francisco, 1968).

[3] Taini, Smith, Englund and Curran, *Drugs Among the Young*, p. 19.

[4] Interview with Peter A. Callaway, Peter Sherer and Joseph Moreau, Jan. 12, 1970, Boston, Mass.

[5] Aldous Huxley, "Culture and the Individual", in David Solomon, ed., *LSD: The Consciousness-Expanding Drug* (G. P. Putnam's Sons: New York, 1966), p. 39.

[6] Aldous Huxley, *The Doors of Perception* (Harper and Row: New York, 1954, Harper Colophon ed., 1963), passim.

[7] Ibid., p. 52.

[8] Ibid., pp. 34–5.

[9] Alan Watts, "The Drug Revolution", *Playboy* Magazine, January, 1970, pp. 64–5.

[10] These tests are reported in: Walter N. Pahnke, "LSD and Religious Experience," in Richard C. DeBold and Russell C. Leaf, ed., *LSD, Man & Society* (Wesleyan University Press: Middletown, Conn., 1967), pp. 60–84.

[11] Ibid., p. 67.

[12] Ibid., p. 65.

[13] For a discussion of this case, see Neil L. Chayet, "Social and Legal Aspects of LSD Usage", in DeBold and Leaf, ed., *LSD, Man & Society*, pp. 92–124.

[14] Joseph S. Oteri, "The Drug Revolution", *Playboy* Magazine, January, 1970, p. 74.

[15] Interview with Dr. David Walters, July 16, 1969.

[16] Joel Fort, "The Drug Revolution", *Playboy* Magazine, January, 1970, p. 62.

[17] Donald B. Louria, "The Abuse of LSD", in DeBold and Leaf, *LSD, Man & Society*, p. 37.

[18] Duke D. Fisher, "LSD for Science and Kicks", in Margaret O. Hyde, ed., *Mind Drugs* (McGraw-Hill: New York, 1968, Pocket Book ed., 1969), p. 72.

[19] Helen H. Nowlis, *Drugs on the College Campus*, p. 103.

[20] James T. Carey, *The College Drug Scene* (Prentice-Hall Inc.: Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1968), p. 39.

[21] Louria, "The Abuse of LSD", p. 56.

[22] Pahnke, "LSD and Religious Experience", p. 78.

[23] Harrison G. Pope, Jr., *"Pure Experience": A Study of the Social Psychology of LSD and the Hippy Subculture*, A. B. Thesis submitted to Harvard University, March 28, 1969, 153 pp. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: unpublished).

[24] Interview with Joseph Moreau, January 12, 1970, Boston, Mass.

[25] Reported in the *New York Times*, September 18, 1969.

[26] Joel Fort, "The Drug Revolution", p. 55.

[27] Joseph S. Oteri, "The Drug Revolution", p. 55.

[28] *Time* Magazine, September 26, 1969, p. 74.

[29] Lester Grinspoon, "Marijuana", in *Scientific American*, December, 1969, p. 17.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Lawrence Hartman, letter to the editor of the *Boston Globe* published September 20, 1969.

[32] Statement reported in the *New York Times*, September 18, 1969.

[33] Grinspoon, "Marijuana", p. 21.

[34] Charles E. Wyzanski, "There's Only One Way to Deal With Marijuana", Harvard Alumni Bulletin, November 11, 1967, p. 13.

[35] *Boston Globe*, January 1, 1970.

[36] *Boston Globe*, January 12, 1970.

[37] *Time* Magazine, September 26, 1969, p. 74.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

*I. Books*

George Andrews and Simon Vinkenoog, ed., "The Book of Grass" (New York: Grove Press, 1967)

James T. Carey, "The College Drug Scene" (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1968)

Richard C. DeBold and Russell C. Leaf, "LSD, Man & Society" (Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1967)

Robert S. DeRopp, "The Master Game" (Dell Publishing Co.: New York, 1968)

———, "Drugs and the Mind" (New York: Grove Press, 1957)

Erik H. Erikson, "Identity: Youth and Crisis" (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1968)

Paul Goodman, "Growing Up Absurd" (New York: Vintage Books, 1956)

Hermann Hesse, "Siddharta" (New York: New Directions, 1967)

Abbie Hoffman, "Woodstock Nation" (Vintage Books: New York, 1969)

Aldous Huxley, "The Doors of Perception" (New York, 1954: Harper and Row; Harper Colophon ed., 1963)

Margaret O. Hyde, ed., "Mind Drugs" (New York: McGraw Hill, 1968)

Alfred R. Lindesmith, "The Addict and the Law" (New York: Random House, 1965)

R. D. Laing, "The Politics of Experience" (New York: Ballantine Books, 1967)

Kenneth W. Mann, "On Pills and Needles" (Seabury Press, 1969)

R. E. L. Masters and Jean Houston, "The Varieties of Psychedelic Experience" (New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1966)

Helen H. Nowlis, "Drugs on the College Campus" (Garden City, New York, 1969: Doubleday & Co.)

Harrison G. Pope, Jr., " 'Pure Experience'. A Study of the Social Psychology of LSD and the Hippy Subculture," A. B. Thesis submitted to Harvard University, March 28, 1969, 153 pp. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: unpublished).

Theodore Roszak, "The Making of a Counter Culture" (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1969)

David Solomon, ed., "LSD: The Consciousness-Expanding Drug" (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1968)

David Solomon, ed., "The Marijuana Papers" (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1966)

Reno Taini, David Smith, David Englund, and William Curran, "Drugs Among the Young" (San Francisco: Central City Poverty Program, 1968)

Alan W. Watts, "The Way of Zen" (New York: Vintage Books, 1957)

Lewis Yablousky, "The Hippie Trip" (New York: Pegasus, 1968)

*II. Articles*

H. Anslingler, Burroughs, Coburn, Baba Ram Dass, Fiedler, Rinlator, Fort, Oteri, and Watts, Panel Discussion: "The Drug Revolution", "Playboy," January, 1970)

A. Crancer, Jr., et al., "Comparison of the Effects of Marijuana and Alcohol on Simulated Driving Performance", "Science," May 16, 1969, p. 851.

Joel Fort, "Pot: A Rational Approach", "Playboy," Oct. 1969, p. 131.

Paul Goodman, "The New Reformation", "The New York Times Magazine", Sept. 4, 1969, p. 32.

Lester Grinspoon, "Marijuana", "Scientific American", December, 1969, p. 17.

A. T. Weil, N. E. Zinberg, and J. M. Nelsen, "Clinical and Psychological Effects of Marijuana in Man", "Science", Dec. 13, 1968, p. 1234.

Charles E. Wyzanski, "There's Only One Way to Deal With Marijuana", Harvard Alumni Bulletin, November 11, 1967, p. 12.

## EARTH DAY AND CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the successful achievement of the goals set by those participating in Earth Day will depend on commitments by private citizens, government agencies, and private corporations. One cannot act without the cooperation and support of the others.

I was particularly struck, this week, to read an eloquent address on the subject by J. Paul Austin, president of the Coca-Cola Co. Mr. Austin chose to speak to the Georgia Bankers Association on "Environmental Renewal or Oblivion—Quo Vadis?" at a meeting in Atlanta, Ga., April 16.

Mr. Austin had something to say to all of us about the need for action to improve our natural and man-made environments, and he outlined some steps his company is taking to meet that need. I commend his remarks to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL RENEWAL OR OBLIVION—QUO VADIS?

(An Address by J. Paul Austin)

I appreciate the invitation to speak to you Georgia Bankers, and I'm delighted to be with you.

Rather than invest my time today exploring some of the financial and economic pressures that face both of us—as bankers and businessmen—I would like, instead, to talk with you quite seriously about an even more pressing matter. This is one that involves us even more directly and far more personally, than matters of finance.

I'm talking about . . . our environment. This is the most urgent problem any of us has right now . . . not just as businessmen . . . but as human beings, as Americans who honestly care for this land of ours.

I do care about this country. And I'm concerned about what's happening to it.

My company shares this concern. And my purpose in speaking to you today is to publicly commit The Coca-Cola Company to active and honest programs which we sincerely believe will help reclaim—even renew—an environment which some say has already passed any point of possible return.

Most of us in this room have children. But, have we paused recently to reflect on the legacy we're creating for their generation? Have we thought much about the quality of the life they will enjoy—or be forced to endure—largely because of the decisions and acts you and I undertake . . . or worse, fail to attempt . . . during this decade of the 70s?

Not long ago I realized that my sons will reach my age sometime late in the first decade of the twenty-first century. A realization like this can bring a man up short. If you share my concern for the happiness, the hope and well-being that all today's children will find in their world of tomorrow, I know you'll agree that it's about time we began doing more than merely hoping that the world we leave them will still be hospitable to man. The hard facts, the stark evidence of environmental homicide that's emerging today indicates with painful reality that my sons may not find this a hospitable home at all.

By the time they're my age—when they should be enjoying real fulfillment and meaningful satisfaction in life—there may be little left on this world to be satisfied with.

Last year when this country put two men on the moon, I found myself transfixed by the televised pictures of that incredibly barren lunar landscape. How cold and utterly dead it seemed. And then I wondered, could that bleak terrain, with no natural life stirring anywhere between the eye of the camera and a distant, pock-marked horizon—could that same desolation someday be the look of this world? Someday—no matter how far in the future—might we look like that to a pair of alien explorers from another star system?

And what if that were the grim prospect for the future of earth? Wouldn't at least some of our children—or, maybe, their children—look to the stars as the only alternative to death on a dying planet?

While we don't now see interplanetary migration as a serious possibility for future generations, I can't help wondering if migration might someday become the only acceptable alternative. No matter for how few . . . some may well prefer the uncertainties of space to the predictable death right here.

Is this an overstatement of the imperatives for cleaning up our world? I don't think so. After all, what has man always done after he leached the land and so thoroughly fouled his water that it was no longer tolerable? He picked up and move. He has always been able to find another, more hospitable home on land that would grow lush crops—in a place where the streams hadn't yet been spoiled.

But man can move no more. Not on this world, anyway. Sure—there are the vast savannahs of the African wastes. And the perma-frost of barren Arctic reaches. There's still plenty of raw real estate around. But, until now, at least, man hasn't solved the problems of living on lands like these. That's why he's packed himself—and almost four billion like him—into only a fraction of Earth's total landmass. Perhaps that's also why he's submitted to the increasingly popular urge to rush, lemming-like, into the cities of his world. Already, we're told, over a fifth of the planet's entire population lives in cities of a hundred thousand or more.

Professor Kingsley Davis, one of the top authorities in the study of urban development, predicts that—if present trends continue—it will take only fifty-five years for everyone on Earth to be urbanized.

And that's frightening! Especially when you consider that within the lifetime of a child born this year—there will be some fifteen billion inhabitants on this incredibly delicate Earth.

So—to add to the manifold problems of land waste, the prodigal depletion of both land and water, and the all-too-visible carbonization of our air . . . we must also add geometric multiples of human beings. Vast hordes of humanity which must somehow be fed, housed, employed and coped with by each other.

Already, in this country, we're hearing strange-sounding names of tomorrow's super cities. Boswash will be the sprawl down the eastern seaboard from Boston to Washington. Chipitts is destined to be a single over-industrialized behemoth embracing Chicago on the west and Pittsburgh on the east. And Sansan is the name proposed for California's contribution to urban insanity. Sansan, we're told by the experts, will run along the Coast from San Francisco to San Diego.

And, as you know, the experts have usually been wrong in the past only when they underestimated the magnitude of future growth.

So, twenty-first century man may find himself faced with the necessity to colonize other planets if only because he's run out of room on this one. But, sadly, a glut of humanity is likely to be the least among his motivations to move.

Why? Simply because some of today's most eminent scientists are saying that the relatively few people on Earth right now are doing more than an adequate job of totally destroying their environment.

Even without another ten or twelve billion people, we're told we haven't much of a chance to survive . . . unless we make some dramatic commitments right now!

Who are these scientists? Who is behind all the environmental doomsday talk we're hearing today? And why are they seemingly going out of their way to get everybody all upset about the mess we're making of our environment?

There are two answers here. The scientists are ecologists. And they're shouting warnings at us because we're wasting our natural wealth . . . because, they tell us, we have no inkling of the enormity of the problem we've created—or, perhaps even more importantly—the terrifying and unacceptable consequences of our ecological ignorance and irresponsibility.

Now, let's take these one at a time. First ecology. What, exactly, is it?

The word was first used a hundred years ago to define the interrelationship of everything to everything else in nature.

Example? The rain and sunlight help plants to grow. The plants—through photosynthesis—help renew the air. The air helps purify the water. And the water irrigates the plants.

Everything around us is tied together in a closed system of interdependence. It's called an "ecosystem"—the sum total of all the living and nonliving parts that support a chain of life within a selected area.

Left undisturbed, an ecosystem will continue to operate indefinitely . . . with, as one of this country's top environmental scientists, Dr. Barry Commoner, puts it: "Everything connected to everything else." In fact, Dr. Commoner calls this simple equation "The First Law of Ecology."

Now, remember, undisturbed an ecosystem will continue to operate indefinitely. And there's the problem. Man hasn't—perhaps he can't—leave the system undisturbed.

The rewards of man's own system don't seem to allow a peaceful co-existence with nature. Or at least, man's attitudes and values he demonstrates everyday in seeking his rewards haven't operated in the best interests of his ecosystem!

Man is a doer. He's a road-builder, a house-builder, a tree-cutter; an industrious, hard-working chap whose very industry determines the size of his rewards. And, being rather selfish—or, shall I say, operating in his own self-interest, anyway—this doer, this creature with the big brain has chopped and hacked and paved and built . . . and polluted his way from one end of this once-virgin land of ours to the other.

So why not? Isn't that the way things simply are? Nobody is known to have achieved commercial greatness in this society by whiling away his hours beside some pastoral pond, Thoreau to the contrary, not withstanding.

Really . . . isn't that the popular, no-nonsense attitude . . . the industrialized heritage we've been taught since we were children? Yes, it is.

Hard driving free enterprise is a fine old tradition in this country. It's what's made this country what it is. So what is wrong with free-wheeling progress?

Maybe nothing is wrong with it but on the other hand, maybe the ecologists are trying to tell us something. They're telling us—in quiet, clear tones—that if we keep all this up, we're going to "advance" ourselves into oblivion. An oblivion comprised of undrinkable water and air that can't be breathed.

Listen to what they're saying. Think about some of the mid-twentieth century realities they're pointing out to us as we plunge headlong in pursuit of "progress."

They're telling us that, as a people, we're firing rockets at the moon—while standing knee deep in our own garbage.

They say man is the only creature in nature who, apparently with great foresight and planning, dumps that same garbage into his drinking water.

Researchers point out that right now—in the breasts of this country's young mothers—there is human milk containing from three to ten times more pesticide residues than the government will allow in cow's milk meant for human consumption.

Ecologists are disturbed over the decline and disappearance of whole species. Fish, fowl and other types of wildlife are finding it increasingly more difficult to adapt to an unnatural environment which rots fins and gills—an environment where unprecedented concentrations of death-dealing chemicals mutate the young.

And, recalling that first law of ecology—that everything is connected with everything else in nature—we're beginning to understand that there is no such thing as an isolated act.

Large amounts of pesticides—not merely traces—are found today in the freezing waters of Antarctica where none has ever been used before.

It is said that this country alone is clearing, paving and—if you still buy the term—"improving" some three thousand acres a day. Plants and trees on these once-lush tracts are lost forever. They're oxygen producers, remember. And some very responsible scientists are expressing real fear that, if this

wholesale land improvement continues at our present rate for a few more years, there won't be enough oxygen in either the air or the sea to sustain life.

Now, you know why I am so upset about environmental pollution. However, let me be even more specific.

I'm concerned . . . because you and I are killing each other, and I'm deadly serious when I say that. Unless you and I and every other responsible American—especially those who guide the policies of our major corporations and those who sit in the halls of our councils, legislatures and the Congress—unless all of us begin immediately to reverse the processes of impending self-destruction which we have set in motion—this green land of ours will become a graveyard!

The youth of this country know what the stakes are. They're upset. And they're indignant over our apparent unconcern. Whole student populations are engaging in protests and demonstrations against those who compound their transgressions of pollution with an abysmal ignorance of man's responsibility to his environment.

Why? Because it's their world we're wasting. And, to put it mildly, they don't like it a bit!

There's a nationwide "Environmental teach-in" planned for the twenty-second of this month—just six days from now. On that day—on over a thousand college and university campuses all over America—lecturers, seminars, demonstrations and discussions will be devoted entirely to the preservation of our environment.

This sort of thing hasn't happened before. Not on this scale. Not with the planning, organization and thought that's been put into this collegiate effort to enlighten and illuminate.

And I commend our young people for their awareness and perspicacity. They have done all of us a service by pushing the panic button.

But wnat are we going to do—now that we have some idea of the magnitude of the problems that face us?

The President of the United States—in his State of the Union message to the Congress last January—called for a broad federal program designed to help clean up our land, air and water. He has since proposed legislation which would implement parts of this mammoth program. And this is not a bad beginning. But that's really all it is.

The government can't solve our problem. The government has been trying to do something about pollution and environmental decay since the first administration of Teddy Roosevelt.

The people, though, can do something. And it will take the best effort of every individual and corporate citizen to do what must be done.

Of course, there are the "doomsdayers" who say nothing will prevent "ecocide"—the death of the environment. Others claim that, since ecological destruction is so intimately linked with over-population and over-production, the only answer is a zero population increase and a stable Gross National Product. And it may be that they're right.

But, before ultimate measures such as these are imposed on us, shouldn't we at least attempt some determined solutions of our own?

I'm convinced we must! And the Corporate policies of The Coca-Cola Company reflect our commitment to employ substantial technological, financial and human resources as a responsible corporate citizen.

In setting our policy and stating our commitment. The Coca-Cola Company accepts a dual responsibility.

We acknowledge and accept the responsibility for having been a limited contributor to the problems in the past. But, at the same time, the Company accepts the responsibility to set its own house in order.

Those aren't mere high-sounding pleasantries to be forgotten or ignored by this time tomorrow. Those are commitments! Commitments to be met while discharging our responsibility to our stockholders to operate our business at a reasonable profit level.

As you know, we manufacture the syrups which our Bottlers mix with water to make soft drinks. Water—good, clean, potable, unpolluted water: it's vital to the operation of our business.

For almost half a century, we've been studying the water in this country and in the one hundred thirty-five other countries where our products are sold. We know what's happening to water. That's why it's standard practice for Coca-Cola Bottling Plants to filter water before it's mixed with syrup and bottled or canned.

So—we're not entirely altruistic in our approach to the preservation of our environment. We freely admit that the profit motive and the desire to remain in business has played a major role in the decision to commit ourselves to the cause of environmental renewal.

Very well, what are we doing to fulfill that commitment?

First let's talk about cleaning up our air and water.

The Coca-Cola Company has been involved in its own programs of environmental renewal for a long time now. And over a year ago we began looking for a way to get into the business of pollution control, itself, through merger with a leading firm in this field.

Now, The Coca-Cola Company expects to enter the business of pollution control, itself, through an agreement to merge with The Aqua-Chem Company of Milwaukee. This anticipated merger represents a substantial investment for us—about one hundred fifty million dollars.

Aqua-Chem is the world's leading manufacturer of "packaged" steam and hot water generating systems—systems which produce no toxic effluent or airborne pollution of any kind and which require no smoke stack.

As a result of their leadership and experience in making these generating and heating systems, Aqua-Chem found it a natural progression to the fume-free incinerator. Like their generating systems, this unusual incinerator gives off no smoke, no fumes and no odors.

There's an experimental unit on test in one of our midwestern cities right now. And—assuming this test proves successful—the Aqua-Chem Company may be on the way to offering a large, commercial incinerator that will provide both pollution-free disposal and a source of energy created by the intense heat that's generated during the total combustion process.

In addition to these advances in pollution control, Aqua-Chem is also a leader in the development and production of water desalination and purification equipment.

Just recently a true breakthrough was made by the Company. It's the discovery of a new application for a process called "reverse osmosis." This special application is still in the developmental stage.

But, with this revolutionary process—which may take Aqua-Chem into a whole new area of its basic business—the Company should be able to produce economical water purification devices for both industrial and consumer applications.

There may be a small, compact model for the kitchen of the home—as well as huge sands of gallons of clear, pharmaceutically clean water a day.

Now it is possible for industry to clean its waste water—not only efficiently and inexpensively, but even at a profit!

One test installation is in a Wisconsin paper mill where, as you can imagine, the effluent from manufacturing is highly polluted. But, by purifiying this effluent, the mill is able to recapture chemicals used in the making of paper. It costs the mill $100 a day to operate the water purification equipment, but they recoup $500 a day in reusable chemicals. Instead of dumping syrupy, brown water into a nearby river and, eventually, into Lake Michigan, the mill is now discharging water that's so pure you can drink it!

When you introduce profits into pollution control, you radically change the environmental equation.

Most legislatures and the Congress have shown a degree of leniency in dealing with pollutors up to now. But I don't think any of us doubts that stronger legislation is bound to come. And, if industry can both conform to the requirements of new laws—and earn a profit in the bargain—it would seem to be just good business to anticipate these changes.

In fact, with profit incentives to clean up their industrial effluents, it may well become indefensible for companies to corrupt their environments.

But the manufacture of devices to control air and water pollution isn't the main business of The Coca-Cola Company.

Our main business is soft drinks. We're also in the coffee, tea, orange juice and food business through divisions of our Company.

And recently we completed a comprehensive study of all our operations in the United States to determine where and how we were contributing to pollution . . . of any kind. This study, by the way, was initiated by the Company over two years ago.

Our Corporate goal—and a priority that's right at the top of our list—is to stop any form of pollution . . . anywhere it exists in our entire Company . . . and to stop it as fast as money and technology will allow.

But let me tell you briefly what we discovered in our study—and what we're doing about our findings

Our Foods Division produces citrus products—orange juice and others—along with coffee.

And our study showed that—in our coffee roasting plants—there is smoke and odor being generated.

We're going to eliminate these entirely.

In our citrus operations in Florida, we found that so-called "weak wastes" from washing down our equipment was a potential problem. So we've asked one of Aqua-Chem's top engineers to study the situation and find a way for us to use some of their technology to clean up the problem.

Incidentally, we recently received a Gold Medal Award from The Sports Foundation—a non-profit membership association dedicated to conservation in the interest of outdoor sports. Our award recognized the contribution to conservation that's being made by an elaborate water treatment system we operate in one of our Florida citrus processing plants. In addition, we are continuing to cooperate with state water quality control engineers in order to utilize more sophisticated pollution control technology to further insure that all operations at this plant, and other similar plants, will meet existing regulations and exceed them, if possible.

In our Tenco Division, we produce instant tea and coffee.

In our coffee operations, we even use the "spent" coffee ground as fuel to generate heat and power for the plant. And we use after-burners for total combustion of the gasses coming off the roasting ovens.

But once we've extracted the tea from our tea leaves, we dispose of them in a private, sanitary land fill. This is the proper and recommended way to do it, but we think there may be a way to liberate nutritive values from the "spent" leaves. If there is, we may be able to come up with a new component for cattle feed.

In our domestic soft drink division, Coca-Cola USA, we find that virtually the only effluent from our operations is in the airborne exhausts of our trucks and other vehicles.

While there isn't now an efficient device to eliminate lead and hydrocarbon emissions from the internal combustion engine, I can pledge that—as soon as one is developed—this Company will lead the way in putting it on our entire corporate fleet. Our franchised bottlers will willingly follow our lead.

At this moment, over ninety percent of all our Company-owned bottling plants are recycling both glass and paper waste material. Paper, of course, is used in the cartons, can wraps and other packaging that surrounds our glass and cans in shipment and on dealers' shelves. Ninety percent of our own plants are returning glass and paper to manufacturers for re-use.

Ninety-five percent of the bottling plants owned by The Coca-Cola Company are recycling the old crankcase oil that's drained from our trucks. The oil, too, is returned to the manufacturer—the refining company—for purification and re-use. This means that we don't dump it down a drain where it could add to the pollution of rivers and streams.

It's a fact of our Corporate life that soft drinks must be put in some form of container before they can be distributed, sold and consumed.

Soft drinks are packaged in several types of containers: returnable and one-way glass bottles—and in cans made of various materials. And, because the glass, aluminum and steel used in our containers are rather sturdy materials—and because the brightly colored decoration on a can or the unique shape of our bottle doesn't deteriorate as readily as paper containers—the packaging for our products is highly visible.

As a result, we're criticized more than many other manufacturers. But there's evidence—from a recent survey of the roadside debris in twenty-nine states—that soft drink containers account for only about five percent of the total highway litter. This study—conducted by the Highway Research Board, the National Research Council and the National Academy of Sciences—disclosed that only three percent of the litter was comprised of soft drink cans and only two percent was soft drink bottles.

So, even if there were no such thing as the soft drink industry, it appears that we'd still have ninety-five percent of the litter problem we're faced with now.

But we don't deny that the bright red can and the familiar bottle are a part of the problem. And we've been taking steps designed to reduce their numbers in places where they don't belong.

In fact, back in the mid-60s, when it became clear that consumers would demand more and more convenience—and that non-returnable, "convenience" packaging would become an increasingly large part of our total market—we began an intensive program to study the problem of litter and what we could do to help minimize our contribution to the problem.

In 1966 we assigned a senior executive of The Coca-Cola Company to learn more about litter and to formulate ways we could help hold it in check.

What have we learned? What are we doing?

Well, for one thing, we've learned that litter probably won't be reduced appreciably until the consumer has a greater awareness of the problem and his part in it.

So, our Company, other members of the soft drink industry and the manufacturers of the containers we use are right now launching a major effort to inform the consumer and, hopefully to motivate him to do his part in helping reduce the volume of litter.

Here are two specific examples of this cooperative effort to inform and motivate the consumer.

First—can manufacturers are right now underwriting a sizeable re-tooling expense which will result in the tops of all our cans being embossed with the message, "Please don't litter—dispose of properly."

It's our hope that consumers—seeing this request as they enjoy our products—will do as we ask and dispose of the container properly.

One can manufacturer has even mounted a major recycling program for its used containers.

And what about one-way bottles?

The Coca-Cola Company has created special advertising for several parts of the country which seeks to promote the sale of returnable bottles.

Since one-way bottles carry no deposit value, these are the glass packages most frequently thrown away by the consumer.

The thrust of this special advertising asks the question, "Wouldn't you rather borrow our bottle than buy it?" And I think this sort of appeal—tied to economy and value—should help reduce the number of one-way glass bottles that wind up as litter.

Even so, cans and one-way bottles comprise only about thirty percent of our Company's total sales of packaged soft drinks. That's in this country. Abroad, our products are sold almost exclusively in returnable bottles.

The returnable bottle built our business. And most returnables still do return.

At any given time, something over ninety percent of all the returnable bottles leaving our bottling plants do come back. However, this figure does vary from market to market. And the return of our bottles depends heavily on consumer and retailer cooperation.

And even though it's far more economical for consumers to buy our products in these returnable packages, some of our dealers—supermarkets and convenience stores—find it more desirable to handle one-way bottles and cans.

And, as I've already said, we're well aware of the demand by many consumers for convenience. That's why we refer to non-returnable containers as "convenience" packages. There's no deposit on them and consumers don't have to bring them back to the store.

But there's an even larger issue here. It's the issue of solid waste disposal and the degradability of containers.

Glass and cans are not degradable. Some cans will eventually oxidize, but even then, the materials of which they're made don't return to nature as realistically re-usable resources.

And there aren't any serious prospects for truly degradable soft drink containers. Not now, anyway. But we are working on this and we have a number of research teams attacking this problem of degradability.

In the meantime, we're trying still another approach to the disposal of one-way bottles. This involves a special grinding apparatus which we recently had made for use in conducting an unusual test.

This test is already underway with a unique device which grinds up glass containers. Two of these units are in place at a supermarket in one of Atlanta's large shopping centers. Consumers bring their one-way glass containers with them when they come to shop. These containers then will be ground up by the machines.

The ultimate?

Sand. It isn't quite fine enough—or highly polished enough—to be used in playgrounds yet. But we're working on improvements to the process which may eventually enable us to make safe, inexpensive playground sand out of bottles.

Meanwhile, this material has several other applications.

One is in the manufacture of asphalt. It's a perfect matrix material. It's cheap, reasonably consistent in size, and it can be produced in plentiful quantities.

Roads made from old bottles? It's more than just possible.

One more thing on packaging: We've been working for some time now with a leading chemical company in experiments with a plastic bottle. This innovative package has only now gone into some limited consumer testing. But it may be that—within a few years—we'll be able to offer consumers a soft drink container that can be incinerated without giving off any noxious gas, fumes or smoke in the process.

So, you see . . . we are working at it. We've been working at it for years. We were involved in our own anti-pollution programs long before it became a fashionable or expedient cause to espouse. Again, what have we been doing?

Trying to find new ways for this Company to serve the best interests of our environment . . . new ways to prevent our contributing any further to the problems of pollution . . . new ways to more responsibly share in the task of environmental renewal that's ahead.

But no Company—no matter how large or influential—can do more than share in this task. I believe this Company is doing its share in attacking the problems of our environment. And we're glad to see other responsible companies joining us in this effort.

But, more than just the corporations of this country, each of us . . . as individuals . . . must commit himself and actively get involved in the massive job that's ahead.

We can no longer accommodate the selfish acts and unthinking environmental waste of which each of us is guilty. We have to change! And this may well require—even demand—some basic revisions in our traditional attitudes. But, whatever it takes, we must require it of ourselves . . . and, if necessary . . . enforce it with others.

That's what I was talking about when I said earlier that, for The Coca-Cola Company, this is a time of meaningful commitment. We are responsibly policing our own acts, and—through both our leadership and our innovation—we hope to join forces with all those who share our determination that this world shall not become just another lifeless planet.

For the only alternative to commitment and intelligent action now may be the possibility of extinguishing ourselves through ignorance and indifference.

And no matter what future technology may give us—even the ability to colonize among the stars—I still want my sons and yours to enjoy their lives right here . . . and to remember that we acted responsibly to insure the well-being of their and all future generations.

But, I cannot conclude without pointing out the bright prospect that shines through the dark cloud. We are a nation of optimists, and even in this dim perspective, there is an overriding potential benefit that we can reap.

Several years ago, a major publication asked a number of historians and social scientists to define the national purpose of the United States. The conclusion reached was most unhappy: i.e., that we don't have a national purpose except in time when we are in a world war.

However, today the facts have changed. Environmental control offers a national purpose. Pollution is the sole common danger that confronts us all . . . spares no one, no institution, or individual . . . is recognized by every segment of our society . . . and can unite us all in a common goal.

There is no political spectrum here . . . no color line . . . no generation gap . . . no public-private sector conflict . . . no urban-rural clash . . . no "haves" and "have nots" . . . no doves and hawks in this issue. We share this fragile issue braided together.

Thus saving our environment can give us

a national purpose. It is the one crisis . . . the unique challenge . . . that can knit this nation together again. It can give us a vital national goal . . . give us all a new sense of purpose, of sharing and of accomplishment.

It is the absolute crisis that demands the total support of young and old . . . of people and government . . . of management and labor . . . of small town and metropolis . . . of black and white. It knows no politics. The stakes are high, but the rewards are not only the physical survival of the species but also the spiritual renewal of the nation.

We must begin now. We must begin together. There is no place to hide.

## ADJOURNMENT TO 11:30 A.M., MONDAY, APRIL 27, 1970

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11:30 a.m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 27, 1970. at 11:30 a.m.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 21, 1970:

### U.S. Coast Guard

The following-named officers of the Coast Guard to be permanent commissioned officers in the grade of chief warrant officer, W–2.

Roland W. Callis
James H. Thomson
Richard C. Motter
William B. Clow
Robert C. Herold
Malcolm W. Gray
Lavere E. Amundson
John F. Weseman
Karl Kaufman
Donald L. Dobbs
Robert B. Swart
John S. Wenter
Philip K. Hauenstein
Donald A. Kirkham
John H. McLaughlin
Robert W. Baine
Richard B. Petersen
John G. Gaskill
Kenneth H. Kramer, Jr.
Francis G. O'Hearn
Charles H. Thompson
Roland E. Miller, Jr.
Manual G. Macara, Jr.
Ellis A. Gray, Jr.
Carl A. Wade
Joseph F. Newsome
Arthur W. Stokes
John R. Koehler
John T. Crowe
John M. Lehman
Hubert C. Jackson
James G. Kirby
Richard E. Carrier
James L. Herron
Herman J. Murphy
Frank D. Goolsby
Alfred G. Addy
Jack R. Kirk
Jerry D. Fisch
Steve J. Avilla
Mark C. Dennis
William F. Doyle, Jr.
Harold E. Helfrich
Roger L. Lanier
Harold Z. Parker
Gary L. Elliott
Rexford W. Altman
Dan G. Lents
Dale S. Draa
Oscar N. Skelton
Floyd W. Hayden
Stuart W. Clarke
Robert O. Horst
David H. Martin
Julius Alama
Paul E. Sparrow
Robert P. Edgar
Donald E. Bay
Joseph W. James
Donald M. Warren
George E. Cain, Jr.
Loyd S. Williams
James C. Tanner
John H. Fenter
James A. Walker
Eugene A. Mellott
William R. Beers, Jr.
John D. Klemm
William A. DeGeorge
Eugene B. Crawford
Darwin G. Asch
Billy F. Rawlinson
Richard E. Irwin
Eugene B. Murray
Irvin J. A. Treadway
Gerald L. Colton
Wayne J. Ayers
Edward T. McArthur
Thurman L. Knight, Jr.
William R. Brantley
Gordon M. Snook
Donald L. Nolan
Donald R. Strange
James N. Defries
John H. Peabody
James A. Arthur
Robert J. Covert
Robert K. Critchlow
Ray L. Buckner
Royce W. Fulcher
Robert E. Osterberg
Robert D. Harwell
Lowell R. Andrews
Richard D. Rebele
John W. Harm
William E. Garrett
Donald M. Hanley
Melvin L. Ferguson
Edward E. Laycock
Donald L. McMillin
David T. Daniels
John E. O'Donnell
Aubrey E. Fussell
Christopher Maropis
Guy O. Seago
Gene I. Goodwin
Clark C. Logsden
William C. Henning, Jr.
James D. Grimes, Jr.
Wilfred J. Laufenberg
Kent D. Vallier
Robert E. Dailey
Robert R. Raby
Frederick L. Regan
John W. Babcock, Jr.
William F. Haygood, Jr.
Jack L. Elam
Robert W. Jackson
Charles L. Kidd, Jr.
Alvin K. Johnson
Robert V. Kassela
Damian T. Sarchiapone
William M. Dukes
Leroy Rosa
Stanley M. Pridham
Weyland D. Logue
Elmer A. Stevens
Leo L. Whaley, Jr.
Pernell J. Perry
Allen L. Smith
John R. Hearn
Delbert A. Riley
Robert M. St. John
William A. Sturgis
James B. Zipfel
Carl R. Green
Frederick P. Pitts
Gene F. Lewis
William R. Shaffer
Brian C. Curtis
John L. Anglin
Alex Z. Walker, Jr.

The following-named officers of the Coast Guard to be permanent commissioned officers in the grade of chief warrant officer, W–3.

Giles M. Vanderhooff
Lyn E. Nicholson
Robert W. Jackson
George M. Miley, Jr.
Jack W. Gildersleeve
Augusta L. Duncan
Kenneth A. Parkin
Frank W. Thompson
Worth H. Hopkins
Edward L. Goodrich
James L. Dorsey
Gerald D. Kaarstad
Thomas E. Stringer, Jr.
Anthony J. Maglione
David R. Cheyne
Clyde R. Hutton
Michael J. O'Donnell
Clarence L. Moulton
Toshio Mitsunaga
Donald E. Darnauer
Victor F. Lane
Paul R. McKenna
Lawerence H. Borelis
Artis Copeland
Charles R. Martin
Russell V. Gilbert
Nicholas L. B. Galash
John H. Edwards
John R. Arnold
Edgar B. Mason
Seben Griffin, Jr.
Harland D. Speer
Robert E. Behrens
Amos R. Daniels
Francis A. France
William T. Burnette, Jr.
Raymond A. Hughes, Sr.
Carroll H. Holst, Jr.
Richard T. Lyon
Raymond J. Duplin
Robert B. Jordan
Harold D. Lineweber
Rex F. Wall
Robert J. Jones
Thomas J. Borbrowski
Floyd C. Greenfield
Kenneth J. Harker
James V. Shilley
Kilby T. Guthrie
Robert O. Backlin
Gary P. Day
Richard T. Shannon
Edward T. Kassick
David M. Donaldson
Lee R. Oliver
David M. Peake
David L. Heinecke
William M. Crumrine
Donald D. Olson
Dennis E. Coughlin
Samuel L. Clark
Horace C. Webb
Casimir Malinovsky
Neil J. Dodge
Robert C. Rescola
Robert C. Collins
Lonnie K. Johnson
Rodney L. Harter
Thomas A. Bozeman
Everette H. Hoins
Louis J. Jensen
Clarence M. Pope
Harold T. Cogburn
Frank W. Slaney
William G. Parr
Tomas K. Jahn
Donnie R. Weitzel
Richard L. Jonas
Gerald F. Perry
Tom W. Shelton
John W. Spreter
Dan R. Riksen
David N. Russell
Robert I. Young
Paul F. Burden
Colin J. Woodbury
Ronald D. Ricker
Ernest C. Card
Peter J. Anderson
Pleasant A. Lewis, Jr.
William C. Pless
Ernest P. Joyce
Richard J. Bebble
Jerry L. Furey
Robert C. Simpson
Gordon M. Schreiber
Don L. Siena
Donald L. Schmidt
Fred L. Sanders
Dale U. Duren
Rudolph Eberwein, Jr.
Louis A. Nataro
Maxwell B. Ferrill, Jr.
Bobbie W. Evans
John Norman Edens
Mitchel Arnold, Jr.
James W. Bailey
Wilbur A. Yoast
Clifford A. Emert
William L. Lett
Daniel Ing
Joseph J. Welsh
Reginald T. Hensley
Robert E. Barbutti
Richard G. Pelley
Robert C. Curtz
Thomas G. Henderson
Festus L. Snead
John P. Fitzgerald
Donald H. Jones
Edmond B. Paradis, Jr.
Thomas C. Calderwood
Jesse A. Moffett
Lynn C. Oliver
Leon R. Cisek
Malcolm I. Simmons
Lennis L. Getchell
William F. Collier
John R. Manyon
Foy A. Stiewig
Leonidas M. Patton
George H. Wilp
Robert A. Swanson
William C. Russell, Jr.
William Sneller
William F. Young
Louie J. Weber
William K. Herrell
Leonard W. Flood
William F. Madigan
James W. Knapp
Horace O. Rawls
William H. Gill
George A. Nicholson
Kenneth E. Clark
Fred B. Eidson
Roger E. Cowley, Jr.
Thomas J. Lynn
Robert W. Baine
Myron G. Colburn, Jr.
James R. Seward
Harold R. Packer
Eugene P. Bishop
Ernest D. McLawhorn
Kyran P. Kane
Odom E. Nowlin
John W. Acuff
Harold L. Skinner
Edward L. Ferguson, Jr.
Ronald P. Vancamp
James T. McAndrews
Donald H. Yonkie, Jr.
William E. Davis
Jack N. Bond
Robert C. Hoffman
Alex Z. Walker, Jr.
Roger L. Kennedy
Ellis W. Grimes
Lywald W. Hendricks
Michael J. Schiel
Larry E. Martin
Harry F. Schmecht
Roland W. Callis
George S. McDowell, Jr.
William R. Paul
James M. Hough
James H. Thomson
Winston G. Churchill
Richard C. Motter
Jerry L. Echols
William B. Clow

The following-named officers of the Coast Guard to be permanent commissioned officers in the grade of chief warrant officer, W–4.

Bobbie L. Bentley
Allie C. Woodcock
George E. Montfort
Donald K. Byrd
Owen M. Halstad
John E. Cutright
Clifford E. Reeves
Carl A. Powers
Charles E. Fulcher
Eugene O. Thorson
John R. Scott, Jr.
John R. McMahon
Wallis N. Zimmerman
Delbert F. Summers
Joseph E. Bruce
Daniel M. Wirzburger
Allen V. Walker, Jr.
Edward H. Monson
William Jackson
Raymond W. Nickerson
Burr K. Vail
Elmer Berrish
Loyd B. Reach, Jr.
Allen W. Craven
Forrest E. Colbath
Billy Hopper
Wayne E. Nunnenkamp
Edward E. Godlewski
Edgar L. Parker
Dale E. McElfresh
Richard B. Page
Robert J. Baker
Arnold Brooks
Robert T. Gray
Warren G. Berto
Henry E. Brunet
Carl F. Baker
Jack G. Albert
Ernest C. Moore III
Alfred E. Schreiber
Paul W. Licking
Thomas J. Hummel
Orrin E. Starr
James C. Myers
John P. Higman, Jr.
Herbert E. Roche
Charles C. Stephenson
Alex Z. Walker, Jr.

The following-named Reserve officers to be permanent commissioned officers of the Coast Guard in the grade indicated:

*To be lieutenant commander*

John H. Murphy

*To be lieutenant*

Barrett T. Beard
Scott D. McCowen

Executive nomination received in the Senate April 22, 1970:

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

*To be general*

Gen. Earle Gilmore Wheeler, [redacted] Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 23, 1970:

### U.S. Circuit Judge

Wilbur F. Pell, Jr., of Indiana, to be a U.S. circuit judge, seventh circuit.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

Howard B. Turrentine, of California, to be a U.S. district judge for the southern district of California.

Warren K. Urbom, of Nebraska, to be a U.S. district judge for the district of Nebraska.

Joseph F. Weis, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be a U.S. district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania.

Andrew W. Bogue, of South Dakota, to be U.S. district judge for the district of South Dakota.

James L. Oakes, of Vermont, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Vermont.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Robert L. Meyer, of California, to be U.S. attorney for the central district of California for the term of 4 years.

D. Dwayne Keyes, of California, to be U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of California for the term of 4 years.

Robert E. Hauberg, of Mississippi, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Mississippi for the term of 4 years.

A. Roby Hadden, of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Texas for a term of 4 years.

U.S. MARSHALS

William B. Henderson, of Kentucky, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Kentucky for the term of 4 years.

Joseph W. Keene, of Louisiana, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Louisiana for the term of 4 years.

John A. Birknes, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Massachusetts for the term of 4 years.

Anthony T. Greski, of New Jersey, to be U.S. marshal for the district of New Jersey for the term of 4 years.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. C. R. Walker, First Baptist Church, Marion, Ill., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, and our God, God of this Nation and all nations, we bow before Thee with grateful hearts for our many blessings. We thank Thee for this great Nation with all its resources, opportunities, and people. Give to us a spirit within to match the resources without.

As we confront the problems of this day, grant us the grace and courage to seek first the kingdom of God that we may be enriched in our Nation with a great spiritual heritage. Then make us humble in the acceptable of that heritage.

Instill the moral integrity and courage in these our leaders to stand for the hard right against any easy or expedient wrong that might seem attractive.

In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 21, 1970, was read and approved.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on April 15, 1970, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

On April 15, 1970:

H.R. 16612. An act to amend the District of Columbia Bail Agency Act to provide additional funds for the District of Columbia Bail Agency for fiscal year 1970.

## THE REVEREND C. R. WALKER

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

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate your courtesy in recognizing me at this time. I wish to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Dr. Latch, our beloved Chaplain of the House of Representatives, for permitting one of southern Illinois' finest ministers, the Reverend C. R. Walker, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Marion, Ill., to give the invocation today.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out the fact that in our busy lives so many times we overlook the great work done by our spiritual leaders. I again want to thank you and our beloved Chaplain of the House, Dr. Latch, for giving us the opportunity of bringing in from our congressional districts these able servants of His service royale to help us in our spiritual guidance. Reverend Walker is a lifelong friend and is a leader in his own right. He does this great body honor by his presence.

## APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 2062, ADMINISTRATION OF ACREAGE LIMITATION OF FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAW

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2062) to provide for the differentiation between private and public ownership of lands in the administration of the acreage limitation provisions of Federal reclamation law, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ASPINALL, JOHNSON of California, FOLEY, HOSMER, and MCCLURE.

## APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 743, TOUCHET DIVISION, WALLA WALLA PROJECT, OREGON-WASHINGTON

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 743) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Touchet division, Walla Walla project, Oregon-Washington, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ASPINALL, JOHNSON of California, FOLEY, HOSMER, and BURTON of Utah.

## PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 17123, MILITARY PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATIONS, 1971, UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight Friday to file a report on the bill (H.R. 17123) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1971 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

## APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 515, TO AMEND THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT AND THE CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 515) to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to clarify responsibilities related to providing free and reduced-price meals and preventing discrimination against children, to revise program matching requirements, to strengthen the nutrition training and education benefits of the programs, and otherwise to strengthen the food service programs for children in schools and service institutions, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, am I correct in my understanding that this has been cleared with the ranking minority member of the committee, and that he is totally in agreement with the conference?

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PERKINS, PUCINSKI, WILLIAM D. FORD, AYRES, and QUIE.

## PROVIDING FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN INTERNATIONAL QUARANTINE STATION

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2306) to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment to the House amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment to the House amendment, as follows:

Page 3, line 12, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "and the Virgin Islands." and insert: ", Guam, and the Virgin Islands, contrary to the conditions prescribed by the Secretary in regulations issued hereunder."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment to the House amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## JUNK MAIL POLLUTION

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, junk mail pollution is a major contributor to the ecological crisis on which this Nation is focusing attention this week.

To begin with, millions of trees must be cut down to produce all the junk which crams your mailbox, bends the backs of the letter carriers, and adds to the burdens of the taxpayers. Second, all these gimmicks, contests, prizes, and pressures used by junk mail are only designed to force the purchase of more and more items which add to the solid waste disposal problem. Then the trash has to be burned, thereby polluting the air.

We must wake up and realize that progress can no longer be measured in the sheer quantity of goods produced. The quality of American life and the protection of our environment are higher goals which must be accorded higher priority.

The junk mail lawyers and lobbyists have now been joined by the accountants who are now trying to prove that junk mail does pay its way. This mumbo-jumbo of the accountants avoids the main issue which is that junk mail pollution is a threat to the quality of American life and a threat to our environment. Junk mail is such an outrageous nuisance that a heavy nuisance tax should be placed on junk mailers for insulting the American people by deluging them with millions of pieces of unwanted junk every day.

Let us end junk pollution. You get fined if you throw litter on somebody else's front lawn; what about littering people's mailboxes?

## RULES OF DESTRUCTION

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent editorial which appeared in the Santa Maria, Calif. Times. It is as follows:

[From the Santa Maria, Calif. Times, Apr. 17, 1970]

RULES OF DESTRUCTION

We received a note from a woman this week in which she enclosed an interesting bulletin which shows how long and in what manner Communism has aimed at our destruction.

The bulletin noted that in 1919 allied forces obtained some Communist rules for revolution. As you read the rules, think about the conditions in the country today and consider the rules in relation to those conditions.

We quote the Red rules.

A. Corrupt the young, get them interested in sex. Make them superficial; destroy their ruggedness.

B. Get control of all means of publicity, thereby get people's minds off their government by focusing their attention on athletics, sexy books and plays and other trivialities.

C. Divide the people into hostile groups by constantly harping on controversial matters of no importance.

D. Destroy the people's faith in their natural leaders by holding them up to contempt and ridicule.

E. Always preach true Democracy, but seize power as fast and as ruthless as possible.

F. By encouraging government extravagence, destroy its credit, produce fear of inflation with rising prices and general discontent.

G. Promote unnecessary strikes in vital industries, encourage civil disorders and foster a lenient and soft attitude on the government toward such disorders.

H. By spacious argument cause breakdown of the moral virtues, honesty, sobriety, continence, faith in the pledged word.

I. Cause the registration of all firearms on some pretext, with a view to confiscating them and leaving the population helpless.

The note, sent by Jane Tackitt of Nipomo, ended with the comment, "My prayer for the nation is that young people wake up and see how they are being used, and then strike back for America."

We concur, emphatically.

## DATE PERISHABLE PACKAGED FOODS FOR BENEFIT OF CONSUMER

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

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is time to break the code on food products, to date-stamp them so that shoppers will know whether the canned and packaged goods on their grocers' shelves are outdated.

The average housewife does not have the time to become a cryptanalyst, deciphering these often hard-to-find, and usually impossible to understand, coded date stamps on perishable products.

Surveys have revealed that such coded dates, placed there for the benefit of store employees to indicate when perishable products should be removed from sale, may consist of a short series of numbers, a series of letters, or both, and that they may indicate either the packaging date or the last day of "shelf life" of the product.

The food industry should let the most important involved—the consumer—know the truth about the last usable date of any perishable product. There should not be any secret about the freshness of our food. The bill I am introducing today would require that all perishable or semiperishable foods be clearly labeled as to expiration date and would include all meat, poultry, fish, dairy products, eggs, fruit, vegetables, bread, coffee, or any other foods the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may designate as perishable or semiperishable.

## HAPPY EARTH DAY

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was Earth Day and the emphasis was on our environment, what we can do to preserve it, to clean it up, to keep it livable.

Many different groups were involved in programs yesterday at many schools and many different places across the Nation. People make debris, and the same people are primarily responsible for cleaning it up.

Hopefully, this was the start of a real, long range effort by people, by civic groups, by business and by government at all levels to make our world a better place in which to live.

Hopefully, this is not just the latest fad of young people, tired of marching and demonstrating in other causes, hopefully, it is not just another gimmick perpetrated by ambitious politicians or a worried people.

There is no doubt today that man has fouled large segments of his planet pretty thoroughly. We have dirtied the air, we have polluted the water, and we have cluttered the landscape.

Fortunately, it is not too late to do something about it. Certainly this Republican administration recognizes that fact and has called for action on many fronts.

I would hope this Congress would also take up the challenge seriously and approve the programs that are necessary to do the job. If we do not join with the President in taking the necessary leadership, we cannot ask the people of America to join in the task that must be done.

## MAKE IT UNPROFITABLE FOR BUSINESS OR GOVERNMENT TO POLLUTE OUR ENVIRONMENT

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

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that those groups and individuals that yesterday celebrated Earth Day will make a positive contribution for years to the cause of cleaning up our environment.

It is easy to place the blame for pollution, much easier than it is to enunciate practical cures.

We all recognize the causes of some pollution—the auto, the factory, the oil spill.

But the answer is not banning the auto, or closing down the plant or ending commercial uses of oil.

The answer lies in controlling the technology we have developed and using it, not to destroy our environment, but to preserve it.

The answer lies in coordinating controls, setting standards, and developing effective, enforceable laws that make it unprofitable for anyone or any business or any government to pollute our environment.

Mr. Speaker, while the duty to improve our environment lies with all of us, the leadership lies here, with the President and with the Congress. The President has already sent to us his proposals and his program. I would hope that we here in the Congress will live up to our responsibilities by acting quickly on them.

## NORTH CAROLINA COAST GUARD APPRECIATION DAY

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

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on April 18, the State of North Carolina officially recognized the dedicated and courageous service rendered by the U.S. Coast Guard to our State and to the Nation during its 100-year history.

The occasion was Coast Guard Appreciation Day, proclaimed by Governor Scott with appropriate ceremonies in Morehead City, in my congressional district.

So far as the Coast Guard has been able to determine, this is the first time any State has ever taken official action to show its appreciation for its service.

It was a well-planned and well-organized affair which required considerable time and effort by many people. In my judgment, it was a highly appropriate and effectively executed means of showing to the officers and men of the U.S. Coast Guard the respect and esteem in which their service is held by the government and the people of North Carolina.

Representing as it does the efforts of so many, it is always dangerous to single out one or two persons for praise and appreciation on an occasion of this nature, but credit should certainly go to Mr. Bob Campbell, of Morehead City, who first suggested the idea, and Mr. J. L. "Tony" Seamon, Jr., the general chairman. I have firsthand knowledge of the many hours these two spent in organizing and arranging this effective and well-deserved tribute.

The U.S. Coast Guard is one of the many fine services of our Government which all of us are too prone to take for granted. I was delighted to have the people of my district originate and execute this fine expression.

## LITTER IS A NATIONWIDE PROBLEM

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

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, in the last year America has had a great awakening. The combined warnings of alarmed scientists, nature lovers, and sociologists have had their effect.

Now millions of Americans have joined in warning of the dangers of garbage and sewerage and exhaust and smoke and litter.

And all of this culminated yesterday in the observance of Earth Day, during which the total problems of our environment were discussed on campuses and public meetings around the country.

But, Mr. Speaker, talk is not enough. We need money, we need investigation, we need new laws, and we need dedicated action from every sector of our society to keep from being burled and destroyed by the end products of our own technology.

And when we come right down to it, the buck stops here in Washington at the White House and in the Halls of Congress.

Pollution knows no city or State boundaries. Lakes and rivers and seas that border many States are polluted. Polluted air blows from one State to another. Litter is a nationwide problem.

And we need to start with nationwide answers. The President recognized this in sending to Congress his proposals on pollution last winter.

Now, with the first observance of Earth Day, I believe we in the Congress should also recognize those facts and dedicate ourselves to taking the necessary action before many more weeks have passed.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that the danger is great and is at hand. We cannot dally too long.

## EARTH DAY

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

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, all across the Nation Americans yesterday observed a special day aimed at pointing up the need to support an old cause, that of conservation.

But today we take a much broader view of conservation than we used to.

Once conservation meant primarily the preservation of forests, and wildlife and natural areas.

These efforts are still important today, perhaps more important than they were 50 or 25 years ago. But now conservation literally means preservation of our planet and its ability to support human life.

It means not just keeping air and water clean, it means removing the pollutants from them and the causes of those pollutants. It means finding a way to dispose of garbage and rubbish and sewerage without polluting the land and the water. It means controlling the fumes of factories and autos.

Fortunately, the need has been recognized, not just by those who sponsored Earth Day, but by most segments of our society, individuals, most industries and businesses and by government.

The President, this year, has already sent to Congress proposals for cleaning up our waters and our air and our land. It is up to Congress to accept that challenge—quickly—and pass the laws and the appropriations necessary to do the job.

## TOTAL POSTAL REORGANIZATION IS NEEDED

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

Mr. RUTH. Mr. Speaker, we can no longer afford the luxury of merely voting increased wages or higher opportunities each time the Post Office Department finds itself in economic or other difficulties.

We must attack the entire scope of the problem. What we desperately need is an immediate and far-reaching program of total postal reorganization as proposed by the administration. Through the creation of a Government-owned postal service, the framework would be established to make it possible for the Post Office to pay its own way. In this way, the postal employee can improve his position without continually adding to the burden of the taxpayer.

I urge approval of the bill which the unions and postal management have negotiated, along with the reasonable 8 percent pay increase for employees, as the only responsible method for providing the country with an efficient and economical mail system that will benefit both user and employee alike.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE COURT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

APRIL 22, 1970.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
*U.S. House of Representatives.*

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope from the White House, received in the Clerk's Office at 12:15 p.m. on Wednesday, April 22, 1970, said to contain a Message from the President wherein he recommends the enactment of the Disaster Assistance Act of 1970.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
*Clerk,*
*U.S. House of Representatives.*

## DISASTER ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1970—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. No. 91-323)

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

The spirit of neighborliness, the readiness to extend a helping hand in time of trouble, is one of the great traditions of this country. In the early years of our history, good neighbors were essential in coping with the hardships of pioneer life. They are equally essential in meeting the challenges of life today.

The spirt of the good neighbor was particularly evident in 1969 when natural disasters struck this country in unprecedented numbers and with unprecedented force. Twenty-nine major disasters and an untold number of smaller disasters were responsible for over 300 deaths and an estimated $2 billion in property damage in the last calendar year. Events such as the California floods and Hurricane Camille with the Virginia flood were exceptionally destructive.

Private voluntary agencies have traditionally played a crucial role during times of disaster. State and local governments are key factors in any successful disaster relief effort. Thus the Federal role is only one part of the overall response of the nation. But it is a very important part of that response. Under the Federal Disaster Acts of 1950, 1966, and 1969 and their amendments and under provisions in many other statutes, the Federal government works to help individuals through relief and rehabilitation efforts and to assist State and local governments by restoring public facilities essential to community life. In 1969 the Federal government allocated $150 million for assistance from the President's Disaster Relief Fund—the largest sum for any 1 year in history. Significant additional funds were spent on disaster assistance under other Federal programs. A report on our 1969 experience is being provided to the Congress.

We are confident that the general framework of our present program provides an effective mechanism for channeling Federal disaster assistance to individuals and communities. Rather than depending on a specialized disaster assistance agency, the present system makes maximum use of existing agencies, centrally coordinated by the Office of Emergency Preparedness, to perform tasks in time of emergency which are similar to those which they perform in normal circumstances. Our present arrangements also encourage constructive and cooperative efforts among individuals, local communities, the States and the Federal government.

At the same time, however, we have learned that a number of improvements are in order within the existing framework. The last Presidential special message on the subject of disaster assistance was written 18 years ago. Since that time, this program has grown in a piecemeal and often haphazard manner, involving over 50 separate Congressional enactments and executive actions. This slow development process has created a complex program, one which has a number of gaps and overlaps and needs increased coordination. It is time for new legislation and executive action to make our Federal disaster assistance program more effective and efficient.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

*To extend and to improve the assistance which the Federal Government can provide in time of major disasters, I am asking the Congress to enact the Disaster Assistance Act of 1970.* This legislation contains a number of specific proposals, the most important of which are the following:

REVENUE MAINTENANCE

When a community experiences a major disaster, the physical impact is obvious. What the television camera does not capture, however, is the loss of property tax revenue which occurs when a substantial portion of a community's property tax base is destroyed and its essential services are disrupted.

---

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. O'KONSKI (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman wish to withhold his point of order until the President's message is read by the Clerk?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I believe the Members ought to hear this message, Mr. Speaker. I insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes a point of order that a quorum is not present, and evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 87]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Adair | Gettys | Powell |
| Alexander | Giaimo | Rees |
| Ashbrook | Goldwater | Reifel |
| Baring | Green, Oreg. | Rhodes |
| Barrett | Green, Pa. | Rivers |
| Brooks | Griffin | Roberts |
| Brotzman | Griffiths | Roe |
| Brown, Calif. | Gubser | Rogers, Colo. |
| Brown, Mich. | Hagan | Rosenthal |
| Bush | Harvey | Roybal |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Hébert | Ruppe |
| Cabell | Holifield | Sandman |
| Carey | Johnson, Calif. | Scherle |
| Chisholm | Kirwan | Scheuer |
| Clark | Kyl | Schneebeli |
| Clay | Landrum | Slack |
| Cowger | Lennon | Snyder |
| Crane | Long, La. | Stanton |
| Dawson | Lukens | Steed |
| de la Garza | McCarthy | Steiger, Wis. |
| Diggs | McMillan | Stephens |
| Dingell | MacGregor | Sullivan |
| Dorn | Madden | Taft |
| Eckhardt | Melcher | Teague, Calif. |
| Edwards, Calif. | Mikva | Tunney |
| Edwards, La. | Mollohan | Udall |
| Feighan | Moorhead | Vanik |
| Flynt | Moss | Waldie |
| Ford, Gerald R. | Myers | Watkins |
| Ford, William D. | Nichols | Watson |
| | O'Neal, Ga. | White |
| Foreman | Ottinger | Wright |
| Fraser | Patman | |
| Fulton, Tenn. | Pepper | |

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 331 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

## DISASTER ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1970—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91–323)

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will continue the reading of the message.

The Clerk read as follows:

To ease this difficulty, *I recommend that the Congress enact a property tax revenue maintenance plan.* Under this plan, the Federal government would be authorized to lend money at favorable interest rates to local governments to make up their loss of property tax revenues following a major disaster.

PERMANENT REPAIR

*I am asking the Congress for expanded Federal authority to permanently repair or fully replace essential public facilities damaged by disasters.* This authorization would provide a more effective and practical approach to the replacement of damaged public facilities which are vital to community life. This Administration would give preference to local employees and contractors in repair and rebuilding work.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

*I am also asking the Congress to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, so that the Economic Development Administration would provide staff support, technical advice and financial assistance to those communities affected by major disasters.* Such assistance is vital in recovery efforts, particularly when the community is attempting to begin long-range rebuilding or redevelopment efforts.

DISASTER LOANS

*I am proposing legislation to improve the disaster loan programs of the Small Business Administration and of the Farmers Home Administration.* These loans are among our principal sources of assistance to stricken individuals. The recommended changes would provide for improved refinancing, payment deferral, and forgiveness arrangements and would assure disaster loans to older citizens. My proposed amendment would allow the FHA and SBA to provide faster service and would therefore promote speedier recovery following disasters.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

*I am also recommending that the Congress extend for two years the expanded unemployment compensation provisions of the Disaster Relief Act of 1969.* These provisions make temporary income available as promptly as possible to help individuals who are unemployed as the result of a major disaster. Such assistance to individuals was a new feature in the 1969 Act. Before last year, only those unemployed persons who could qualify for compensation under the normal unemployment insurance programs could receive income protection following a disaster. The two-year extension which I recommend would provide time to fully evaluate the new provisions and to consider appropriate legislation.

HOUSING

Hurricane Camille provided the greatest test of the Federal government's

ability to provide temporary housing to victims of a major disaster. We believe we met that test; at the direction of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, the Department of Housing and Urban Development was able to place more than 5,000 mobile homes in the disaster area. We also believe, however, that the language of the law which authorizes such activities is confusing.

Two separate provisions in two different laws are now directed to temporary emergency housing. In order to simplify the legislative provisions that apply to this problem, *I propose that the provisions for temporary housing in PL 81–875 be amended so that they incorporate many of the broad principles of PL 91–79, without sacrificing flexibility.* A clarified version of this law would allow the government to provide temporary housing or other emergency shelter—including leased mobile homes or other readily fabricated dwellings.

DEBRIS REMOVAL

One of the serious problems encountered in Hurricane Camille related to the removal of debris from private property. Current legislation in this area is confusing and difficult to administer. *I am therefore proposing corrective legislation that would simplify and speed debris removal from private property when it is in the public interest.* Again, preference would be given to local employees and contractors.

DISASTER PREVENTION

In March and April 1969 this Administration conducted a massive flood prevention program in the upper Midwest and New England. This program—Operation Foresight—was immensely successful; it prevented widespread human suffering and an estimated $200 million in damages, at a cost of $20 million. The success of this disaster prevention effort suggests that we can do a great deal to avoid or limit the effects of expected disasters. *Accordingly, I am proposing legislation which would extend the Federal government's authority to assist State and local governments in disaster prevention and damage reduction activities.*

PLANNING ASSISTANCE

The Disaster Relief Act of 1969 authorized one-time matching grants to help States formulate better plans for coping with disasters. Almost half of the States have already indicated that they will join us in this effort and we expect that others will soon follow their lead. *I now recommend that the Congress expand this provision of the 1969 law in order to help States review and update these plans on a continuing basis.*

In addition to the major initiatives outlined above, the legislation prepared by the Administration includes a number of other changes designed to extend the scope and improve the effectiveness of Federal assistance.

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

Legislative changes are not the only improvements which are presently required. Our experience indicates that changes in administrative procedures can be equally important in providing a more effective assistance program.

COORDINATION

*To improve coordination of Federal Disaster Assistance efforts, both among Federal agencies and among Federal, State, and local officials, I am establishing a National Council on Federal Disaster Assistance.* The Council will be composed of senior officials from Federal agencies concerned with disaster assistance and will be chaired by the Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness.

To further improve coordination of disaster assistance activities in the field, I have also directed that the Regional Directors of the Office of Emergency Preparedness be included as ad hoc members of the newly formed Federal Regional Councils. This improvement will be supplemented by other actions to improve coordination among all levels of Government, including the Office of Emergency Preparedness regional planning conferences with State officials with the first such conference this month on the West Coast.

In addition to improving coordination and developing more comprehensive plans, we need better procedures for continuous communication with State and local government on such matters as disaster legislation. The Council of State Governments and such organizations as the International City Management Association, the National Association of Counties, the National League of Cities, and the United States Conference of Mayors are assisting us in this effort.

Improvements in disaster assistance also require an improved program of research and evaluation, the results of which are readily available to all who can benefit from them. I have therefore directed the Office of Emergency Preparedness to act as a central clearing house for all Federal research which is related to disasters.

ASSISTANCE TO INDIVIDUALS

An important objective, particularly in large-scale disasters, is that of informing individuals of the assistance which is available and of the places where it can be obtained. To meet this problem, we are expanding our information efforts and keying those efforts to the needs of the individual citizens of the community, particularly those who are poor.

Whenever a disaster occurs, those who live in the area desperately want to be in touch with their friends and relatives who live elsewhere. Rescue workers also need better communication facilities within such areas. I have therefore asked the Office of Emergency Preparedness to provide better emergency communication services to stricken regions during times of disaster.

Just as we make it easier for individuals to get information, so we should make it easier for them to get assistance. It should not be necessary for individuals to travel from one place to another and then to still another location in order to obtain the help which various agencies of the Federal government are providing. *Accordingly, we are developing plans to provide "one-stop" service to individuals in disaster areas.* Representatives of the principal Federal agencies and of the Red Cross, as well as caseworkers and legal advisors, will all be available at a single assistance center.

DISASTER ASSISTANCE TEAMS

Disaster stricken communities frequently lack trained personnel who can help them make the best possible use of the assistance which is available to them from many sources. To meet this need, I have directed the Office of Emergency Preparedness to form *Federal disaster assistance teams to help local communities coordinate the overall assistance effort.* These teams will be supervised by a Federal Disaster Assistance Coordinator who will act as an on-the-spot representative of the President in any particular disaster area.

DISASTER INSURANCE

Our experience with disasters in 1969 clearly demonstrated the need for expanded insurance coverage for property owners. The national flood insurance sections of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 presently permit Federal insurance assistance in flood-prone areas and we are now implementing that program on an accelerated basis. *I am also directing that a comprehensive study of property insurance coverage for disaster situations be undertaken and that specific recommendations be provided me by the end of this year.* This study should take into account the views of the State insurance authorities, the insurance industry, lending institutions, and the general public.

CIVIL DEFENSE

The disaster assistance activities of State and local governments often are closely related to their civil defense responsibilities. The relationship between the Federal government's disaster assistance and civil defense activities should now be carefully reviewed. Accordingly, I have asked that such a study be carried out and that its recommendations be given to me by December 31, 1970. It is important that any changes in this sensitive area be made only after a careful review, one which gives special attention to the impact of any suggested change upon national security.

As we move into a new decade, one of the nation's major goals is to restore a ravaged environment. But we must also be ready to respond effectively when nature gets out of control and victimizes our citizens.

With the improvements I have recommended to the Congress and those which I am instituting by Executive action, the disaster assistance program of the Federal government will continue to provide outstanding public service in times of crisis. This program manifests the extraordinary humanitarian spirit of our nation. The changes I have proposed would enable it to reflect that spirit even more effectively.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 22, 1970.*

The message was referred by the Speaker to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The Speaker laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

APRIL 22, 1970.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
*U.S. House of Representatives.*

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelop from the White House, received in the Clerk's Office at 3:40 p.m. on Wednesday, April 22, 1970, said to contain a Message from the President wherein he transmits a report of Federal disaster relief activity for calendar year 1969.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
*Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.*

## REPORT OF FEDERAL DISASTER RELIEF ACTIVITY FOR 1969—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91–325)

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Natural disasters—in unprecedented numbers and scope—presented a grim challenge to this nation in 1969. The exceptional response to this challenge by the United States government is something in which all Americans can take pride. The story of that response is detailed in the report which I am today transmitting to the Congress.

This report of Federal activities in 1969 under authority of the Federal Disaster Act (Public Law 875, 81st Congress, as amended) is required by Section 8 of that law and has been provided by the Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness. The report also describes activities carried out under authority of the Federal Disaster Act of 1969 (Public Law 79, 91st Congress). The funds which supported these activities are specifically appropriated to the President for the purpose of relieving suffering and repairing damage when disasters strike.

There were 29 major disasters during 1969—the largest number since the program began in 1950. Two of these—the California floods and Hurricane Camille—were exceptionally destructive. The number and extent of major disasters in 1969 required a massive Federal effort; a total of $148,970,000 was allocated from the President's Disaster Fund, the largest amount since the enactment of Public Law 81–875. Despite these increased demands, the Federal response was most prompt and effective and those who participated in it deserve our commendation.

Under the leadership of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, the Administration is developing a stronger and more comprehensive disaster assistance program. An important part of this strengthened program is outlined in my disaster assistance message to the Congress. That message discusses both the legislation which will be submitted—the Disaster Assistance Act of 1970—and the improvements which are being made by executive action. I am confident that our strengthened program will improve cooperation with State and local governments and with private and voluntary organizations. More important, these steps would enable the Federal government to continue to meet its reponsibilities to individuals who are victimized by these unhappy events.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 22, 1970.*

The message, together with the accompanying papers, was, without objection, referred by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON) to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

## THE DRAFT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91–324)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

The draft has been with us now for many years. It was started as a temporary, emergency measure just before World War II. We have lived with the draft so long, and relied on it through such serious crises, that too many of us now accept it as a normal part of American life.

It is now time to embrace a new approach to meeting our military manpower requirements. I have two basic proposals.

—The first deals with the fundamental way this nation should raise the armed force necessary to defend the lives and the rights of its people, and to fulfill its existing commitments abroad.

—The second deals with reforming the present recruitment system—part volunteer, part drafted—which, in the immediate future, will be needed to maintain our armed strength.

### TO END THE DRAFT

On February 21, I received the report of the Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force, headed by former Defense Secretary Thomas S. Gates. The Commission members concluded unanimously that the interests of the nation will be better served by an all-volunteer force than by a mixed force of volunteers and draftees, and that steps should be taken in this direction.

I have carefully reviewed the report of the Commission and have discussed the subject with many others knowledgeable in this field. The preeminent consideration in any decision I make involving the American Armed Forces must be the security of the United States. I have had to weigh carefully how our responsibilities in Vietnam and our overall foreign policy would be affected by ending the draft. I also had to consider the budgetary impact, and the possible effect on our economy.

On the other hand, we have all seen the effect of the draft on our young people, whose lives have been disrupted first by years of uncertainty, and then by the draft itself. We all know the unfairness of the present system, no matter how just we try to make it.

After careful consideration of the factors involved, I support the basic conclusion of the Commission. I agree that we should move now toward ending the draft.

From now on, the objective of this Administration is to reduce draft calls to zero, subject to the overriding considerations of national security.

In proposing that we move toward ending the draft, I must enter three cautions: First, the draft cannot be ended all at once. It must be phased out, so that we can be certain of maintaining our defense strength at every step. Second, existing induction authority expires on July 1, 1971, and I expect that it will be necessary for the next Congress to extend this authority. And third, as we move away from reliance on the draft, we must make provisions to establish a standby draft system that can be used in case of emergency.

To move toward reducing draft calls to zero, we are proceeding with a wide array of actions and proposals:

—This Administration proposed, and the Congress has approved, a six-percent across-the-board pay increase for Federal employees, retroactive to the first of this year. This raises the pay of members of the Armed Forces by $1.2 billion a year.

—I shall propose an additional 20 percent pay increase for enlisted men with less than two years of service, to be effective January 1, 1971. This action, if approved by the Congress, will raise the annual pay of enlisted men with less than two years of service by $500 million a year, and is a first step in removing the present inequity in pay of men serving their first two years in the Armed Forces. The cost for Fiscal Year 1971 will be $250 million.

—In January 1971 I shall recommend to the Congress, in the Fiscal Year 1972 budget, an additional $2.0 billion for added pay and other benefits—especially for those serving their first two years—to help attract and retain the personnel we need for our Armed Forces.

—I have today directed the Secretary of Defense to give high priority to the expansion of programs designed to increase enlistments and retentions in the services. Further, I have directed that he give me a report every quarter on the progress of this program. Other agencies have been directed to assist in the effort.

—I am also directing the Secretary of Defense to review the policies and practices of the military services to give new emphasis to recognition of the individual needs, aspirations and capabilities of all military personnel.

No one can predict with precision whether or not, or precisely when, we can end conscription. It depends, in part, on the necessity of maintaining required military force levels to meet our commitments in Vietnam and elsewhere. It

also depends on the degree to which the combination of military pay increases and enhanced benefits will attract and hold enough volunteers to maintain the forces we need, the attitude of young people toward military service, and the availability of jobs in the labor market.

However, I am confident that, barring any unforeseen developments, this proposed program will achieve our objective.

The starting pay of an enlisted man in our Armed Forces is—taking the latest raise into account—less than $1,500 a year. This is less than half of the minimum wage in the private sector. Of course, we should add to this the value of the food, uniforms and housing that is provided free. But it is hardly comparable to what most young men can earn as civilians. Even with special allowances, some married enlisted men have been forced to go on welfare to support their families.

The low pay illustrates another inequity of the draft. These men, in effect, pay a large hidden tax—the difference between their military pay and what they could earn as civilians. Therefore, on the grounds of equity alone, there is good reason to substantially increase pay.

While we focus on removing inequities in the pay of men serving their first few years in the military, we must not neglect the career servicemen. They are the indispensable core of our Armed Forces. The increasing technological complexity of modern defense, and the constantly changing international situation, make their assignments ever more difficult—and critical. We shall continue to make every effort to ensure that they are fairly treated and justly compensated.

There is another essential element—beyond pay and benefits, beyond the best in training and equipment—that is vital to the high morale of any armed force in a free society. It is the backing, support and confidence of the people and the society the military serves. While government can provide the economic justice our men in arms deserve—moral support and backing can come only from the American people. At few times in our history has it been more needed than today.

The consideration of national security contains no argument against these historic actions; the considerations of freedom and justice argue eloquently in their behalf.

TO REFORM THE DRAFT

As we move toward our goal of ending the draft in the United States, we must deal with the draft as it now exists. This nation has a right to expect that the responsibility for national defense will be shared equitably and consistently by all segments of our society. Given this basic principle, I believe that there are important reforms that we must make in our present draft system.

It is my judgment, and that of the National Security Council, that future occupational, agricultural and student deferments are no longer dictated by the national interest. I am issuing today an Executive Order to direct that no future deferments shall be granted on the basis of employment. Very few young men at age 19 are in such critical positions that they cannot be replaced. All those who held occupational deferments before today, as well as any who may be granted such deferments from pending applications filed before today, will be deferred as they were previously.

This same Executive Order will also eliminate all future paternity deferments—except in those cases where a local draft board determines that extreme hardship would result. All those who held paternity deferments before today, as well as any who may be granted deferments from pending applications filed before today, will be deferred as long as they are living with and supporting child dependents.

I am also asking the Congress today to make some changes in the Military Selective Service Act of 1967.

The first would restore to the President discretionary authority on the deferment of students seeking baccalaureate degrees. If the Congress restores this authority, I shall promptly issue a second Executive Order that would bar all undergraduate deferments, except for young men who are undergraduate students prior to today. These young men would continue to be eligible for deferment under present regulations during their undergraduate years. This Executive Order would also end deferments for young men in junior college, and in apprentice and technical training programs, except for those who entered before today. Men participating in such programs before today would continue to be deferred until they complete them.

Should Congress pass the legislation I have requested, those young men who start college or enter apprentice or other technical training today or hereafter, and subsequently receive a notice of induction, will have their entry into service postponed until the end of the academic semester, or for apprentices and trainees, until some appropriate breaking point in their program.

Even if college deferments are phased out, college men who through ROTC or other military programs have chosen to obligate themselves to enter military service at a later date would be permitted to postpone their active duty until completion of their study program.

In each instance, I have spoken of the phasing out—not the elimination—of existing deferments. The sudden elimination of existing deferments would disrupt plans made in good faith by individuals, companies, colleges and local school systems on the basis of those deferments.

My second legislative proposal would establish a direct national call, by lottery sequence numbers each month, to improve the operation of the random selection system. We need to ensure that men throughout the country with the same lottery number have equal liability to induction.

Under the present law, for example, a man with sequence number 185 may be called up by one draft board while a man with a lower number in a different draft board is not called. This can happen because present law does not permit a national call of young men by lottery sequence numbers.

Some local draft boards may not have enough low numbers to fill their assigned quota for the month. As a result, these local boards are forced to call young men with higher numbers. At the same time, other draft boards throughout the country will have more low numbers than necessary to fill their quotas.

I am recommending to the Congress an amendment to suspend this quota requirement while the random selection system is in effect. If the Congress adopts this amendment, I will authorize the Selective Service System to establish a plan under which the draft call each month will be on a national basis, with the same lottery sequence numbers called throughout the country. This will result in a still more equitable draft system.

As long as we need the draft, it is incumbent upon us to make it as fair and equitable as we can. I urge favorable Congressional action on these legislative proposals for draft reform.

CONCLUSION

While I believe that these reforms in our existing draft system are essential, it should be remembered that they are improvements in a system to be used only as long as conscription continues to be necessary.

Ultimately, the preservation of a free society depends upon both the willingness of its beneficiaries to bear the burden of its defense—and the willingness of government to guarantee the freedom of the individual.

With an end to the draft, we will demonstrate to the world the responsiveness of republican government—and our continuing commitment to the maximum freedom for the individual, enshrined in our earliest traditions and founding documents. By upholding the cause of freedom without conscription we will have demonstrated in one more area the superiority of a society based upon belief in the dignity of man over a society based on the supremacy of the State.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 23, 1970.*

## DRAFT REFORM

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the President's concern for reforming basic institutions has been evident on many occasions in his Presidency. He has called for reform in our foreign policy, reform of Federal-State relations, reform of the welfare system, reform of the Post Office. But one of the President's reforms which history may record as the most important reform of all is his reform of the draft.

The President's message on this subject should be carefully read and enthusiastically applauded by everyone of us. In the first place it reforms military pay scales in a way which will encourage more volunteers. Secondly, it reforms the Selective Service System, ending some deferments, and seeking the power to end others—so that the system will operate more fairly.

The President's message is brief, bold, and to the point. It sees that something

is wrong and it seeks to set it right. The President's actions and his proposals deserve our support. The changes which they would make will have a great and healthy impact on the life of this Nation.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as the President has pointed out in his message on the draft, a peacetime draft is a relatively recent phenomenon. Traditionally, it has been used only when the Nation's security was seriously threatened.

In recent years, the draft has provoked debate and dissension, but nothing substantive was done until President Nixon advocated a lottery system a year ago and appointed a commission to study the feasibility and desirability of an all-volunteer force.

Now, the President has again acted. He has endorsed the basic conclusion of the Gates Commission's report that immediate steps should be taken to move toward an all-volunteer force. He has asked that military pay be increased, especially for first-term servicemen, as a first step toward eliminating the draft.

If we are willing to pay first-term servicemen approximately what they deserve and need—the draft can be eliminated. The draft is a heavy burden on our free society in peacetime. It infringes on personal freedom and inevitably causes unrest and dissatisfaction.

In the short run, we should continue to reform the present Selective Service System to ensure that it is as fair as possible both in its present application and in the event it needs to be reactivated in the future.

The ultimate goal must be an all-volunteer system. Only that system is consistent with the Nation's basic traditions of personal freedom.

Meantime, I am delighted that the administration is moving toward reducing draft calls to zero.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the President has asked Congress to make available $250 million in the fiscal 1971 budget and $2 billion in fiscal 1972 to make military service more attractive and thus move toward an all-volunteer armed force.

Increasing military pay, especially for first-term servicemen, will attract true volunteers and eliminate the present inequity in pay for those serving an initial tour of duty.

Because the draft has been available, pay for first-term servicemen has lagged behind pay for the career force and comparable civilians. First-term servicemen receive only about 60 percent of what they could earn as civilians and some servicemen have had to go on welfare to make ends meet. The underpayment of young servicemen is a national disgrace. The President's pay request for fiscal 1971 and 1972 will cure this serious inequity and will also be a major step toward ending conscription.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Congress to support the President's program. We have an obligation to reexamine and, when no longer necessary for national security, a duty to eliminate institutions like the draft so that the process of Government is as consistent as possible with the Nation's traditions of freedom and equal justice for all.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, any President must reconcile long term goals and shortrun responsibilities. But rarely does any President accomplish the reconciliation as successfully as President Nixon has in his message on the draft. In it he spells out explicitly his determination to end the draft. He calls for specific reforms which will bring about that goal. But, at the same time, the President recognizes his responsibility to make the interim period as fair as possible. He therefore calls for reforms in the draft system as well.

On the one hand, he asks that military pay be substantially increased—by 20 percent for first term enlistments. This provision should make it easier eventually to end the draft. On the other hand, the President also asks that the inequities created by our present system of deferments and local quotas be eliminated.

The President demonstrates in this message that he is looking both at the immediate realities and at less immediate goals. The American people are well served by his approach to his problem.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I feel constrained to express my disappointment that President Nixon has decided that the recommendations of the Gates Commission on establishing an all-volunteer armed force cannot be fully implemented at this point. The Commission report, which involved months of painstaking study and which was unanimously agreed to, concluded that our national security would not be jeopardized if a volunteer force were instituted by July 1971. I can only regret the President's decision to place continued reliance on the present Selective Service Act for an unspecified period of time.

Nonetheless, President Nixon has stated his readiness to move toward ending the draft and I commend him for the positive steps he has proposed toward that end. Certainly the key to reducing draft calls to zero is to improve pay and other benefits for officers and especially for enlisted men. I am pleased to note that Mr. Nixon does recommend that pay increases and additional benefits be granted in both 1971 and 1972. Although the cost is high—an additional $2.25 billion—over a 2-year period—we have no right to compel young men to fight and perhaps die for this country if we do not at least pay them a living wage.

The review of programs and policies which the President has directed the Secretary of Defense to conduct should also serve to increase enlistments and retentions in the services and thus advance the day when draft calls no longer are necessary.

If the draft cannot be abolished entirely—a step which I continue to advocate—then I do support the President's plan for reform of the draft. The institution of a lottery system eliminated some inequities in the Selective Service Act but unfortunately introduced new injustices. The President's request for a phasing out of various deferments and the establishment of a direct national draft call by lottery sequence should help to ensure that the draft operates in as equitable a manner as possible.

I think the Congress should at this juncture hold a comprehensive and public debate on the question of how this country is to raise and maintain an army in the next decade. The volunteer army and other similar proposals should be given a full and dispassionate hearing. If, after such debate, the Congress concludes that it is impossible to allow the draft to expire in July 1971, then I think we must at the very least reform the present system. Many of President Nixon's proposals for reform are worth while and should be adopted.

Most important of all, the Congress must resist attempts to prolong the draft unnecessarily. If new authority to extend the draft is voted, we should insist that such authority be extended only for the shortest time possible. It would be well for us to remember that the draft, no matter what reforms are instituted, remains an inequitable system based on a compulsion repugnant to our democratic society.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, April 23, 1970 is a landmark day in American history. Three years ago, after years of frustrated effort to reform Selective Service—I coauthored a book called "How To End the Draft." Today, for the first time since before World War II, a President of the United States has sent to Congress a message in which he recommends legislation which will enable us to do just that—to rely on volunteers for the defense of our freedoms.

The President's proposals go beyond mere words or intentions. He has offered concrete proposals which will result in pay increases of over 25 percent for most armed services personnel by next year. Also, he has instructed the Secretary of Defense to give new emphasis to recognition of the individual needs, aspirations, and capabilities of all military personnel.

Combined with these proposals, the President's move to continue our withdrawal from Southeast Asia raises for the first time, the real probability that we can reduce draft calls to zero in the near future. Until that time, the President has indicated we cannot tolerate current inequities in the draft system between now and the day an all-volunteer army can be realized.

While the basic concept behind the President's message may seem simple, it has somehow eluded priority consideration by the leadership of this Nation until recently. The concept is that the manpower procurement program for the American military should interfere as little as possible with the individual freedoms of as few men as possible.

Conscription of any sort is diametrically opposed to this principle. As long as this Nation leans back on its ability to make military service compulsory, lives will be interrupted and freedoms will be violated. Further, a compulsory draft allows the military itself to be lazy about its treatment of individual soldiers. Manpower is not a very valuable com-

modity when the supply can be absolutely controlled by draft calls. Thus, pay is criminally low, opportunity for individual advancement and training is not given a high enough priority. In short, the draft enables the military to avoid the necessity of reforms, of efficient manpower utilization, and in some cases, of fair treatment of individual servicemen.

The steps outlined in President Nixon's message will substantially improve the fairness of the draft for as long as conscription is absolutely essential for national security. After that hopefully short period, other provisions of the President's message will lead the way to a manpower procurement concept which puts as high a priority on individual freedom as it must place on national security.

I heartily endorse these proposals.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on the President's draft message immediately after the reading of the President's message.

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

There was no objection.

## SECOND ANNUAL PLAN FOR U.S. PARTICIPATION IN WORLD WEATHER PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with Senate Concurrent Resolution 67 of the 90th Congress, I am forwarding to you the second Annual Plan for United States' Participation in the World Weather Program. This report reviews the progress made during the past year and describes the activities planned by the Federal agencies for the coming fiscal year.

Progress in the World Weather Program has been significant. Of particular import is that, through the United States' effort in space, we have seen the development and testing of an instrument which is capable of measuring globally from a satellite the temperature distribution of our total atmosphere. This represents a giant stride forward. It holds promise of providing data from over the oceans and other remote areas, heretofore unavailable, which are essential for providing weather predictions to our people.

On another front, it is most encouraging to note the progress in international cooperation in this area. Nations have joined hands in moving forward with a program to assist developing countries in improving their meteorological services. And the nations of the world are coming together this month to decide on the next major steps in the research activities of the World Weather Program.

The World Weather Program focuses on the important problem of understanding our global atmosphere. Whether we are attempting to assess the impact of pollutants on the quality of our environment, or trying to improve the accuracy and time range of weather prediction, these activities are vital to the people of the United States—to their safety and to their economic well-being.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 23, 1970.*

## AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS TO THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 893 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 893

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 16516) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there is no controversy that I can discover on this rule. Of course, there will be considerable discussion under the 5-minute rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Missouri is correct in his statement. There is no controversy on the question as to whether or not we should adopt the rule and discuss the space authorization bill.

Let me say, however, in the few minutes that I have that I wish to note the presence back with us on the floor the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, the ranking Republican on this committee, Mr. FULTON. We are pleased to have him back with us. It also gives us an opportunity to say that I know of no one in this Chamber or in this House who has been more devoted over the years to this program and no one who has a more tremendous fund of expertise and knowledge of our goals in the space program than the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I am pleased that he can be here to take his usual part in the debate today.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to authorize NASA appropriations for fiscal 1971.

The authorization totals $3,630,875,000. By far the greatest part of this authorization—$2,903,200—is earmarked for research and development efforts. Some $33,975,000 is for facility construction at various NASA institutions around the country and $693,700,000 is for administrative costs and research efforts.

The largest single item is $1,101,500,000 for continued Apollo flights. Seven more flights are now programed; two in 1970, two in 1971, one in 1972, and two in 1974. Boosters, command, service, and lunar modules must be procured.

Another large item, $670,200,000, is for the space flight operations. These include the orbital workshop program and the space shuttle and station. Some $300,000,000 of this total was added to the bill over and above what was requested by the administration.

Other major projects funded by the bill include—

First, lunar and planetary exploration, $144,900,000. This includes our Mariner and Viking unmanned flights to Mars;

Second, space research and applications, $172,600,000. This includes our scientific satellite efforts, like Nimbus, Tiros and our geodetic, communications and navigational satellites;

Third, launch vehicle procurement, $124,900,000; and

Fourth, tracking and data acquisition, $293,800,000.

Mr. KARTH has filed additional views. He opposes delaying some ongoing projects in order to fund a new one, the space shuttle and station.

Mr. KOCH has filed additional views opposing the funding level. He believes it should be cut and the funds made available for more pressing domestic needs.

Mr. FULTON has made several recommendations. He believes the level of Apollo flights should be increased from 2 per year to 2½, to more fully utilize existing equipment, boosters, and personnel. He also believes that the Nerva nuclear rocket project should have an increase in funding.

Mr. MOSHER has filed additional views. He opposes funds added to the bill for the manned space flight program over what the administration recommended—some $300,000,000. He believes our unmanned flights bring back more useful information.

Mr. WYDLER has filed additional views. He believes that the Department of Defense and NASA should get together on a Manned Orbiting Laboratory program as a matter of national security.

Mr. FREY has filed additional views in which 12 Members have joined. He points out that our space program has provided us with many new products and processes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speak-

er, will the distinguished gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Yes; I shall be pleased to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for welcoming back the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON). I join the gentleman in saying how happy we are at seeing the ranking Republican Member back on the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for those remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 16516) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 16516, with Mr. ROONEY of New York in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today we bring before the House H.R. 16516, the fiscal year 1971 National Aeronautics and Space Administration authorization bill.

The bill before you would provide new obligational authority in the amount of $3,630,875,000 for this Nation's space and aeronautics activities in the forthcoming fiscal year.

The President's space budget submitted to the Congress this year was the lowest request for space since fiscal year 1962.

The original NASA request to the Bureau of the Budget totaled $4,500,000,000 and was designed to implement the recommendations contained in the report of the President's task group.

The President's space budget submitted to Congress was for $3,333,000,000; or $1,200,000,000 less than the recommendations contained in that report.

In view of this, it was the committee's considered judgment that a portion of these amounts should be restored.

The committee's action, as reflected in the bill before you, was to increase the total authorization to $3,630,875,000—an increase of $297,875,000.

The increase falls entirely within the area of manned space flight, with the exception of a $1,400,000 increase in research and program management.

However, this latter increase was offset by an equal reduction in research and development.

We have just crossed the threshold of a new decade in space. I do not believe that it is necessary for me to remind the Members of the House of our past successes in space, and particularly the flights of Apollo 11 and 12.

Hundreds of millions of people in almost every country of the world watched the first landing on the moon.

The Apollo 13 mission was to have been a continuation of our program of lunar exploration.

The entire world is aware that the mission had to be aborted because of severe damages to the service module which occurred as the spacecraft approached the moon on April 13.

The cold, statistical history of Apollo 13 will show the mission as a failure.

In my opinion, Apollo 13 was one of the greatest successes we have had in space flight to date.

A success because it was a vivid example of American expertise, working as a team, bringing into play all of our technological know-how to avert a tragedy.

I had the privilege of being present at the Mission Control Center in Houston during the return and recovery of our brave Apollo 13 astronauts.

There, I witnessed one of the most remarkable demonstrations of cool, calm, and deliberate application of space technology, all concerted toward one objective: To bring astronauts Lovell, Haise, and Swigert home safely to earth.

I think that all concerned, not only the astronauts, but the fantastic ground crew as well, deserve the praise of every American for their outstanding accomplishment.

The single national space target of the last decade was the manned lunar landing.

This feat demonstrated what Americans, as a people, can accomplish when they have the will and when the national leadership and the public favor are united to achieve a desirable goal.

The program of the seventies will, however, have no single climatic goal.

It must be clearly understood by us in Congress and the American people that the space program of the seventies will be quite different from that of the sixties.

It will be a balanced and viable program composed of a reasonable schedule of space priorities.

It will be a program responsive to opportunities presented by the remarkable new technology developed in the last decade.

It will also be a program responsive to the limitations imposed by our Nation's many competing needs.

Already we have begun to reap the benefits of our space program.

The commercial Comsat satellite is now giving us television coverage of world events on a regular basis—and the corporation is making a profit.

The international Intelsat satellite is working smoothly to provide TV coverage to over 70 countries around the globe.

Worldwide weather coverage from space has moved from an experimental to an operational basis with satellites routinely sending back valuable pictures of the earth's cloud cover and weather patterns.

We now have satellites for navigation, geodetic surveys, nuclear test ban surveillance, and numerous other scientific information. Yet, we are just beginning to realize the potential of our new space technology.

We now know that space observations can answer the basic questions that must be answered if we are to make efficient use of the limited resources of our own planet.

What causes ocean currents? What untapped food resources are in the sea?

How do the oceans affect the weather and vice versa?

Can we get accurate weather predictions for longer than a few days? Can weather be controlled? Can earthquakes be predicted?

And of prime importance, what are the sources of air and water pollution?

The answers to these questions and many other problematical areas affecting the life of man can be found in a viable national space effort.

We must proceed in the development of space technology, just as this Nation proceeded in the past during the eras of rail and air transportation development.

Now permit me to explain briefly the increases in authorization the committee has recommended in the bill before you.

NASA requested $956,500,000 for continuation of the Apollo lunar exploration program in fiscal year 1971.

The committee recommends an increase of $145 million for a total authorization of $1,101,500,000 for fiscal year 1971.

Of this amount, the committee has added $45 million for the initiation of long leadtime production of payloads for lunar exploration flights after 1973, and to start production of the spacecraft and science payloads for one more Apollo lunar exploration flight in addition to those now planned.

It is necessary that we authorize funding for these long lead items now.

Insofar as Saturn V is concerned, the committee recommends the addition of $100 million to start procurement of long leadtime hardware and to begin fabrication of an improved Saturn V system.

This includes startup costs of vendors and subcontractors that have been phased out of the Saturn V program.

Among Saturn V systems, engine funding would have the highest priority, due to the long leadtime associated with their production.

NASA requested $515,200,000 for space flight operations in fiscal year 1971, and

the committee recommends an increase of $155 million.

Of this amount, $75 million has been added to augment the development and qualification effort on spacecraft and subsystems for the orbiting laboratory which is now called Skylab.

This addition would emphasize earth resources experiments.

The initiation of preliminary design for a second orbiting workshop would also be possible.

The committee also recommends the addition of $80 million for more extensive analysis and engineering studies, payload definition and preliminary design for the space shuttle and space station programs.

The key to the success of this Nation's future space effort lies in the development of a low cost, recoverable, and reusable space transportation system.

The reusable space shuttle will drastically reduce the cost of putting people and cargo into space.

In particular, the shuttle will facilitate construction of a manned orbiting space station that will open up new areas of scientific and technological activity in the near neighborhood of earth.

The committee's action in increasing this program will serve to emphasize the necessity of proceeding with the development of this system at a faster rate than envisioned by the President's budget.

And now a few words about the unmanned space flight program.

The bill before you includes $565,700,000 for these purposes.

NASA's scientific satellites have enriched mankind's knowledge in many scientific disciplines, notably geophysics, astronomy and solar physics.

The Nation's unmanned probes to the nearby planets of Venus and Mars have revealed a wealth of information about our two closest neighbors in space.

The study of the solar system will be continued with the launch of instrumented spacecraft to the other more distant planets during the decade of the seventies.

Satellites have also proven to have a variety of practical uses, and the space application program has already contributed to a better life for all men.

International communications are routinely handled through satellites today, and weather forecasting is assisted by satellites currently in space.

The future looks even brighter. Research is underway on a navigation and air traffic control satellite system.

In addition, experimental spacecraft are now being designed which will survey the earth's resources so as to provide information of great value to farmers, foresters, hydrologists, geologists, the maritime and fishing industries, among others.

I will not go into the many details needed to explain the extremely good work which is being performed by NASA in aeronautics and advanced research and technology.

This continuing work has been very valuable in our space program.

We did find it necessary, however, to reorient some of the funding emphasis in several program areas that had suffered reductions in the budget process this year.

These program areas were given modest increases to perform needed research in aeronautical safety of flight items that should be continued.

We did this by reducing the tracking and data acquisition program by $4.2 million, redistributing $2.8 million within research and development, including technology utilization, and the balance, $1.4 million to research and program management.

This latter item is to encourage the movement of younger scientific personnel into aeronautical research fields.

Thus, we bring before you a modest space and aeronautical program for fiscal year 1971.

We are embarked on our second decade in space, one in which U.S. spacemen will continue to visit the moon, and unmanned craft will go to every planet in the solar system.

There is hope of launching an experimental nuclear powered rocket by 1978—the type needed for long stay time manned interplanetary flights at some time before the end of this century.

Very few Government programs are based on the type of long-range planning that characterizes this Nation's space activities.

It is typical of Americans that we are prone to react in spurts.

Sputnik jolted us into the space age and we scrambled to get the first man to the moon.

But now is the time for advance planning if we are to insure that our space program does not stagnate—and that we do not waste the investments already made or we do not deprive ourselves of the important knowledge we seek.

The wide-ranging but relatively modest objectives planned by NASA are reasonable, practical, and within our resources.

It is a program the public will support.

Important and dramatic goals await the United States in space.

So we should forge ahead into the seventies and let it never be said that we failed to support this investment in tomorrow.

In summary, we are presenting to you a bill which would authorize $3,630,875,000 for the Nation's space effort in fiscal year 1971.

The bill before you is $297,875,000 more than the President's request.

We think it is a minimal program, but one which will permit the Nation to move forward in line with the stated objectives of the President's Space Task Group Study.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON).

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor, with minor exception, H.R. 16516, the NASA authorization for this coming fiscal year.

Space is with us to stay. It is not only with us for peacetime uses, in order to remain first in technology, but it is also with us for our very security. Therefore, we should move ahead. That is why I strongly favor the action of the Science and Astronautics Committee and its members who have given so much study to this over the past few weeks.

Space is here to stay. It is now a vital part of the lives of the earth's people.

The United States must remain first in space and technology working in cooperation with other countries, not only to maintain our progress, but our security.

We should proceed on a measured course for both manned and unmanned exploration with particular emphasis on the safety of our U.S. astronauts. We can reduce by 90 percent the cost of earth orbits by promptly going ahead with the research and development of the space shuttle, which can land like an airplane; by the development of a permanent space workshop that can be expanded by the addition of modular units as needed; by continuing research on liquid, solid, and nuclear space storable fuels.

The progress of the United States in space has already changed the United States making the American people and the economic system world acknowledged first in research, technology, and systems management. The impact of worldwide television and satellite communication, weather prediction, hurricane warning, health benefits, and so forth, has really changed the world.

We must remember that in 1961 the U.S. House of Representatives by a unanimous record vote authorized the Apollo program of lunar research.

Differences have arisen and will always arise as to priority and approaches on the technical level. We will have heated discussion about the best equipment as to command modules, lunar modules, fuel components, valve fittings, and even screws and bolts, but this is our American system to obtain excellence.

The tremendous success of America through NASA in returning alive and unhurt the three Apollo 13 astronauts has fully demonstrated to the world that we can really operate in space.

Do not forget our big threat of destruction to the American people and our very security rests now in space. Also our greatest peacetime progress in research and development has occurred in space.

Any nation that gains absolute control or absolute superiority in any strategic area, such as space has now become, controls the world and absolutely everybody on earth. We American people certainly do not want this to happen.

For peace as well as defense purposes, the American people are doing well in lifting their sights to space and the future. President Eisenhower advocated "open skies." Our generation must say, under President Nixon, "open space." We must work for open participation of the world's people to make the benefits of space available for all mankind as our original space law has so well stated in the statute setting up NASA.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to include in the RECORD a summary chart of the committee's actions:

FISCAL YEAR 1971 NASA AUTHORIZATION—SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ACTIONS

| Program/project | NASA request | Committee action (thousands of dollars) | H.R. 16516 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Research and development: | | | |
| 1. Apollo | $956,500 | +145,000 | $1,101,500 |
| | | (+45,000) Lunar payloads and Apollo 20. | |
| | | (+100,000) Saturn V improvements. | |
| 2. Space flight operations | 515,200 | +155,000 | 670,200 |
| | | (+75,000) Apollo applications | |
| | | (+80,000) Space shuttle/station. | |
| 3. Advanced missions | 2,500 | −1,500 | 1,000 |
| Subtotal, MSF | 1,474,200 | +298,500 | 1,772,700 |
| 4. Physics and astronomy | 116,000 | −5,600 Explorers | 110,400 |
| 5. Lunar and planetary exploration. | 144,900 | Approved request | 144,900 |
| 6. Bioscience | 12,900 | do | 12,900 |
| 7. Space applications | 167,000 | +5,600 ATS F. & G | 172,600 |
| 8. Launch vehicle procurement | 124,900 | Approved request | 124,900 |
| Subtotal, SSA | 565,700 | No change | 565,700 |
| 9. Space vehicle systems | 30,000 | Approved request | 30,000 |
| 10. Electronics systems | 22,400 | +1,500 Avionics | 23,900 |
| 11. Human factor systems | 17,900 | +440 Air crew stress | 18,300 |
| 12. Basic research | 17,600 | +400 Aeronautics | 18,000 |
| 13. Space power and electric propulsion systems. | 30,900 | Approved request | 30,900 |
| 14. Nuclear rockets | 38,000 | do | 38,000 |
| 15. Chemical propulsion | 20,300 | do | 20,300 |
| 16. Aeronautical vehicles | $87,100 | Approved request | $87,100 |
| Subtotal ART | 264,200 | +2,300 | 266,500 |
| 17. Tracking and data acquisition. | 298,000 | −4,200 General reduction | 293,800 |
| 18. Technology utilization | 4,000 | +500 Dissemination of space technology. | 4,500 |
| Total, R. & D | 2,606,100 | +297,100 | 2,903,200 |
| Construction of facilities: | | | |
| 1. Ames Research Center | 1,525 | Approved request | 1,525 |
| 2. Goddard Space Flight Center. | 2,050 | do | 2,050 |
| 3. Jet Propulsion Laboratory | 1,950 | do | 1,950 |
| 4. Kennedy Space Center | 575 | do | 575 |
| 5. Manned Spacecraft Center | 900 | do | 900 |
| 6. Marshall Space Flight Center. | 525 | do | 525 |
| 7. Nuclear Rocket Development Station. | 3,500 | do | 3,500 |
| 8. Various stations | 18,575 | 625 Projects at Michoud and MTF. | 17,950 |
| 9. Faculity planning and design. | 5,000 | Approved request | 5,000 |
| Total, C. of F | 34,600 | 625— | 33,975 |
| Research and program management | 692,300 | +1,400 ART for aeronautical trainees. | 693,700 |
| Grand total | 3,333,000 | +297,875 | 3,630,875 |

Mr. Chairman, I wish to join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) in support of funds in the amount of $298.5 million added to the manned space flight program by the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight and the full committee. As you know, the NASA request for the Apollo program for fiscal year 1971 is $729.6 million less than fiscal year 1970. The budget as proposed by NASA terminates Saturn V production and reduces the launch rate to two lunar exploration flights per year. The total increase proposed for the Apollo line item is $145 million; $45 million will be used for long lead production payloads for the sixth and seventh Apollo flights. This will augment the scientific payloads and contribute to an increased stay time on the lunar surface. These same funds will provide for production of spacecraft components and definition of science payloads for an eighth Apollo flight.

One hundred million dollars was also added to the Apollo line item for the Saturn V to provide long leadtime components and to start fabrication of improved Saturn V systems. For several years I have strongly urged that NASA undertake efforts to improve the Saturn V system so that it will not become an obsolete vehicle. These funds will provide for this activity particularly for vendors and subcontractors who are now being phased out of the program and for engine work which requires the longest leadtime. The leadtime to build the Saturn V is approximately 4 years. If we are to have Saturn V vehicles available in the mid 1970's to lift such payloads as nuclear flight stages and space station modules this leadtime must be minimized. The $100 million included by the committee in this bill will reduce this leadtime and make more efficient and less costly the reinitiation of the Saturn V production in the mid 1970's.

Space flight operations was increased by $155 million over the NASA request for fiscal year 1970 in the area of Apollo applications workshop, now called "Skylab," and for the space shuttle, and space station—$75 million of this increase will provide for augmenting the development and qualification of spacecraft and workshop subsystems for long duration missions planned for 1973. This same money allows for initiating development for experiments for the Skylab which have been excluded because of funding limitations.

I have insisted that adequate attention be paid by NASA to the earth resources and medical areas. These funds will provide for experiment emphasis in these areas. Within this $75 million preliminary design for a second mission will also be undertaken. A thorough examination will be made of incorporating artificial gravity in a second mission if it is approved in subsequent years.

A low-cost space shuttle is the single most important component of our total national space program in the 1970's. Because of this $80 million was added on my insistence to the space shuttle and space station effort for 1971. The $80 million will provide for more extensive analysis and engineering studies, long leadtime payload definition effort and advanced testing and fabrication of preliminary designs for both the shuttle and the station. If we are to reach adequate decisions on the timing and emphasis in the low-cost shuttle program and space station it is important that during fiscal year 1971 that the detailed design effort be carried out so that sufficient information is available to the committee and the Congress to make decisions on proceeding with the development of the low cost shuttle and space station.

NASA requested $2.5 million for advanced missions studies for fiscal year 1971. After reviewing this program and at my insistence this line has been reduced by $1.5 million. After considering all of the information it was obvious that NASA could conduct sufficient studies in the advanced missions area with an authorization of $1 million for fiscal year 1971 utilizing unobligated funds remaining in this program for fiscal year 1970. If we are to have a strong space program in the 1970's that will pay substantial returns on the large investments made in the past decade it is important that the Members of this body support the bill as recommended by the committee.

I would like to quote an excerpt from a statement issued by the House Republican policy committee, which was supported unanimously, and which shows the measured pace of the space program under President Nixon's decisions.

The first year of the Nixon Administration witnessed the culmination of the greatest scientific effort of the American people, the magnificently perfect lunar landings of Apollos 11 and 12. The United States achieved in full measure the goals set and the commitments made for the decade of the sixties.

President Nixon has now called upon the Congress to join in charting a new course in space for the seventies. He has challenged America to forge ahead and to continue our progress and leadership in lunar exploration, in satellite communications, in navigation, meteorology and medical research. The President has presented to the Congress an effective and balanced program which insures the achievement of the nation's long-range goals.

The Republican proposals for FY 1971 emphasize: (1) preservation of U.S. technological, engineering and scientific leadership, (2) maximum economy and efficiency in all space programs, (3) development of practical, usable benefits, (4) broadening the contribution of technology and research advances to the U.S. economy, (5) maintenance of balance between manned and unmanned space flight programs to achieve maximum scientific results with minimum expenditures, and (6) safe and efficient conduct of aeronautics research programs including air pollution and noise abatement studies.

For several years I have been critical of NASA's planning schedules for the production and launch of Saturn V vehicles.

Last year NASA planned to maintain

a production rate of three Saturn V vehicles for fiscal year 1970 at the Michoud Assembly Facility. Although this would not have resulted in the optimum production rate, it at least reduced the production costs per vehicle considerably from the $250 million cost per vehicle at a production rate of two per year as was the previous plan.

During testimony received this year, however, we learned that Saturn V production will be suspended for an indefinite period after the completion of the original 15 vehicles planned. This means that the Mississippi test facility will revert to a mothball status in early 1971, and the Michoud Assembly Facility with its production capability will be placed in standby status.

It is unfortunate that budgetary restrictions have forced these two installations to a skeleton-force type of operation. We should try to keep these installations partially active and hold as much of the technical team together.

There is no question in my mind that we will need eventually more Saturn V launch vehicles for future missions, both manned and unmanned.

It was for this reason that I recommended that we add $100 million to the Apollo request for fiscal year 1970 to start long leadtime procurement on Saturn V components and to start on the development of an improved Saturn V system. Since it is the only large booster we have, we must continue to upgrade it to prevent it from becoming obsolescent.

I am not advocating that we resume production now. This should not be done until we have specifically defined missions. With long leadtime and improved components on hand, the startup time for the production lines will be reduced and we will be in a position to start production of an improved version of the Saturn V.

But when production is started, we must be prepared to produce the vehicles at or near the optimum economic rate, and in any case no less than three per year.

Likewise, we must pay very careful attention to launch rates. According to Dr. Paine's testimony this year, the Apollo 20 lunar exploration mission has been canceled. Apollo flights 18 and 19 missions have been delayed until 1974, and the Apollo applications workshop, now called Skylab, has been slipped by 4 months.

The limited budget available has caused the launch schedule to be stretched out to a maximum of two per year, with only one flight in 1972 and none in 1973.

My analysis of launch operations costs, including those incurred at the Kennedy Space Center and the Manned Spacecraft Center, indicates that the more launches you have per year, the less the operating cost per vehicle. For example, if only one launch per year is scheduled, the cost per launch is $260 million. If four launches per year are scheduled, the cost per launch decreases to about $106 million per launch.

Our present rate of two per year works out to about $143 million per launch. It is apparent that the space budget will not permit us to attain the optimum in launch rate costs for the immediate future. However, with some minor rescheduling, the cost per launch could be considerably reduced.

My recommendation is that the launch rate should be stepped up slightly to 2½ launches per year, or five every 2 years. Then operating costs savings of about $20 million per launch could be realized.

Likewise, the frequency of launches has much to do with safety and the risk of accidents during the launch phase. If launch crews are not exercised often enough, they tend tc become rusty with attendant risk of accident. We must keep the launch crews and supporting personnel sufficiently busy to maintain top proficiency. This can be done with a launch rate of 2½ vehicles per year.

Over the years the committee has consistently emphasized the need for additional research and development in the propulsion field. It is unfortunate that these words have not been heeded and that our advanced propulsion technology in high energy liquid fuels, solid fuels, and engine components has not been pursued at a faster pace. This country's space program has always been propulsion limited. The effects are dramtically shown in the recent Apollo 13 abortive mission. A sounder policy of research in this field would have resulted in a larger payload capability, longer mission capability, improved storable fuels, and more efficient propulsion systems.

The unprecedented management by NASA of the limited resources available to our astronauts in the Apollo 13 is a tribute to the technical competence of the NASA team. But it is also an indication of the limitations caused by lack of propulsion capabilities that have forced the program to operate very close to the ragged edge of the weight limitations. This, of course, is caused by lack of propulsion capability. One simple example to show this fact—the lithium hydroxide filters which were used to purify the air in the service module and in the LEM are of two different sizes. They, therefore, presented some problems in the jury-rigged lifesaving arrangements that were made in the return flight. Why were they of different sizes? Primarily, they were of different sizes because of weight saving requirements. There are numerous other weight limiting factors. For example, there were no spare oxygen tanks for use with the fuel cells after the failure of the first tank.

It would seem to me that somewhere in our future planning we should provide more than enough propulsion capability to prevent our programs from being weight limited. With an adequate program in the chemical propulsion field, we could have more "push per pound" merely by the application of a relatively small amount of funding in the areas that are so critical to the mission's success; namely, propulsion and space electrical power generation. I have consistently pushed for further development of the large solid rocket booster which has now been completely phased out of the NASA program. This is being done in spite of the obvious simplicity and more economical "push per dollar" that is inherent in the large solid program.

Previous testimony has shown that the Russians are expected to have a new booster of more than 10 million pounds of thrust. The Russians have always had a forward thrusting development program with respect to large boosters, and their new booster is almost one-third larger than our Saturn V rocket. They have learned that it is folly to be limited on booster capability. Why cannot we wake up to this same obvious fact?

In addition, we have not pursued the development of space-storable fuel at a very impressive rate. NASA has at my prodding continued work in the fluorine-oxygen-methane program and in the fluorine-diborane program. These new technologies offer many advantages in propulsion efficiency, storability and simplification of total mission payloads. However, this program has been limping along at a reduced rate. Additionally, NASA has year by year reduced the amount of money available in the chemical propulsion research area. It is extremely difficult for me to understand the thought processes which could arrive at this type conclusion.

From this brief discussion it is obvious that there are a number of areas which are being completely overlooked and by the application of a relatively small amount of money could give our country the propulsion capability it needs to stay foremost in the space field. With the paucity of effort that is now being expended, we will be fortunate if we do not slip further behind the Russian booster effort.

The NERVA nuclear rocket program continues to progress according to the schedule dictated by reduced funding over the past 3 years. We are achieving technology that will give this country a vitally necessary capability in exploring the outer reaches of the solar system. Already the NASA–AEC team has successfully test-fired the NERVA at present maximum power of 50,000 pounds of thrust for over an hour, including 10 cycles of shutdown and restart. The ultimate development objective, which is already within reach, is 75,000 pounds of thrust with 10 hours of operation and having the capability of multiple shutdown and restart. To get some understanding of what that means, the longest we can operate a chemical fueled rocket is about 6 minutes.

The key to success in space is propulsion, thrust power to lift the payloads necessary to accomplish our objectives. It is as simple as that. It is also the one factor that forced this Nation to come from behind and overtake the Soviet Union, because for many years we could not match their rocket power. We must never be caught in that position again. The NERVA is intended for operations after 1978, when we will be approaching really ambitious missions which are already well into development. Those missions will include close investigations of the outer planets, lunar orbiting manned spacecraft, the manned orbital laboratory, and so forth—all those missions that require long duration of thrust and are much more economical if the engine is reusable.

NASA requested $38 million for fiscal year 1971 for nuclear rockets, $1.5 million more than was programed for fiscal year 1970. In my view, the request is really a very minimal amount to carry forward the schedule. Personally I would have preferred a more substantial funding level, increasing the NERVA to approximately $50 million. However, I am also deeply aware of the budgetary strictures this country is experiencing at this time. NASA has given assurances that the agency can make significant progress with NERVA under the present budget request. The committee, therefore, approved the authorization request of $38 million by virtually a unanimous vote and I support it completely.

In any event we cannot afford to hamstring the program without paying a tremendous penalty in our program organization and in funds to make up lost ground in the not too distant future.

No American could have been prouder than I last July when our astronauts landed on the moon. I have stated, from the very beginning that man's exploration of space will not end with the lunar landing. We must continue to take advantage of the almost limitless possibilities of space exploration and the benefits to mankind it offers.

You may recall that I served on the select committee formed in 1958 to chart a course of dynamic action in our Nation's space endeavors. The wisdom of the committee that went into formulating the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 is attested to by its durability. The goals and objectives started nearly 12 years ago are still valid today.

To date, our Nation's space program has provided unparalleled gains in scientific knowledge, communications, weather observations and predictions, navigation, and improvements in national security. Our Apollo lunar landing program alone has produced remarkable scientific and technological advances. Then there are the achievements that are not so easy to put your finger on. We can speak of national pride and international respect as side effects from recapturing the technical/scientific leadership from the Soviet Union. We can speak of the proof of our country's ability to set a formidable goal and to stick by our guns until that goal is reached. We can speak of the revolution in American education sparked by the space race. These gains cannot and must not be lost.

If these gains are not to be lost, what then must our national space program of the future be? What then is the course that America must chart to stay at the forefront of space exploration and development? What must we do to provide a steady flow of returns in science, applications, and technology from our national investments in space?

This bill now before us supports the conviction that the groundwork for future, more diversified and productive activities must be laid—although in more modest aspects.

The legislation before you outlines a national space program that will be continued at a steady but moderate level. There are no crash programs but rather wide-ranging space goals for the nineteen-seventies. These goals are exploration, the gathering of scientific knowledge and the practical application of the lessons of space to life on earth.

The unmanned space programs have formidable goals but goals that must be reached if we are ever to understand our universe. A more viable and diversified planetary program is needed. The development of carefully conceived plans, not only for the exploration of Mars, but for Venus, Mercury, Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, Neptune, and Pluto, as well as the Astroid Belt should be strongly supported. The U.S. space program for the next decade will include unmanned flights to all the planets in the solar system, including the ground tour mission to the five outer planets.

The legislation before you today is presented by an administration unhampered by channel vision. It is based on the recommendations of the President's Space Task Group—recommendations which are bold and forward looking—recommendations which are broad and balanced. It is legislation that is supported by NASA, supported by me, and I am confident, supported by the American people.

For mankind on earth, our exploration of space has had far-reaching consequences which only now are we beginning to grasp and appreciate.

Since its establishment, NASA's program of space exploration has been visible in its constructive effects on almost every section of our society and every area of the Nation. It has spawned new communities and new jobs. It has advanced both education and the educated man.

To demonstrate this, let me turn your attention southward to Huntsville, Ala., once known only a decade ago as the Watercress capital of the world. Its population then was less than 20,000. Today Huntsville is the home of the Marshall Space Flight Center where the Saturn V, the rocket that boosted men to the moon, was designed and fabricated; and it has a population of more than 140,000. Where only one small fire station operated, there now are nine modern stations. In 1958, there were only a very few century-old churches in Huntsville; today there are more than 40 new churches and two new synagogues.

Since 1960 an average of one classroom a week has been added to Huntsville's public school system; and the growth is one of quality as well as quantity. More than 80 percent of the city's high school graduates who have competed for National Merit scholarships in the past 5 years are numbered in the top 25 percent above the national average. The educational level of Huntsville's residents is far above the national average. The level at Huntsville is at least 2 years of college.

The influx of personnel, both government and contractor, has brought to Huntsville a new mix in population and new ideas. The city boasts its own symphony and its own observatory. The Huntsville Branch of the University of Alabama has developed into one of the Nation's best graduate schools in science and engineering. Through education and the educated community of Huntsville, resulting from the impact of space, the problem of race has been mitigated.

The story of Huntsville is not an isolated one in the Nation. Space exploration has brought new life and productivity to areas from New York to California; and, indeed, the influence also extends beyond our national borders. Our achievements in space have stimulated worldwide a new appreciation of the values of the American democratic system and the capabilities inherent in citizens working in a free society. The effect of this, its significance for the future with respect to the political direction of many of the newly emerging nations is beyond measure.

The success of our effort to reach the moon provided a new view of earth. We were able to see it as a whole; and this new view provided us with a deeper appreciation of its bounty. I am certain that this view has contributed to our recent intensified concern for our environment and the growing resolve to decrease pollution by managing the life-support systems of "spacecraft earth" as carefully as we do those of the Apollo spacecrafts. Space has given us a greater awareness of our mismanagement of earth and an increased regard for our future and our destiny.

Our voyages into space have been voyages of discovery. How does one express in dollars the incentives for achievement this provides? How does one measure in material terms the growing hope, the confidence that if we will it, a better world is no dream? Perhaps this is the most important achievement of our reach into space—this spur that has been provided to encourage us to set goals for improving man and his condition and then plan to achieve them.

NASA has shown how to manage and integrate worldwide thousands of peoples, countless skills, various industrial teams as well as groups from the universities, research centers and government in order to pursue and achieve a great goal. We must apply the lessons we have learned from our efforts in space to fulfill our aspirations on earth.

Our reach for the moon has given us an increased regard for the future. The best part of that future is in our children—and the more than a billion children born all over the world since 1958. Our view of earth and space, new and startling to us, will be and, indeed, is already familiar to them. Gravity that for most of our lives has confined us to earth no longer is a barrier.

Today's children will in their time go farther and faster than any of us have ever thought probable. Because of the space program, the young people who are part of that future, will master new sciences, learn new cosmology, and will have a new view of man and his ultimate destiny in the universe. The full consequences of this is now beyond our perception; but we can be certain that the promise of a future rich and productive beyond belief will be within their reach.

The funds this Nation has invested in NASA programs are paying off in ways

no one could perceive when we started back in 1959. The Intelsat communications systems already a reality is based principally on the work NASA has done in communications satellites. The existence of the Comsat Corp. is solely due to the technologies that have been evolved through the NASA-contractor teams. One of the great accomplishments we expect to achieve is widespread use of this media for educational purposes. NASA is participating in the creation of an educational system by satellite for the Indian Government, this system is to be tested within the next 2 years. An applications technology satellite will be placed in synchronous orbit precisely at 23,300 miles over the Indian Ocean and will beam down experimental educational programs to inexpensive television receivers located in 5,000 villages. These programs on farming, family planning, conservation, the three "R's," and many others will initially be transmitted by India's Government stations and will be seen by more than 5,000,000 people. The later operational system will reach the 400,000,000 citizens of India who live off of the earth. Such efforts to help underdeveloped nations to make their people self-sufficient in the basic needs of human existence is, from our point of view, well worth the investment.

Additionally, the Canadian Government is planning a similar satellite to cover the wide expanse of that relatively thinly populated country. In addition, there are now 75 countries of the world participating in Intelsat system. This shows that not only do the underdeveloped countries have an output from NASA spinoff, but also the developed countries as well.

NASA programs such as these should continue to receive vigorous support. Soon to come into being are the earth resources satellites, which will bring unprecedented benefits. These unmanned craft will be able to pinpoint early indications of crop disease, previously undiscovered sources of fresh water, the beginnings of locust swarms in barren country, not to mention global weather patterns.

Not only are such programs of direct benefit to ourselves and other countries, but NASA is participating in space-related activities with more than 70 other nations around the globe. These ventures are either conducted jointly or on a reimbursable basis. To me, this policy is an excellent example of enlightened self-interest, and goes far to give strength and support to the international objectives of the country.

The space program and particularly the manned space flight portion thereof, has brought the biomedical scientist and engineer to closer conjunction than any other endeavor in the history of the earth. The hostile environment of space including the weightlessness, the radiation, the great distances involved and the loss of earth's influence on man's natural periodicities has made it mandatory that the technology of measuring man's physiologic and psychologic reactions to the space environment be reported in real time or as close real time as possible.

Because of the weight, volume and power limitations of spacecraft and because techniques traditionally used on earth are not acceptable and in many cases not feasible in space, much effort has been expended in developing new and advanced techniques of measurement and of instrumentation. These advances affect almost all man's bodily systems, but the cardiovascular system has been found to be one which is highly susceptible to the environments of space and, of course, is a key system in maintaining man in a healthy, effective state.

Many of the developments which have risen directly from the space program and have been used therein, have had other offshoots into terrestrial cardiovascular assessment and treatment functions.

Today, there are a number of these in actual use in the United States and some have been tried abroad. Examples are the spray on electrode. Normally, when one has an electrocardiogram, the technician applies a metal electrode to the chest and moves it about. In addition, he connects wires to the wrist and ankles. These electrodes are all right for short contacts, but in doing dynamic monitoring of the heart they have proven to be inadequate. Under NASA sponsorship, a spray on electrode was developed. One merely sprays this electrode over the end of a lead wire which has been greatly miniaturized and these are connected to the electrocardiogram machine. The application of the electrode doesn't require the removal of heat and this then flexible layer of material will contain the electrode, even though the patient is moving about. This is particularly useful in children.

Because of the need for good communications and receiving data from space, the equipment has been adapted for use in not only ambulances which are not attended by a physician—in moving a cardiac patient from his home on to a treatment center, so that the physician on the other end can give instructions to the ambulance attendant, but in addition, is being utilized today in a number of mobile cardiac treatment vans which are operational in various places.

Another development which is proving to be of use on earth, is enhancement of X-rays by means of a computer. X-rays, particularly of deep unaccessible portions of the body hidden behind boney areas, are often distorted and unclear. The use of a computer technique of converting the X-ray picture into digital forms and converting each point of the picture into a number proportionate to the film's optical density has resulted in the ability to reproduce them with much more clarity of detail and these are being used in studies of the heart and great vessels, as well as of the vessels in the brain.

Today, in many places, catheters used to do pressure studies and analyses of the cardiovascular system and the heart are equipped with pressure transducers which are miniaturized and have been adapted for measuring these pressures in humans. These transducers originally were designed for pressure survey probes in wind tunnels and for telemetry of pressure data from small flight models. They have greatly increased the sensitivity and increased the data returning from these very important measurements.

Another interesting technique which is still under development, but which has been used by cardiac surgeons, both in this country and abroad, is a technique for measuring the output of the heart by means of a four-electrode impedance plethysmograph. Normally, to measure the heart output, one must put a catheter directly into the outflow tract of the heart. This is still somewhat a dangerous procedure, even though done almost routinely today, and this technique shows extremely high degree of promise of either replacing or complementing the dye dilution techniques which are used today.

Another somewhat recent development is a technique for improving the image of the contractions of heart muscle tissue in doing heart research. This particular method was developed because a closed circuit television being used to monitor muscle movement produced a degraded and distorted image because a muscle moves rapidly, and the image storage time in the camera tube was wrong.

An engineer at one of the NASA centers suggested and developed the method of synchronizing a rapidly flashing light with the closed TV system, and as a result markedly improved images were obtained utilizing these stroboscopic principles. Although no catheters or tubes have been placed into any of the astronauts today, the research going on related to the cardiovascular system has resulted in the production of a miniature semiconductor transducer capable of transmitting pressure variations which help to assess cardiovascular function. This particular pressure transducer is about 200th of an inch thick and uses less than 500 millionths of a watt of electrical power and is a particularly attractive device which advances the state of the art in monitoring blood flow changes in cardiac patients for coronary inclusion.

A new type of artificial heart controller has been developed in cooperation of one of the space research centers with other medical groups, and consists of a pneumatic control system which supplies a driving pressure for either a cardiac assist pump or for a total replacement artificial heart. The system is still rather large, but continuing work is going on to make it small enough so that it can be useful outside the great institutions. This particular control system responds to very small variations in the atrial pressure of the heart, and results in a normal regulation of the artificial heart outflow system.

Going somewhat beyond the cardiovascular system, there are at the current time in use in several places in this country an automated monitoring system which can collect several channels of physiologic data from as many as 64 hospital patients and transmit it in digital form to a central control station for processing by a computer. A variety of conventional medical sensors can be used with a patient unit and these include EKG, temperatures, blood pressure,

peripheral blood flow and certain other physiologic parameters, such as depth and rate of respiration.

Another method of measuring peripheral blood flows using ultra sound techniques and the doppler phenomenon are also under development and show great promise.

A further advancement is the discovery that some high purity, high strength carbon forms which were developed for the aerospace activities are chemically, biologically, and physically compatible with fluids and tissues within the human body. In addition to their high strength and long term compatibility, these forms of carbon can be fabricated easily into variable shapes and easily sterilized. Because of these characteristics, these materials may very well be the next order of materials used in surgical implantations for corrections of various pathological body conditions resulting from disease and/or injury. They well may be used for implantation splints, bone extensions, circulatory bypass implants, replaceable heart valves and other implantable prostheses which can probably be used more safely than the materials available today.

No one knows what the future will bring, but the space program continues to drive technology to find ways of measuring cardiac and vascular functions in man by noninvasive techniques and to develop the means of communicating this data over great distances rapidly in a form that will be easily interpreted.

It is likely that in the next 20 to 30 years, a number of new diagnostic or detection methodologies will be derived. Looking toward the future, a number of likely advancements are in sight. With the capability of imprinting microcircuitry on very small discs, it is entirely possible that a man's complete medical history—to include EKG's, cardiac outputs, peripheral blood flow, venous compliance, state of certain peripheral vessels, that is rigidity, and so forth, miniaturized pictures of the heart and vessels of the brain, plus every significant component of his physical examinations can be imprinted upon a disc as small as a quarter. This disc could then be used in place of the physician taking a history each time. Merely by inserting it into a small machine, he could pick out those elements which were significant as he reviewed the case in question.

Another advancement is that by the use of early detection of disease techniques, upon which the space agency is working very hard, one may be able to detect those subtle early changes which indicate that the cardiovascular system is beginning to get into trouble. With the advancement in communications and monitoring devices, I can foresee that rather than go to the doctor's office for a lying down examination, the patient may very well be able to pick up a monitoring device and wear it for several days, either transmitting directly to a receiver or deliver a very tiny recorder to a physician's office that can then be analyzed.

The development of new material and new techniques for pumping and regulating pressures may very well result in the ability to produce devices which can take the load off the heart if it is diseased, while the body goes through its normal function of repair.

There has been mention many times of a hospital in space where the weightless environment would take the load off of a diseased heart and, that while the patient was recovering from a heart difficulty they could be in this environment. This may come, but the stresses of returning to a gravity environment might very well limit the usefulness of this idea.

If, however, one can reduce the stresses of insertion into orbit and return to earth, this has a possibility in the future. Because space flight makes it important that we understand the various subtle and basic changes which occur at the cellular and even molecular level, the research being done and to be conducted may well lead to a much deeper understanding of the total function of the cardiovascular system and its relationship to other systems, so that more effective preventive means can be devised for patients with heart disease.

One development currently of great interest, but not yet far enough along to predict when it will come into effect, is one called "integrated medical behavioral laboratory system." This is a modularized flexible system which would have the capability of—at one sitting—measuring a good many physiologic and psychologic factors and integrating them into a picture of the individual's total well-being very rapidly. This system is being developed in its first form to fly in a spacecraft in the mid or late 1970's. This should prove a great boon to hospitals and physicians' offices—in that it would simplify and speed up the process by which the biochemical, behavioral and physiologic measurements are being carried out today. It might well be the greatest breakthrough in diagnostic instrumentation that we will have seen within the past 100 years.

In the NASA fiscal year 1971, the construction of facilities budget request of $34,600,000 is the lowest budget for new facilities that NASA has submitted. Their low budget program has been submitted in consideration of economy in spite of testimony before the committee on the need for more facilities for research.

Repeatedly, I have emphasized the need for forward-looking research programs and am well aware of the demands for newer facilities to meet the new research needs. I am, however, in agreement with this year's request and support it without change. My colleagues should be reminded that more research facilities are a must if this country is to maintain its predominance in space and aeronautics in the future. NASA must closely review its future needs and present them to the Congress in their proper order of priority.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude by complimenting our Apollo 13 astronauts, the officials of the NASA mission control, and the whole NASA team on bringing the Apollo 13 astronauts safely back to earth. They showed the world that we really can operate in space, that we are first in space and first in technology in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER).

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, before we approve H.R. 16516, the NASA authorization bill, I believe it should be substantially amended. I oppose it in its present form.

Frankly, I have hesitated to grab this tiger by the tail. I particularly hate to stand here against the position of the gentleman from Texas, OLIN TEAGUE, chairman of the Subcommittee on Manned Space, for whom I have great admiration and respect. I hate to disagree with the gentleman from California, GEORGE MILLER, chairman of our full committee, for whom I have a very special personal devotion.

Also, I regret being in disagreement with my distinguished minority colleague on the committee, JIM FULTON, of Pennsylvania. I salute JIM FULTON for his personal courage, his devotion to duty, and his devotion to NASA's missions, as indicated by the fact that he has risked coming from the hospital in order to participate in our action here today.

We all recognize that the superb success of the moon landings, the Apollo program of the 1960's, owes much to the wise and vigorous leadership of Congressmen MILLER, TEAGUE, and FULTON, as well as the persistently strong support of all members of our committee, and the Congress as a whole. We continue to persist.

Personally, I certainly do support a continuing, strong manned flight program. At the same time, I urgently submit it should be supported at a lower priority level, and slower paced.

Therefore, I regret and oppose the action of our Science and Astronautics Committee in proposing nearly $300 million for manned flight programs over and above the administration's NASA budget requests, in this authorization bill.

I suggest that any such tremendous increase above the administration's budget request is not only unwise because of our crucial inflationary problems and the whole question of national priority needs, but also because it would to an unfortunate degree tend to distort the shape of NASA's overall effort, would distort the mix or balance of its various elements.

Therefore, I urge that we hold this NASA authorization much closer to the level requested by the administration, and that our amendments should provide wiser balance, direction, and timing for the whole space program.

This is 1970. Our original commitment for the Apollo program in the 1960's has succeeded magnificently. Now new needs and goals, other opportunities, demand our greater attention and support in this new decade.

Among those opportunities, relatively neglected thus far and crying for greater attention, are those so very evident in the greater use of unmanned, automated, instrumented space flights.

At this time of severe budget restraint, when our dollars are so scarce and must be spread so thin and wisely, I argue

strenuously that we must put relatively greater emphasis on those aspects of the space program whence the practical returns, the fruitful returns, are the greatest. I mean usefulness to human beings right here on the earth. And all the evidence clearly shows that we achieve by far the greatest return in usefulness, in potential dollars profit for every dollar invested, from the unmanned space programs.

There was abundant evidence this year before our Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications that encouraged us to increase the authorizations for unmanned flight. We could have presented strong, valid arguments here for such increases. But in view of the Nation's other crucial needs, and other NASA programs, we felt obligated to stay strictly within the NASA budget request, and that is what we did.

Similarly, in the Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology, they faced strong arguments for increases, but they too held the line.

But the $300 million increase proposed for manned flight broke that policy. I repeat, it thus tends to distort the whole program. I am confident there are many, many more places where that $300 million could be put to better use.

I believe that the $3⅓ billion—I repeat, $3.30 billion—requested by NASA is adequate for that agency's needs in fiscal year 1971. It will be argued that is the smallest NASA request in many years. But that is as it should be. Right now should be a period of transition, a time for rethinking plans and priorities; not a time for rushing headlong into major expensive new programs, but a time for relatively very low budgets. I submit that a proposal for $3.3 billion is not very low. And, three hundred added millions is much too much.

Mr. Chairman, the Apollo 13 crisis of last week was a tremendous test of NASA's planning and skills. NASA's crews, both ground control and the astronauts themselves, came safely through that harrowing test with superb courage, skill and success. All of us are profoundly grateful for that; and we are immensely proud of the NASA performance. The accident does not diminish our faith in the space program; in fact, that faith is strengthened by the way NASA's men overcame it.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I believe the Apollo 13 accident inevitably may require some slowdown in the manned flights, and that in itself weakens the argument for added funding right now. All the more reason for holding to NASA's original budget request.

If thorough investigation of the Apollo 13 accident proves the need for added funds, then a supplemental authorization should be warranted, but not until we have the special investigating board's report.

Incidentally, I believe an excellent review board—headed by the extremely capable and conscientious Ed Cortright—has been named to do that investigation.

Mr. Chairman, I expect to support amendments which will be offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH), chairman of the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications, on which I have the privilege of serving as ranking minority member.

Mr. KARTH will of course explain his own amendments later, in detail. But, in general terms, I understand he expects to propose cutting, not all of the extra money added to NASA's budget request by the committee, but a substantial part of it. His amendments would cut a total of about $240 million. Some $190 million of that would be cut from the proposed space shuttle development.

We argue that advanced research for the shuttle should be funded for the next fiscal year, but that it is too early to spend millions upon millions for its development. Far too many basic, beginning questions seem to remain undetermined as yet about this major new program. We argue this is a transition year in which we should move slowly, carefully, a time for a lot of rethinking, especially in relation to other national and NASA needs, not the right time for a huge new program start that inevitably will cost countless billions of dollars.

I doubt most Members of the House fully recognize that, if we authorize $190 million for beginning development of the space shuttle next year, it may well be the first step, a commitment for a $40 to $60 billion—yes, billions—dollar program in the next 6 to 8 years. Implied here, I submit, are annual NASA budget levels of $6 to $7 billion or more, year after year in the near future.

I urgently believe this is not the time to make any such new start.

Mr. Chairman, please note that I have not emphasized here the argument which several other Members undoubtedly will speak very eloquently, that our society is suffering today from several other human needs which should have a much higher priority, above the NASA programs, in our very limited national budget.

I understand and sympathize with that argument. However, in reality, I do not believe a reasonable NASA budget is in conflict with, or steals from these other budget needs. In fact, I believe the NASA program so vigorously bolsters our economy, stimulates our technology and points the successful way by which great public problems should be attacked, its beneficial "fallout" is so great and so varied, I do not see it as a rival but as an essential ally to other positive, creative programs. But, I repeat, that assumes that the NASA authorizations should be held down to the administration's requested budget limits. I believe it very healthy for NASA itself, that it be held to a very lean budget in these difficult times.

In closing these remarks, I repeat my strong feeling that the really big potential return for dollars invested in space effort is in the unmanned programs, and that is why I tend to resent any action here which seems to overcommit us away from the unmanned flight opportunities, already too much neglected.

I submit that an overwhelming portion of the scientific knowledge produced thus far by NASA has been based upon data produced by unmanned, automated spacecraft.

Similarly, most of the practical applications of space technology, such as communications, meteorology, navigation and earth resources survey, have been and will continue to be achieved by using unmanned satellites. In my judgment it is these efforts which should receive relatively much greater emphasis in the decade of the 1970's, and many of the most responsible, knowledgeable assessments of our full space program by others, also emphasize the need for that change of emphasis.

In the earth resources satellites program alone, there is literally billions of dollars of return possible in benefits for agriculture, forestry, mineralogy, geology and geography, oceanography, air pollution controls, better weather controls, and so forth, the entire spectrum of activities for the conservation, enhancement of our natural resources and environment. And yet we are supporting only a very limited beginning Earth Resources Technology Satellites (ERTS) effort by NASA.

I am very glad, in these days of limited funding, that H.R. 16516 does include some authorizations for the unmanned programs—for lunar and planetary exploration, physics and astronomy research, bioscience experiments and space applications. But these are very limited, "bare bones" programs, even though they are in several respects very much needed as preliminary to later manned flights.

All the more reason why we should not approve here today the adding of nearly $300 million over and above NASA's budget request for manned flights, the most expensive and least productive aspect of our national space effort—least productive both in terms of scientific output and in practical applications.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MOSHER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, my record of support for the space program, I believe, is second to none in this House. I have consistently voted for this program over the last 12 years and it goes without saying that I have the highest possible personal regard for all our marvelous spacemen, from Dr. Von Braun and Colonel Glenn right through to all of the heroes of the Apollo 13 flight. These brave men in space and those able and dedicated technical geniuses on the ground that made the successful recovery possible gave all Americans here on earth a tremendous moral lift.

I favor and will continue to support the further continuation of the space program. However, I cannot in these days of grave domestic national concern over such earthly problems as environmental pollution, crime and drug prevention, and the need to rebuild our cities, support the expansion of the space program. I will, therefore, vote to support cuts in the bill before us today in those areas where I deem the program requirements as expansive. Specifically, I am for deleting the $190,000,000 provided for the manned space shuttle/station at the expense of other unmanned programs of greater value.

In addition, I shall vote to eliminate

the $100 million which is provided by the committee for the long lead time procurement of hardware for an improved Saturn V rocket. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the current Saturn V which has done such a fine job in making our Apollo flights so successful, is sufficient for the present time. Research should of course continue on improvements for the future but I do not think now is the time to begin a large procurement effort. We have landed Americans on the moon. Our only competitors in this field are the Russians and they have admitted our primacy in technical excellence and achievement. Therefore, I feel that we are entitled at this point to relax somewhat our effort in this area and concentrate our main assets on those grave national domestic concerns, some of which were voiced so dramatically yesterday on the first Earth Day.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH).

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, it is with sincere regret that I am unable to support the bill (H.R. 16516) as reported by the Committee on Science and Astronautics. Our distinguished chairman, Mr. MILLER of California, knows that I have been a strong supporter of the national space program over the many years it has been my privilege to serve under his able leadership. I have supported large NASA budgets, even in the face of other urgent needs of our Nation and our citizens, because I am convinced that the space effort represents the leading edge of America's technological advancement. As a nation we must remain in the forefront of the world's technology, for to fall behind, in my judgment, is to assure that we will shortly become a second-rate nation.

Yet, as Chairman MILLER has pointed out, this is a year of budget austerity. The Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications recognized this fact and observed the stricture in considering NASA's request for space science and applications funds, and in making our recommendations to the full committee. We approved the exact amount that the administration requested, which is $565.7 million for research and development for the Office of Space Science and Applications for fiscal year 1971. That amount for this important work is a little over one-fifth—21 percent—of the NASA budget for research and development. To me, this is a reasonable approach to the budgetary problems which we face at this session of the Congress. I hope that the House will sustain our recommendations.

I want to assure the Members that our subcommittee, in arriving at this judgment, gave very careful and detailed attention to each of the five major programs in our jurisdiction, and to the money authorizations requested for each program. These are the line items identified in the bill as "Physics and astronomy, lunar and planetary exploration, bioscience, space applications, and launch vehicle procurement."

The subcommittee met for 3 days in executive session to evaluate each program, weigh the possibilities of reductions in the stern administration budget, and appraise the benefits of possible increases in certain items. I think I can speak for all the members of our subcommittee in stating to the House that we feel strongly that the space applications program—the practical, end-result, benefits-on-earth type of space activities—needs greater emphasis and attention than it has had in the past. We believe increased expenditures for these purposes can be justified. Nevertheless, as I said earlier, we did not increase that portion of the NASA R. & D. budget within the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

We did, however, make one minor change in the form of a transfer of $5.6 million from one program to another. Frankly, in order to find a little more money for space applications work, we searched diligently for an item that might be cut slightly so that an increase of a like amount would not change the overall total and would not thereby rock the austerity boat. We found it, I think, in the Explorer program which comes under the line item, "Physics and astronomy." The Explorer satellites constitute an on-going program which is important, but which at least to some degree, is deferrable. So this is where we took away the $5.6 million. The Explorer item is thereby reduced to an even $20 million for fiscal year 1971, which approximates the Explorer funding level for the current fiscal year under NASA's operating plan, and accordingly the line item of "Physics and astronomy" is reported at $110.4 million instead of $116 million as presented in the original budget.

The transferred amount—$5.6 million—is added to the applications technology satellite project, to bring it up to $36.7 million—which is still less, incidentally, than the current fiscal year budget for this project. The purpose of the transfer is to permit the timely launching of two specific satellites, called ATS–F and G, under the original schedule of 1972–74, rather than to postpone the launchings for perhaps a year. The effect on the bill before you is to make the "Space applications" item $172.6 million instead of $167 million as in the original budget.

Mr. Chairman, please observe that we have resisted the temptation to increase, at this time, the highly popular tremendously vital earth resources survey program which also comes under the heading "Space applications." The reason for this restraint is not that I have lost my zeal for what many Members consider one of the most important of all space projects; the reason simply is that NASA finally has made a good start on development of an earth resources technology satellite, and proposes to continue its work on this project in fiscal year 1971 under a reasonably adequate budget request of approximately $50 million. I wish it could be more, but I recognize the realities of the current situation, and the need to curtail Government spending in the face of inflation.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, our budget recommendations for space science and applications are moderate, noninflationary, and at the same time at a level that should keep the program moving ahead on an even keel.

Why then do I oppose this bill in its present form? My opposition might be based simply upon the fact that almost $300 million was added by the Science and Astronautics Committee to support a more vigorous manned space flight program.

Mr. Chairman, it should be recognized that the sustained effort on the Apollo project during the last 8 years and its attendant high costs, taken together with 5 years of declining NASA budgets, has caused the space program as a whole to be thrown out of balance.

I supported the large expenditures for Apollo during this period, not only because I approved of the objectives of Apollo, but also because to have done otherwise would have disrupted the pace of the program, introduced inefficiencies, and resulted in dramatic increases in costs.

Furthermore, I am as happy with the successful conclusion of the Apollo project as anyone in this chamber.

Now that the Apollo mission has been accomplished, however, the time has come for a reassessment of the space program, and it seems appropriate that primary emphasis should be placed upon achieving a better balance between the manned and the unmanned aspects of the program.

Unfortunately, the program presented to Congress by NASA this year is not calculated to redress the imbalance in the space effort; rather, it constitutes the initial step in pursuit of an extremely ambitious space program for the decade of the seventies, with all increases in future budgets going toward manned mission. NASA's projected budgets go from $4 billion in fiscal year 1972 to $6.8 billion in fiscal year 1979, but the unmanned effort will remain at a constant level of effort.

While I oppose increasing the NASA budget for fiscal year 1971 in general, and especially for the manned space flight program, I submit that Congress has an unusual opportunity this year to participate in developing basic policy for the Nation's space program for the next decade by making selective cuts in the administration's request for authorization.

NASA proposes to begin large-scale expenditures in fiscal year 1971 for development of a so-called space shuttle/station program. This program is directed toward development, first, of a reusable chemically fueled two-stage shuttle which will operate between the surface of the earth and low earth orbit in an airline-type mode.

Second, the project looks to development of a space station module which is conceived to be a permanent structure in orbit designed initially to support six to 12 occupants. By joining together such space station modules, NASA proposes ultimately to erect a space base capable of accommodating 50 to 100 men. But what 100 men in earth orbit would be called upon to do that 12—or even six—cannot do, is not explained.

NASA's preliminary cost estimates for development of the space shuttle/station

total almost $14 billion. However, NASA officials readily concede that these preliminary estimates are not to be relied upon. Testimony was received by our committee to the effect that "studies of the space station and shuttle, which are in progress during fiscal year 1970 and will continue into fiscal year 1971, will provide a much more comprehensive definition of the development of operational programs with a related improvement in the quality of our cost estimates. Experience indicates a strong probability that these more refined cost estimates will vary significantly from the preliminary values shown."

Mr. Chairman, I agree with that statement by NASA officials. In fact, I have no confidence in those cost estimates. Ten years' service on the Science and Astronautics Committee has convinced me that preliminary costs estimates are uniformly low, often only a fraction of ultimate costs.

In any case, it is my contention that NASA proposes to embark this year upon a new space program based upon new hardware almost entirely in support of manned missions with a manned Mars landing as the ultimate objective. For example, it is estimated by NASA that 68 percent of its total budget will be spent on manned space flight missions in fiscal year 1979 with $1 billion specifically designated for the manned Mars landing in fiscal year 1979.

While I am not opposed to the eventual development of a space shuttle, the large space station, the chemical space tug, and the nuclear transfer stage, I submit that it is unwise to undertake an accelerated program of the type envisioned by NASA during the next decade. I believe that the next few years should be a period of consolidation of the gains made in the space program to date, a fuller utilization of existing hardware and technology, and with special emphasis on a more aggressive exploitation of our space capabilities for useful application. Space systems have already demonstrated their enormous potential for direct economic payoff in such fields as international communications, navigation and air traffic control, analysis and forecasting of weather, and in surveying the earth's resources.

Let me now turn to the specifics of the fiscal year 1971 NASA budget. The Committee on Science and Astronautics adopted a report offered by the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee which increased the administration's request of $110 million for the space shuttle/station development project by $80 million, for a total of $190 million.

I would propose to cut these funds out of the authorization bill under consideration, and at an appropriate time I shall offer an amendment to accomplish this. The purpose of my amendment is not to kill the project, but simply to establish a realistic pace for development. I want to point out that NASA officials have testified that as much as $80 million will be spent during fiscal year 1971 in direct support of the space shuttle/station by the Office of Advanced Research and Technology.

I fully support the research work proposed to be done by OART in this regard.

Before the space shuttle can be a reality, many difficult technological advances must be made in such areas as configuration and aerodynamics, heat protection, guidance and control, and propulsion, to name some of the more obvious ones. While NASA officials appear optimistic that these technical problems can be solved, they admit maximum innovation from the aerospace industry will be required, and that alternative approaches to these difficult problems will need to be studied.

As a matter of fact, NASA officials are divided on the fundamental question of whether the space shuttle should be a fully reuseable two stage vehicle, or simply a recoverable orbital stage launched by an expendable first stage. Dr. Wernher von Braun seems to favor the latter approach, while Dr. Thomas Paine and Mr. Dale Myers have testified in support of the former.

In short, Mr. Chairman, development of the space shuttle may prove to be far more difficult than NASA anticipates. Many technical questions must be resolved before the Nation embarks on such a difficult and explosive undertaking.

Most important, it is far from clear that the space shuttle is needed; NASA has not defined the program of the future in terms of numbers, and size, and cost of payloads that will require a space shuttle.

Even if the space shuttle were now in existence, and the cost of operation of the space shuttle were extremely low, the high utilization rate needed to justify its high development costs and its high procurement costs would require a considerable expansion of the scope of U.S. space activities during the late seventies and the eighties. Specifically, NASA officials have testified that the space shuttle will provide a capability for placing 50,000 pounds in orbit, and that they anticipate a minimum of 30 flights per year by NASA and an equivalent number in support of DOD programs. During the entire decade of the sixties, NASA exceeded 30 launches per year only once—36 in 1966—including Scouts and Saturn V's, which are not to be replaced by the space shuttle. Assuming the space shuttle's payload capacity would be fully utilized on each of the projected 60 yearly flights, this adds up to 3 million pounds of payload launched into orbit each year. Could the United States afford such an ambitious space program? Would the American taxpayer be willing to support such an ambitious space program?

How do 3 million pounds of payload in orbit compare with the space program of the past? In terms of cumulative payload launched, 1969 was NASA's biggest year with 442,358 pounds, over 97 percent of which was attributed to the four Apollo flights. It follows that space shuttle advocates must anticipate a greatly expanded manned space flight program—30 flights per year by NASA alone—one which the Nation might be unwilling or unable to support. Note that the NASA budget has declined each year since 1965. It would have to increase dramatically during the next few years to support the development project if the space shuttle is to fly by 1977, and then increase even more after the shuttle becomes operational in order to support the kind of ambitious program it is designed to serve.

The Titan III experience may be instructive. Development of Titan III was undertaken in the expectation that, once operational, there would be 50 to 100 launches per year. This high utilization rate was the justification for investing $1 billion for development. Currently, there are three Titan III launches per year.

Mr. Chairman, we may someday need a space shuttle. I believe we must all keep an open mind regarding the nature and scope of the space program in the future. Accordingly, I support the basic research work to be done by OART on space shuttle/station technical problems. But $80 million during fiscal year 1971 seems adequate, even generous.

We should proceed with caution, recognizing that these new developments will ultimately cost the taxpayer many billions of dollars. Before we embark upon this new phase of the manned space program, we should be sure it is technically feasible, that there is a genuine requirement and public support.

In short, the United States can have a meaningful manned space flight program using existing equipment during the next decade. The space shuttle, which is designed to replace much of this existing hardware, should be developed in an orderly fashion, the basic technological problems should be resolved prior to design and development, and the cost effectiveness of the entire system should be clearly established before the project is undertaken.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to offer a second amendment to reduce the NASA authorization bill by $50 million, which is one-half the amount added by the Science and Astronautics Committee, and not requested by the administration for Apollo.

The line item "Apollo" was increased by $100 million for "long leadtime hardware" for improvement of the Saturn V launch vehicle. For the Congress to authorize additional funds for "improvement" of Saturn V, a vehicle which will go out of production by the end of this calendar year, makes no sense whatever.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I regret the decision of NASA to discontinue production of Saturn V launch vehicles after No. 515. The decision to suspend production of Saturn V launch vehicles in order to make funds available to begin development of a space shuttle/station in fiscal year 1971 seems to me especially unwise. The Saturn V is a proven launch system which NASA concedes probably will be needed for future manned missions, and for testing of the nuclear stage in which NASA is continuing to make large investments. Suspension and restart of production of Saturn V vehicles has been estimated by Dr. Wernher von Braun to cost additional hundreds of millions of dollars. In spite of this, the decision to suspend production appears to be firm.

In view of the enormous costs involved, if production is in fact discontinued, there is no assurance that it will be resumed. Yet, the Science and Astronautics Committee also authorized an addi-

tional $100 million, under the Apollo line item, for "long leadtime hardware" for improvement of the Saturn V launch vehicle. It makes no sense whatever to authorize additional expenditures of $100 million in fiscal year 1971 for "improvements" to a launch vehicle which may never again be produced.

However, in view of the circumstances of the Apollo 13 flight, I have decided to offer an amendment to reduce that amount by only $50 million so that the remainder might be applied to the Apollo spacecraft system.

Mr. Chairman, the Nation is fortunate that the lives of the Apollo 13 astronauts were spared. There is no doubt, however, that because of the equipment failure, their lives were in jeopardy. Whatever needs to be done to give astronauts on future missions greater assurance of safety and success should be undertaken immediately. Accordingly, with the understanding that the remaining $50 million of the committee increase will be applied for this purpose, my amendment will propose a reduction of only $50 million below what the bill provides.

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

Mr. KARTH. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, I have always been a strong supporter of the space program, and I am now. In my opinion it has accomplished a great deal. It is going to accomplish much more in the future. This is the first time, however, that I concur in the minority views with reference to any part of this program. However, I do think the position which the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH) has taken on this particular issue is a correct one. I intend to support him in his effort.

I feel it is necessary, of course, to explore the moon, but I question how much exploration should be done on that planet. I think I am rather more interested in our technology which has enabled us to get to the moon than I am as to what the moon is composed of or its relationship to the earth. I feel that other things have to be taken in terms of priorities. I feel that the gentleman from Minnesota has made a distinct contribution along this line.

Mr. Chairman, I deeply regret that the administration has seen fit to delay the launch of the Viking project from 1973 to 1975. Such a delay is estimated to cost us an additional $150 million. Moreover, we shall also be delayed 2 years on the acquisition of valuable knowledge and technology which would be derived from the exploration of the planet Mars. This is the planet which scientists say offers the best available possibility of determining whether extra-terrestrial life exists there.

Deferring funding for the planned Viking launch in order to accommodate a major new start in the manned space flight program appears to me to be an unwise move. I do not believe that it is necessary or prudent from a standpoint of economy, to authorize seven more moon landings through 1974.

To me, the real achievement in landing a man on the moon was the fact that we had the technical knowledge to get him there and bring him back. It is a matter of some interest to know that some positions of the moon are over 4 billion years old. We rather suspected, even prior to the flight, that the moon's surface was barren and hostile. But I do not think we should continue seven more manned space flights to confirm these facts.

I would rather see us now direct our efforts in a new direction with new goals in mind. If we find life on Mars, then we have a whole new ball game so far as the space program and space funding is concerned. Personally I am convinced that extraterrestrial life does exist somewhere in space. It may not be technologically reachable for years but that should be our thrust.

In the meanwhile I am concerned that we should expend more effort to make the magnificent technology which we have acquired available, for the betterment of mankind. The flow, in my judgment, from knowledge to use is too slow. The practical benefits to mankind derived from our knowledge of space, continue to be rather nebulous so far as the general public is concerned. This is not to say that we have not already received many useful benefits. The ability to miniaturize, for example, has given the medical profession tiny television transmitters which can be swallowed for visual examination of the inner stomach. Exotic lubricants have been developed which will benefit everyone. Soon we will be able to purchase a "space blanket" which will fit in your pocket but will provide warmth and comfort in the coldest weather. We have discovered how to use the energy of the human body as a source of power for hearing aids and for the direction and control of artificial limbs. The fact that we already have instantaneous world television coverage, worldwide communication capability, world weather forecasts and other benefits are so commonplace that we tend to forget that they came as a result of the space program.

There will be many more dramatic and important developments, as we continue our space effort but again the flow is too slow. We must intensify our efforts in this regard to bring these benefits to the people as quickly as possible.

I reconfirm my faith in the goals of our national space program. In my opinion, it is not only desirable but necessary that we continue to fund a viable progressive program now and in the years ahead. Not to exploit what we have been able to conquer would be a historic failure.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KARTH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, last January I relayed to the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration a request from the University of Northern Iowa for a specimen of moon rock to be displayed at the university. The request was rejected.

Recently I learned that there was on display at the Stardust Motel and gambling casino in Las Vegas, Nev., a specimen of moon rock. I wonder if the gentleman would care to comment on that kind of procedure?

Mr. KARTH. I am not sure that I can enlighten the gentleman as to the reasons for that decision, nor can I enlighten him as to the reasons for its display in Las Vegas. It may have been displayed in connection with some scientific conference. I really do not know. But I want to assure the gentleman that I have not had much to say about who gets one of the moon rocks for display purposes. I do know, however, that—and in all fairness I think it is the right decision for NASA to have made, NASA has distributed rather broadly those moon rocks to the various scientific communities all over the world, for exhibition.

Mr. GROSS. I suppose it is more important to exhibit moon rock to people on their way to the gambling tables than it is to display it to university students. I suppose that is the feeling of the Space Administration.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, if the gentleman from Iowa will formally write to me and cite his authority I can assure the gentleman that we will look into it, and quite thoroughly, because it is the first charge of this kind that I have ever heard of, although I have had to turn down many people who had good reasons, and many institutions who wanted moon rocks, because there are not enough to go around.

I would like to have the facts to prepare a protest to NASA in this case.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, why does not the gentleman from California go and get the facts? That is what I have to do.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman and say to the gentleman I am going to support the amendments which the gentleman will offer. I recognize how difficult it is for a subcommittee chairman and a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics to stand on the floor and urge a reduction in the committee's appropriation. I am a member of that committee and as I say I can understand how difficult it is to urge the body to reduce the appropriations requested, but I think it is in the national interest, as the gentleman in the well has indicated, for us to do that, because of national priorities.

Mr. Chairman, I have been on the Committee on Science and Astronautics a little more than a year, and in the course of that experience one thing has become crystal clear, and that is that the only reasons that we have manned space flight which costs five times that of unmanned space flight is to see what the effect of space would be upon man, and to give a psychological uplift to the Nation. I think that those things would be fine if there were money enough to do

everything we needed, then we might continue with that, but so long as there are rats in the apartments in the ghettos of his country I think it is esoteric for us to ascertain through manned space flight whether or not there is microbiotic life on the planet Mars.

So, because of that I intend to support the amendments to be offered by the gentleman from Minnesota which would reduce the appropriations requested for manned space flight. Indeed, I believe the appropriation should be reduced to an even greater extent.

The administration has requested authorization for more than $3.3 billion for the space program in fiscal year 1971. A majority of the Science and Astronautics Committee have increased this amount by almost $300 million, with the entire increase designated for the manned space flight program.

Expenditures for space must be considered in the context of the total needs of the Nation. This raises a question of national priorities, and it seems absurd that the space program should rate so high when measured against other programs of Amreican society which are in desperate need of attention.

So many of society's most pressing needs are not being adequately funded that the list seems endless. Both the administration and the Congress have failed to fund sufficiently the urgently needed programs in education, housing, mass transit, pollution abatement, and crime control, to name only a few. Nor do prospects for meeting the cities' urgent needs seem very bright. Yet, to continue to ignore these problems is surely a perilous course, particularly while the government proposes to spend more billions on space ventures.

There are some who defend these expenditures by saying there is no assurance that if these vast resources were not spent on space, they would be applied to the accumulated needs of our cities and our fellow citizens. I believe this is too pessimistic an attitude, and I think that we can work together in the Congress and redirect these funds to meeting our needs here on earth.

Rather than increase the NASA budget, I would recommend that it be reduced. While much of the space program is worthy of support, there are several projects in the NASA program which seem particularly unjustified.

The most obvious among these appears to be the space shuttle/station. This is the first year substantial amounts have been requested to start the development of this ambitious new vehicle. The amount earmarked in this bill for the space shuttle/station is $190 million. If Congress approves these new manned space flight projects, the United States will be embarking upon developments that will cost many billions of dollars during the decade of the seventies—approximately $14 billion according to NASA's own estimates—and many knowledgeable persons believe NASA's estimates are unrealistically low.

I would urge that, during the next decade, NASA emphasize the use of automated spacecraft, rather than manned programs. At a fraction of the cost, automated spacecraft have proven to be much more effective in the acquisition of scientific knowledge as well as having practical applications, such as communications, air traffic control, weather prediction, and earth resources survey.

A second project, ill justified in my judgment, is the Viking program. Two Viking spacecraft are scheduled to be launched to Mars in 1975 with the primary objective of acquiring information relative to the possible existence of extraterrestrial life on the planet Mars. Viking is not expected to provide a final definitive answer to the question, but should reveal more detailed information about the environment at the Martian surface so that scientists can speculate as to whether that environment could support life.

We already know enough about Mars to know that if life exists there at all, it must be in the simplest form. I cannot justify approving moneys to find out whether or not there is some microbe on Mars, when, in fact, I know there are rats in Harlem apartments. The cities in this country are on fire; and the people living in the slums are furious at how little is being done to meet their needs while so much is being spent on space explorations.

While the objective of Viking may be very exciting to members of the scientific community, it is not a matter of great urgency to most Americans who are preoccupied and concerned with domestic problems.

NASA currently estimates the total cost for Viking will be almost $900 million. That cost estimate has more than doubled during the past year. If history is any guide, expenditures for Viking surely will ultimately exceed $1 billion.

Finally, there is the NERVA project. To date the United States has spent well over $1 billion on development of the NERVA engine. More than $1 billion additional dollars will be needed during the next few years to complete work on the NERVA engine and the stage with which it is to be integrated.

Since the decision has been made to discontinue production of Saturn V launch vehicles after vehicle No. 515, and since the nuclear stage is designed as an upper stage for Saturn V, if and when such nuclear stages come into existence toward the end of this decade, there will be no way to flight test it. Once discontinued, there is no assurance that Saturn V production will be resumed and the NERVA engine will be grounded.

Even more to the point, the nuclear rocket has never had a mission assigned to it. It does not have a mission today. And there are no approved missions for the future which will require the nuclear rocket. It has been argued that much larger, heavier payloads can be launched using the nuclear rocket but no mission has been defined involving such large and heavy payloads. In short, the need for NERVA has not been demonstrated.

Again, unless the NERVA project is canceled, the United States will end up with an extremely expensive, unlaunchable, and useless piece of equipment.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York. Let me just say in conclusion that the amendments I will offer will not, in my judgment, do damage to the national space effort. I am concerned about one new start program, a multibillion-dollar starting program that is a line item for the first time this year. I am interested in reducing the level of expenditure to begin the start of that program.

I will explain the reasons when we get under the 5-minute rule, but the simple reason I feel so strongly about this particular program is the agency itself, the experts, those who are going to be charged with the responsibility of overseeing it, are not at this point in agreement.

So, Mr. Chairman, I will, at the proper time, offer the amendments and explain them.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the very competent gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROUDEBUSH).

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 16516, the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1971.

As is the custom in our committee, we are again bringing a clean bill without committee amendment before this body. All of the many amendments which were considered in committee are incorporated in this bill. The purpose of this is to save the time of this body in considering the various amendments.

The NASA bill referred to the committee amounted to $3,3.3,000,000. The committee action, as reflected in the bill I speak for, indicates an increase in the authorization to $3,630,875,000 or $297,875,000 more than was approved by the Bureau of the Budget for NASA activities in fiscal year 1971.

The preponderance of this increase falls within the realm of manned space flight, with the exception of about $1½ billion in the field of research and program management. In view of this increase over the amount requested by NASA, I feel a further explanation is in order.

This year's request for the space program is the lowest space budget submitted to the Congress since fiscal year 1962. I am sure we are all aware of our troubled fiscal condition. NASA was thus required to present to Congress a very austere budget.

Actually, the original request from NASA to the Bureau of the Budget was for $4,500,000,000. This was to implement the recommendations contained in the President's Space Task Group Report. The President's space budget submitted to Congress was $1,200,000,000 less than the recommendations in that report.

Personally, I am a great believer in the authorization committees of this House. I do not suppose there is any group of men more familiar with our space program than the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. The committee's considered judgment was that a portion at least of the original recommendations by NASA to the Bureau of the Budget should be restored. And, of course, this restoration is contained in the bill we present to you today.

I do not think I need to remind you that we have had extraordinary success

in our space program. Probably the greatest achievement of our Nation during the past year was the exploits in outer space. And I am sure you all joined with me and thrilled with me as we viewed television's presentations of the Apollo 11 and Apollo 12 flights. Without question, these were a great step forward for man and proved without fear of contradiction that the technical development of our Nation far exceeds that of any competing against us.

I say this without regard to the problems experienced on the Apollo 13 flight. I am sure that every Member joined with me in my personal anxiety for the safe recovery of our astronauts during this perilous experience. Their safe recovery with pinpoint accuracy, I personally think is a tribute to their own skills as well as the skills of those men at the Manned Space Center who improvised the use of their equipment and directed their safe recovery. This, too, even in partial failure emphasizes the excellence of the engineering and technology involved.

I have read that more than 500 million persons in every developed country of this world watched the first landing on the moon and listened to the words of Neil Armstrong as he became the first man to set foot on the lunar surface. The fact that this caused a great rise in American prestige is not refutable.

The President clearly indicated this by sending the astronauts to many countries of the world as envoys of this Nation. I personally feel that the moon landing was the greatest scientific achievement ever accomplished by man.

The success of Apollo 11 was followed by Apollo 12, which was every bit as successful and perhaps more so.

Sometimes I wonder if we have a complete appreciation of the contributions of our space program. I realize full well that many consider our space effort largely a waste of effort and money. I know I hear this often in my own good State and congressional district. But during my past 10 years of service on this committee I have noted a revolution in man's education and the many "fallouts" benefiting mankind.

So far, I have spoken mostly about our manned space programs, and this is as it should be since manned space flights have accounted for the bulk of the money allocated. But I do want to say just a few words about that other category of our space program which does not receive the publicity and notice. NASA's unmanned space program, including the scientific satellites, has enriched man's knowledge immensely in the past 10 years. In physics, astronomy and the many scientific disciplines we have had a great leap forward.

These unmanned vehicles have proved to have a variety of practical uses for the betterment of life for all mankind. We are all familiar with our communication satellites, handling a great amount of our international communications today. Our weather satellites give us a much more complete and analytical look at weather.

When I began my remarks, I spoke of increases in the budget rendered by the committee. It might be well to review just briefly those increases authorized by the committee.

The committee has recommended an increase of $145 million for the Apollo lunar exploration program in fiscal year 1971. This figure was reached in the following manner: $45 million was added for the initiation of long leadtime production of payloads for lunar exploration flights after 1973, and to start production of the spacecraft and payloads for one more Apollo lunar exploration flight in addition to those currently programed. It is necessary that we authorize these funds at this time because of the leadtimes involved.

In addition, we have added $100 million to start procurement of long leadtime hardware to begin fabrication of an improved Saturn V system. This includes the beginning cost to vendors and subcontractors who have been phased out of the Saturn V program. Engine funding would have the highest priority because, from experience, we know the development of new engine systems has a leadtime of many years.

The committee has recommended an increase of $155 million for space flight operations in fiscal year 1971. Of this amount, $75 million has been added to augment the spacecraft and subsystems for a low earth orbiting laboratory called Skylab. This additional funding would give emphasis to earth resources and medical experiments, and would permit work to commence in the field of design for a second orbiting workshop.

The committee further recommends an additional $80 million for the analysis and engineering studies needed for the preliminary space shuttle and space station programs.

I do not think one needs a complete knowledge of the space program to realize that the success of this Nation's future space program lies in the development of a relatively low cost recoverable and reusable space transportation system.

Here I have spoken of our space program and the moneys needed to carry out a well-rounded program. If this money can be authorized by this House, I feel our future is bright.

Many of the undertakings of our space agency have materially and significantly worked for the betterment of man living in earth's environment. I think of the research being carried out in navigation and air traffic control satellite systems. Unmanned vehicles now being designed will survey earth's resources and provide a great deal of information for farming and forestry, the maritime and fishing industries.

We could talk of the efforts of NASA in the areas of aeronautic research, pollution, and noise abatement. However, I am sure the Members of this body are aware of this good work.

I believe H.R. 16516 is a good bill. I recommend its passage to the Members of this body and do hope it will have the approval of this committee and this House.

In the past year, every American citizen held his head high as Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin first set foot on the moon. The world reacted with astonishment and utter amazement and every nation once again looked to the United States as the undisputed leader in science, technology, and management. There was no doubt that our country had recaptured the lead in a contest that could have been lost 10 years ago if the President and Congress had not promptly reacted to the challenge.

Our achievements in space, however, represent much more than adventure and our pride that America has taken once more its rightful place of leadership. Our efforts in space have encouraged the development of new products, new processes, and new technology, much of which has been made available to American industry and our defense organization. We have trained and developed a national resource of engineers, scientists, and other specialized workers in industry, government, and the universities, with skills vital to our economy and national security.

With this vast reservoir of technological talent and space science know-how, our great Nation cannot afford to sit back and rest on the laurels of past accomplishments. We have all seen how our space endeavors have brought about an unprecedented revolution in American education processes. We have seen science and engineering expertise excell to heights which we thought were impossible a few years back. We have observed a spirit of dedication and commitment rivaled only by the Nation's efforts in World War II. It is unthinkable to me that now, with this remarkable capability, we would not forge ahead in further exploration and exploitation of our new frontier.

The vast possibilities of many peacetime benefits to man here on earth have been demonstrated by observations and photographs of the Gemini and Apollo programs. These observations from space can tell experts the location of mineral reserves, the status of crops, the sources of air and water pollution, the flood potential of snow cover in a mountain range, and much more than was ever known about the weather. At the same time, our country is working to assure that all of the potential national security benefits of space are explored. We are conducting programs to protect us against hostile activities and to assure that space is not employed as a medium for aggression against us or our allies.

Our Polaris submarines fix their position beneath the high seas with the aid of the Transit navigation satellites. Ships at sea, aircraft in flight and forces at remote military bases depend on weather information obtained by satellites. A space satellite monitoring system helps us to maintain vigil against violations of the nuclear test ban treaty and the world's communications, both military and civil, have been revolutionized by communications satellites.

America has no ambition to turn space exploration into a destructive battleground. As the Apollo 11 crewmen noted on the plaque deposited at the landing site in the Sea of Tranquility, they "came in peace for all mankind." We must keep in mind, however, that others can have

different motives. More ominous statements were being made by the leaders of the Soviet Union not too long ago when their sputniks and their cosmonauts were in the spotlight of world attention. It behooves us to work to seek to deny them the occasion to make such statements again.

Too much is at stake to allow leadership to revert again to another nation; particularly to one that does not share our ideals or our way of life.

The ultimate benefits of this country's space acomplishments will fully justify the cost.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER).

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology recommended to the full committee an authorization of $775,271,000 for that portion of the NASA request considered by the subcommittee each year. This is $10,376,000 less than the fiscal year 1970 programed amount.

While this is the overall total requested by NASA, we did not "rubber stamp" this budget. We reordered some priorities within the request by emphasizing certain areas of research that will have a more immediate return to the taxpayer. We recommended an increase of $3.7 million for aeronautics research and $500,000 for technology utilization, to be offset by a reduction of $4.2 million in the tracking and data acquisition program.

The total amount is to be utilized in the following areas:

[In millions]

| | |
|---|---|
| Research and development | $564.8 |
| Construction of facilities | 7.55 |
| Research and program management | 202.921 |
| | 775.271 |

The changes to the program were specifically to add: One, $1.5 million to electronics systems; two, $400,000 to human factor systems; three, $400,000 to basic research; four, $500,000 to technology utilization; and, five, $1.4 million to research and program management.

The subcommittee held extensive hearings both in 1968 and 1969 on the aeronautical R. & D. The evidence provided in these hearings—along with the testimony given in this year's authorization hearings—make a strong case for increased support for aeronautics-related work by NASA. In relative terms, the aeronautics part of NASA's budget request is still only 5.6 percent of the total—despite modest increases for the aeronautical vehicles program since the mid-1960's.

The recommendations reflected in this section stem from the conclusions and recommendations contained in House Report 91–932 of March 23, 1970, entitled "Issues and Directions for Aeronautical Research and Development." I recommend this report to you as pointing to the need for additional emphasis and attention to aviation matters in the United States. The purposes of the hearings and of the report were: First, to identify the priorities and problems in Aeronautical R. & D., and second, helping to focus the attention of the Nation's leadership on the urgency of greater emphasis on aeronautical research in the solution of critical aviation problems.

The conclusions and recommendations of this report are in consonance with the longstanding policy and recommendations of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. The committee has always sought greater recognition of aviation problems and greater support for the necessary R. & D. to help solve the problems that are within the purview of NASA. In spite of the efforts of the committee, NASA this year reduced the aeronautics-related work in the electronics research area by 45 percent. The action of the committee was to add funds for the important items that we believe should be emphasized.

The small amounts added will provide for additional work in the area of flight safety including work on aircraft wake turbulence, clear air turbulence, pilot warning indicators, air crew workload, and tension stress and in reducible noise and pollutants from aircraft engines. Also, the actions of the committee reflect this emphasis by providing additional funds to train and encourage new personnel to move into aeronautical research; to continue the development of flight safety items in the vital avionics area that would not have been continued because of the closing of the Electronics Research Center by NASA.

In considering the imbalance of space and aeronautics-related effort and the backlog of critical unmet needs in aviation, the subcommittee would have preferred to make a substantial increase in aeronautics-related areas. However, in balancing this desire with the realities of the total Federal budget and the need to curb inflation, the subcommittee felt constrained to recommend a modest increase for aeronautics which was offset by the reduction in tracking and data acquisition.

I remind the House that the advanced research and technology program provides the reservoir of new technology for our aeronautics and space programs of the future. It is a program that has been declining for the past several years as the NASA budget declines. Each year I have emphasized the need for continuing this basic work with increased emphasis on long-range needs as well as meeting current pressing "payoff" problems that lend themselves to immediate solution.

One of the roadblocks that has long distressed the committee has been the inability of NASA, particularly in the advanced research and technology centers, to maintain an inflow of young scientists and this has been notable in the aeronautical research area. Testimony taken in December 1969, indicates that the inflow has dropped from 179 new hires of young college graduates in 1966 to only 23 in 1969. With the serious shortage that exists in NASA today and with a continuation of this trend, the capability of NASA to provide the needed research could greatly diminish and the impact on the aerospace industry and the country could be disastrous. It would be tragic, indeed, if the country failed to maintain its world leadership in aviation which is being seriously challenged today. For example, while the net contribution of the aerospace industry in 1969 to our international balance of payments was $3 billion, there is no guarantee that this favorable result will continue. Our competitors are pushing hard and have equaled or surpassed us in a number of areas.

To reverse the trend in new personnel hires and to encourage younger personnel to involve themselves in aeronautical research, the committee recommended an increase in research and program management of $1.4 million to be used specifically for: 50 research fellowships with NASA, 100 additional summer jobs at NASA centers, and 100 graduate and undergraduate scholarships.

We believe that the use of this relatively modest sum in this manner and continued for a few years will provide the impetus that can stimulate the innovative research needed to keep NASA and the country in the forefront in this vital industry.

In the area of technology utilization which is the program whereby NASA makes available to industry and to the public new discoveries and ideas resulting from their research, the committee recommends an increase of $500,000.

The subcommittee has always considered this area to be highly important. The budget request was $4 million—or 20 percent lower than for fiscal year 1970. To carry on the modest, but important work in disseminating the results of the space program to the taxpayer, the program was increased by $500,000. Emphasis will be placed on results from space research which contributes to the solution of urban problems and to the reduction of pollutants and noise in our environment. Specifically, these funds will provide:

An additional applications technology team to work specifically on the problems of transferring NASA technology for the solution of urban development and environmental quality problems.

Additional effort in disseminating the results of space-related research to the general public and through trade associations.

Our review of the tracking and data acquisition program showed that it is soundly based; however, a judgment was made that a small 1.4 percent reduction could be made to offset the $4,200,000 increase for aeronautics and technology utilization. The principal impact of this reduction will be to defer certain equipments which must be acquired eventually to modernize the worldwide networks. Although the committee is fully aware of the excellent work that has been performed by the tracking networks and the need to update equipments, it was concluded that the problems discussed above are more pressing at this time.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this important portion of the space and aeronautics program.

APOLLO 13 FLIGHT

The flight of Apollo 13 was unquestionably a tribute to the astronauts' courage and ability. It was equally a tribute to the dedication and skill of the

managers, technicians, and engineers at Houston who guided the crippled spacecraft through its 4-day ordeal. But most of all, it was a tribute to the training, which from the very beginning, has been the very backbone of the Apollo program.

The years spent as test pilots developed in the astronauts a sense of coolness in response to emergency. Continued jet flights enhanced this ability.

In the Apollo program, engineers, scientists, and managers were constantly keyed to anticipating the worst situation that could possibly occur—and solving the problem beforehand.

In the aerospace industry, hundreds of people were constantly performing systems engineering checks. All systems were tested "off nominal" to design and build in alternative modes of operation.

The astronauts were also involved in this process, with simulations on the ground and in flight. In fact, John Swigert wrote the technical manual on Command Service Module emergency procedures. In each Apollo mission, hours and days and months, and even years of practice preceded the flight. Complete missions, with emergencies and alternative means of mission accomplishment, were simulated.

It had been proven in previous flights that the lunar module could provide emergency propulsion and serve as an environmental shelter. On the Apollo 9 earth-orbital mission, Jim McDivitt and his crew deliberately ran the lunar module through the lifeboat operation that was to save Apollo 13.

Simulations and computations on the ground were performed during the Apollo 13 flight to verify other emergency procedures. Scientist Astronaut Anthony England tried the emergency lithium hydroxide air purification setup on the ground before this method was relayed to the astronauts. Computers checked out the necessary operational changes in the mission before they were attempted by the Apollo 13 crew.

The first indication of how all the training in depth paid off for Apollo 13 was when John Swigert replaced Tom Mattingly as the third Apollo crew member just 2 days before launch. But perhaps the most vivid demonstration was when the three astronauts, without the least indication of panic, prepared to take shelter in Aquarius knowing that the fragile craft designed only for lunar landing operations would be responsible for their lives until they once again approached earth.

TECHNOLOGY UTILIZATION

Mr. Chairman, the great technological advances made since the beginning of the space program are resulting in major benefits. Many of these benefits have been made possible by our work in advanced research and technology. We have produced new materials with properties heretofore deemed impossible. We have found new processes and techniques that are more reliable and have greater precision, and we have vastly increased our computer, communications, and data-handling capabilities.

Aside from the direct inputs for specific space programs, there are many additional dividends from our efforts. These are variously called spinoffs, fallouts, or technology transfers—many of which take place under NASA's technology utilization program. The transfers range over a wide field—medicine, materials, safety devices, electronics, tools, fire-resistant foams, and paints—and some may become the nucleus of new industries.

Clearly, the major output of NASA is technology. At the beginning of the space program, for instance, we had tape recorders that could handle 200 bits of information per inch of tape; we now can record 28,000 bits per inch. We have instruments capable of magnifying objects 20 million times. We have a diamond knife that can dissect away portions of a molecule or cut a hair to 10,000 lengthwise strips.

In order to get to the moon, NASA required advances in every technical discipline. Knowledge gained is applied over and over again in all fields of engineering, and this leads to advances in related technologies. The computer industry is a good example of the impact of space technology. NASA is the largest user of computers in the world. We must have large computer systems of great complexity, size, and speed, and we must have great flexibility in the use of computers. In order to meet planetary launch window dates, it is necessary for us to have hundreds of thousands of items on schedule. We also must be able to monitor dependably our space missions. All of this, from automated checkout functions to inventory management, is done by computer.

Stimulated in large part by space demands, our Nation met the challenge for computers so well that the U.S. computer industry now dominates the world. It does about $8 billion worth of business a year. Its exports have increased more than 1,400 percent in the first decade of the space age. It not only pays the highest average wages of any industry, but contributes a large positive international trade balance.

Another field that has felt the effect of the NASA-sponsored technological progress is aviation. History has taught us that we cannot drag our feet in this sector. We did so after the Wright Brothers invented the airplane and, as a result, our pilots were forced to fly French and British planes in World War I. International competition in aviation is intensifying to such a degree that a strong aerospace industry is a matter of national survival. On our leadership hangs our future national security.

This present leadership is evident at airports around the world; 75 percent of commercial aircraft flying all over the world are American-built. American aircraft, whether civil or military, reflect the technical contributions of NASA research in aerodynamics and engines, materials and structures, guidance and controls.

Aerospace is now America's largest manufacturing industry. Last year it did a $27 billion business, with a $28 billion backlog. It is one of our great producers of national wealth, exporting more than $3 billion worth of aircraft and parts in 1969 alone.

Much of our progress has resulted from the effective way in which NASA has organized and managed research and technical development, getting practical results into the hands of people who can use them. Individuals, cities, universities, and corporations have greatly benefited from this technology transfer. Many people employed on NASA programs now have taken their knowledge and skills into other fields. In the Chrysler Corp. for example, automobile ignition systems were reworked in order to meet the new Clean Air Act criteria. This was done by their own personnel who had developed the automated checkout and launch sequence equipment for the Saturn launch vehicle.

Technological transfer and growth mean much to the Nation. They influence productivity, wealth, and power. They bring better and cheaper products, and they mean more and better jobs with higher pay. As an example of what I am talking about, let me give you one brief comparison. Just 38 years ago, in 1932, the U.S. population was 125 million. Today we have 205 million. Some estimates suggest that the U.S. population will reach the 400 million mark by the year 2000. Thirty-eight years ago, in 1932, the U.S. gross national product was about $58 billion. Today it is at the $952 billion level and in the year 2000, if we progress at nothing more than an average annual 3 percent growth, the gross national product will be 2 trillion, 500 billion dollars. My point is this—it is no accident that this tremendous national growth coincides with a major commitment and investment by the United States in science and technology—of which aerospace has been a major component.

One level of technology was generated in response to specific space program needs. But that was just the beginning. What has resulted has been a wide assortment of progress, some expected, some unexpected, and out of it all have come many wonderful things now beginning to be realized. What lies in the future, we can only surmise, but I feel confident the harvest will be rich and bountiful. Mr. Chairman, I believe that our national security, economic progress, and world leadership are values we must protect by continuing to support our investment in technology.

For all these reasons, I strongly support an increase of $500,000 over the President's budget request of $4 million to finance the technology utilization program.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this committee will vote the full amount of $775,271,000 for advanced research and technology, tracking and data acquisition, and technology utilization.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia yields back 5 minutes.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL), who has been extremely interested in the work of the committee on space matters.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, first of all, the chairman of the full com-

mittee, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), has done an outstanding job for this committee in his leadership and ability to anticipate what is going to happen.

Also I commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), for his fine leadership and anticipation and being able to ferret out some of the difficulties that occurred for the committee. Also, I pay my respects to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON). It is a pleasure to have him back. He has done an outstanding job in leading the committee on the minority side and he has a thorough understanding of the problems of space.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 16516 to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

This bill was subjected to the closest scrutiny by your committee in full recognition of the urgent demands of budgetary priorities.

NASA is the only agency in the Federal bureaucracy whose budget continues to decline each year.

We hear a great deal about priorities in our Nation, and I fully agree with most of what is said.

Domestic social ills demand our attention and our resources.

And they are getting them.

But the cry for a trade-off between space/defense and domestic social budgets has become so commonplace these days as to be in danger of losing its meaning.

It is often overlooked, however, that in the last 10 years, while defense spending has gone up by about 73 percent, domestic social program spending has increased 222 percent, while the space program has declined by about 40 percent in the past few years.

Now let me not be misunderstood.

I have supported both in my committees and here on this floor these moves to reorder our national priorities.

But as in any other endeavor, let us beware of shortsightedness.

And let us also be aware that we are not discussing annual increases in NASA's budget, but annual decreases, and how large those decreases should be.

I might point out that this is a highly unusual procedure in this body.

Mr. Chairman, the level of spending authorized in the bill before us is the minimum level at which we can maintain the chance for optimum return of the taxpayer's dollar. Now that we have had some difficulty in our recent manned-space flight to the moon, a few Members may think it popular to try to cut our effort. That would indeed be shortsighted.

Why is it that at the very height of our space success we want to say "forget it—forget the billions we've spent—forget the tremendous technological know-how we've developed."

Unless we approve this legislation, our Nation will have no manned space flight capability after 1974.

No matter how we would view our Nation's requirements in space, we would have cut off our options; we would have lost the leadtime necessary to regain launch capability.

You have heard before, on this floor, the enormous and unwarranted costs which would be incurred from a stop-start, stop-start operation.

It is no less true today.

Mr. Chairman, in my own district, which is the home of so much of the talent that landed Americans on the moon, I have witnessed, personally, the devastating decline of a technological capability that is essential to the maintenance of our Nation's competitive position in the world—not only of today, but of the future.

We are literally destroying our ability to provide our Nation with the scientific and technological prowess essential to our survival.

This is happening not just in southern California but in many areas across the country.

We must not allow American leadership and expertise to be reduced to the vulnerable level it is otherwise headed for.

This legislation offers us the opportunity for a moderate continuation of our space program, a balanced level which permits not only salvaging of our pool of technological talent and facilities, but the maximum return on our space investment.

Without it we may all of a sudden wake up and find ourselves totally unprepared for tomorrow's challenges, and then it would be too late.

I cannot urge more strongly that my colleagues support the bill as reported by their Committee on Science and Astronautics.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman has been an excellent member of the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee.

I kind of have the feeling, when the chairman of another subcommittee and the ranking minority member of that subcommittee came in to offer amendments to cut what was done by this subcommittee unanimously, there must be some curiosity as to what our subcommittee did. Will the gentleman from California tell the Members of the House something about how we operate, about how we get information and how we learn about what is going on in the manned space program?

Mr. BELL of California. I shall be happy to do so.

We make a thorough study of all the aspects of expenditures in the space program and the space expenditures under the NASA authorization.

We travel about various parts of the Nation in which the programs are being developed by the different aerospace plants. A thoroughgoing study is made of the operations of those plants.

I could go on for hours to tell the Members about the amount of time and effort that is placed in the work of programing the space effort. It is not something we go over very hurriedly. It is something highly technical. It requires a great deal of understanding and study.

As the chairman of the subcommittee has said, this is the type of operation you must understand, it is a highly technical subject that must be studied carefully. It is difficult to understand how someone can quickly say they are opposed to this particular proposal, without being a member of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. BELL of California. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his work on the Science and Astronautics Committee. I have great respect for his ability and join in his statement.

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

Mr. BELL of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. Chairman, it is significant that earth day came only 6 days after the most hazardous of space flights has ended. I am happy as anyone to find our three brave astronauts safely back home on earth again. They met the challenges of their dangerous flight with distinction and bravery.

They are now back down on earth for a while. In the days and months ahead, they will have to face another hazard, the dangers and the rigors of earth travel. Riding behind a bus in the middle of a traffic jam is the American version of death in the afternoon.

Our earth stands out among the planets in our solar system. Its blue cast signifies the presence of water—and, as we know, water is the mark of the existence of life. Indeed, life as we know it emerged from the sea millions of years ago. From miles away in space, we cannot see the water turning brown from pollution. We cannot see the objects floating in that water. Water, once the source of life, is now killing the life actually contained within it.

Earth Day signifies that cooperation to combat the crisis of the environment is needed; it is needed between levels of government, between industry and government, and among all citizens. Deadlines for ending pollution are too far into the future. I call upon all to act now so that in the years ahead there will be no need of an earth day.

While people are talking about the problems of the environment, there must be some determination as to what are adequate standards for a "clean" environment. Goals must be established so that we have a direction for our activity. If our methods are spelled out, we can act to keep pollution indices low.

Thus, environment, ecology, and the quality of life on this planet have become the concerns of the 1970's. If they are ignored any longer, some scientists say that there will not be a decade of the 1980's and 1990's.

There is a public mandate for speedy action. Polls have shown that more than

85 percent of the population in this Nation is concerned with environmental pollution. Three out of four are willing to make additional sacrifices to improve our surroundings.

The entire issue is a new departure for the United States. It is a mass effort to improve the quality of life. It is time to put American know-how to work in this effort. If pollution recognizes no political boundaries, we must cross administrative boundaries to fight pollution. I would like to elaborate and to give you further proposals on this matter. I propose that we use the technical know-how of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency to help solve the problems of this planet.

Several months ago, spokesmen for General Motors announced that fume-free automobiles would be available for mass public consumption by 1980. I think that 10 years is simply too long to wait for such an important technological breakthrough.

In 1953, automobile companies began to work on antipollution devices. Seventeen years, and millions of dollars later, our cities are blanketed by automobile-caused smog, carbon monoxide, and sulfur dioxide. The once crisp outlines of buildings now fade into the grayness of the air.

In the past, the automobile industry has had an almost total monopoly on the research and development facilities in this area. When the American public was quoted a date or timetable for an automotive antipollution device, having no other source of information, they could do nothing but accept the work of the industry.

I believe that there is cause for some scepticism in their pronouncements. I feel it is nome to inject some competition into the development of an automobile that does not pollute the air. The American public deserves faster service.

The year 1953 marked the beginning of the automobile industry's efforts to develop an antipollution device. It also marked the beginning of the U.S. Space efforts. In the intervening 17 years, the United States, in what can justifiably be called the achievement of the last decade, landed four men on the moon.

The National Aeronautics and Space Agency has met all the challenges presented to it. The technological feats regarded as science fiction several years ago have become the accepted reality of today. At NASA the impossible seems to take only a little longer.

As a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee, I have observed NASA's achievements first hand. On Earth Day, I have called upon NASA, the Agency that has conquered the challenges of space, to help us conquer some of the problems here on earth. Literally interpreted, space begins right above our hands, and lately this area has become more and more unpleasant. I am calling upon NASA to take up the challenge posed by our polluted environment.

The American public is rightfully demanding some solution to these problems and NASA spokesmen have said they seek the application of space technology for the direct benefits of all mankind.

What could be more beneficial than using a portion of NASA's 35,000 employees, including some of the Nation's top scientists, engineers, propulsion, and electronics experts to solve the problems of our earth's atmosphere?

With the proposed cutback in NASA appropriations for fiscal year 1971, some of the NASA people may remain idle. There are too many problems as yet unsolved for idle scientists. Federal funds should be given to NASA for the express purpose of developing an antipollution device for automobiles.

One of NASA's objectives for the 1970's is "the expansion of human knowledge of the phenomena in our atmosphere and space." Sulfur dioxide, hydrocarbons, and carbon monoxide—thanks to the internal combustion engine—have become phenomena of our air space. Let NASA set the pace for the development of a clean engine, starting from Earth Day, April 22, 1970. It would be another "giant leap" for the health, and the well-being of mankind.

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

Mr. BELL of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL), has served with me on the Education and Labor Committee where he is acknowledged to be one of the most thoughtful, constructive, and useful members of the committee. I value his counsel highly.

I am impressed when he cites the problem of trying to develop important national programs on a "fits and starts" basis.

It is certainly quite true that, to reach the moon, America had to do the whole job. We developed a highly sophisticated, comprehensive master plan to do the job—the whole job—by a predetermined timetable. No "on again, off again" approach could work for space exploration.

Mr. Chairman, neither will such a reluctant, dispirited attack by half-measures help us conquer earth problems either. We have lost ground steadily in our war against the despoilation of our environment. We are fighting a standoff in our war against poverty. We have long since been outmaneuvered and outgeneraled by our own profligate, haphazard, heedless "growth for the sake of growth"— in our feeble effort to create livable cities.

I am exhilarated by the marvelous new scientific insights which our space program has gained for us. I deeply believe in mankind's eternal quest for knowledge for the sake of knowledge. But the cost, and utility, of this new body of knowledge must be balanced against the comparable costs and the comparative benefits of earth problems which need to be squarely faced, and earth programs which must be vigorously prosecuted.

I believe that, considering the urgent programs at home which have been stretched out, thinned out, trimmed down, cut out, and starved on the vine, we must seriously consider eliminating or drastically reducing the expensive manned-space program. Likewise, we must consider some stretching out and temporarily cutting down of the entire multibillion dollar space program.

I hope the day will come soon when we will have diverted enough resources from a wasteful and futile war in Vietnam to finance not only a sound and comprehensive body of education, housing, health, welfare, job training and employment, and conservation and environment programs here at home, but also a long-term space exploration effort which will further probe the mysteries of the Universe.

But, until we serve earth better, so far as I am concerned, the stars will have to wait.

I must vote against this authorization.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA).

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman of the committee yielding me this time. I wholeheartedly support the bill before us today.

First of all, I want to commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California, for his interest and in supporting this great space program. I also wish to express my thanks to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas, for the time and effort that he has put forth in behalf of manned space flight.

We have gone into this bill very thoroughly and visited many of the centers around the country. I think we come to this House with some knowledge of what we think we need to do in our space program.

Mr. Chairman, World War II challenged this Nation as it had not been challenged before. A long-time depression was supplanted by a thriving economy as the factories, and the people went back to work. For the war activated our production, and the wealth of a nation is its productive capacity.

The demand for aircraft made the aviation industry the major manufacturing employer of the Nation. And we produced over 70 percent of all aviation equipment throughout the world. But time passed, and volume production was no longer the criterion for success. The British produced the first pure jet aircraft—the Comet, and if it had been successful the United States would have lost the market. It is not valid to attribute success to the failure of others, but, because of the failure of the Comet, the United States gained the time necessary to produce the 707 which now dominates the world jet market.

While the production equipment of West Germany—financed by the Marshall plan—became the most modern and efficient in the world, the producing plant of the United States fell into obsolesence. By the beginning of the Kennedy administration, the industrial plant of the United States lagged behind the other leading industrial nations of the world. Volume had been achieved during the war—but innovation in equipment and in concept had fallen behind.

One of the early moves to improve the physical plant was the legislation which permitted a 7-percent tax write-off in the year of purchase of new capital equipment. But this was only part of

the problem. It was also necessary to upgrade the technology of mass production induced by the volume requirements of the war. What was needed was a major challenge to bring U.S. industrial technology up to its historical standards of world leadership.

The International Geophysical Year presented such an opportunity and the United States joined the leading technological nations of the world in the quest for new knowledge which was exemplified by the thrust into space. The efforts of this country were not rewarded by immediate success. The first satellite to be launched into orbit was Sputnik I which stunned a nation accustomed to first place in the technological world. However, many aware people were not surprised. The price of leadership has always been daring, risk, innovation, and the United States had not been engaging in any of these pursuits.

Belatedly we realized, as a nation, that in order to keep our industrial house in order, we must innovate, we must engage in fundamental research, we must tread new ground and lead rather than follow. When the U.S.S.R. put the first man into earth orbit we all knew that we would have to compensate for the years of neglect with a crash program for progress. The lunar mission was assigned in 1961. It was performed in 1969, within the time and cost constraints prescribed by the President.

And the lunar landing accomplished all of its aims. It gave this Nation the new capability to operate in space; it upgraded the physical plant of the United States, not only in the aerospace but also in other sections of basic industry; it challenged the university, industry, government team to work together in unprecedented combinations of talent; and it finally returned this country to first place among the nations of the world, in the essential concommitant of industrial and social progress—technology.

At the peak of production for the Apollo program, in 1966, over 400,000 people in government, industry and over 200 universities throughout the country were engaged. Twenty major manufacturing companies subcontracted to almost 20,000 smaller or allied manufacturers. Every aspect of our economy was involved in this national effort. From food to fabrics; from parachutes to plastics—U.S. industry grew and matured in response to the lunar landing program. Since there is still no way to spend money in space, the $21 billion used for Appollo was all spent here on earth. Most of the money went to pay the salaries of the men and women who made up the government, industry, university team which accomplished this miracle of engineering. Less than 5 percent of the total amount was actually expended on materials which went into space.

As a result, the United States can now boast the most modern and most sophisticated plant, on a physical and technological basis, of any nation in the world. Our aerospace industry, still the largest manufacturing employer in the Nation, has the most modern equipment from clean rooms to wind tunnels; from laser cutting techniques to 80 billion a day computer calculation capacity. In the international arena of space, this country can claim a well-rounded capability to operate in every space regime—automated, manned, near-earth, synchronous orbit, polar orbit and planetary.

The challenges of our space program have prepared our industrial base to stand in the forefront of the world of nations. And since industrial capability is synchronized with economic viability, we can expect that our industry will be able to maintain its supremacy in the light of expanding population and social pressures. Only with an expanding industrial capacity can we expect to maintain our scale of living, and maintain our population in rewarding activity.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY).

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, the first question one asks oneself in considering H.R. 16516, is how does the accident and near-tragedy of the Apollo 13 flight change the space program.

As for me, my answer, as far as the manned lunar-landing program is concerned, is that no accident at this late date should deter the United States from continuing to expand man's knowledge of the moon and solar system. As the report of the committee indicates, the moon is the only planetary body, other than the earth, which man can investigate in detail. I think we should continue to study the moon by further landings and exploration. But, certainly, the Apollo 13 accident means a delay and as such I see no need to authorize the increase of $145 million recommended by the committee for the lunar exploration in fiscal year 1971. I think NASA's requested $956,500,000 for its continuation is more appropriate.

Likewise, the recommended increase of $155 million for space flight operation seems unnecessary, and, anyway, I do not think the Appropriations Committee would approve the money or, even if they did, the administration would spend the money.

On the other hand, I don't think that NASA has asked for enough money for aeronautical research. If we had done the necessary research 10 or 15 years ago, the Nation would have avoided much of the difficulties of airport congestion and other problems that exist today.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, I am greatly disturbed by our past submersion of activities in advanced research and technology. I have been an active member of the ART Subcommittee for 8 years and have supported the need to strengthen the entire area of aeronautics so that the Nation would not be faced with the air traffic problems that are proving so unmanageable today. Are we waiting for a tragic air fatality to draw our attention to the priority of aeronautical research and development? I certainly hope not. If we are to continue to rely on our airways in the future as we have in the past and continue to accept the Government's involvement in this field, then the time has come to implement this priority.

The United States has always ranked at the top in nearly every phase of aeronautics thanks greatly to the effort of private industry to concentrate so much effort on advanced research, but I deplore the suppressing of Government support that squeezes and cripples this advanced research in the name of either economy or the stress demands of more immediate practical application.

In the report of the Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology entitled "Issues and Directions for Aeronautical Research and Development" seven conclusions and recommendations were reached.

First. Our Nation should establish a national aeronautics and aviation policy—with particular emphasis on aeronautical research and development.

Second. The pattern of Government agency-industry roles and relationships requires clarification.

Third. The Department of Transportation should be a statutory member of the National Aeronautics and Space Council.

Fourth. With overall U.S. research and development effort in aeronautics and aviation declining, there is reason for concern about maintaining our long-term world leadership.

Fifth. There is a broad range of unmet needs in aviation and aeronautical research and development. Not only must we rebuild our technological base but we must use our existing technology more fruitfully.

Sixth. Positive action must be taken by Government and industry to encourage younger scientific and technical personnel to enter and remain in the aeronautics field.

Seventh. In the past airports have not been considered as a part of aeronautical R. & D.; however, they are becoming more and more related to both R. & D. and operational areas.

It is easy to understand how far we have advanced in aeronautics over the past 12 years when we are reminded that commercial jet flights had just begun in 1958. Yet, in this same period of 12 years there has been a real increase of only $75 million for aeronautical research and development within NASA. This just does not make good sense.

Whether we are talking about civil air transport, noise abatement, air pollution, safety, congestion, or improvements in aircraft themselves, we definitely need more research effort, intelligently organized and directed.

If we accept Government control of civil aeronautics, then we had better think seriously about Government's responsibility to support the necessary research and development in aeronautics and supply the funds required.

It is incongruous for the Government to create and support increasing demands for air service without doing the same for the necessary research and development needed to fulfill these demands.

Government must be consistent and comprehensive in its activities.

Mr. Chairman, as I said at the outset, I do not think the Apollo 13 accident should be used as an excuse to halt or delay America's exploration of space.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr.

Chairman, will the gentleman from Washington yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment and commend the gentleman from Washington for his statement and for the leadership that he has helped to provide in this vital area of aeronautics.

Mr. PELLY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FREY) who very actively represents the Fifth Congressional District of Florida in which Cape Canaveral is located.

Mr. FREY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, first let me say this, it is an honor to serve on this committee with Chairman MILLER and the chairman of my subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), as well as the ranking Republican member on the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON).

Mr. Chairman, there have been several questions raised today. In my opinion one of the questions we are asking ourselves today is, do we want to stay in the manned space flight business? It has been stated by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH) that the amount authorized by the committee for this purpose is too great and that we should support the amendment which he will offer under the 5-minute rule because the gentleman feels that we should slow down a little bit in this program.

However, Mr. Chairman, as of today, right now, with this budget we will be out of the manned space flight business in approximately 3 years, from 1975 through 1977.

In the budget request of NASA for the so-called space shuttle and space station program, they requested $268 million. Our committee, through its action, lowered this amount to $190 million. This lower amount itself has cost us valuable time. Further, if I understand Mr. KARTH'S amendment correctly it will go toward knocking out the entire $190 million and it will go to knock out manned space flight for not just 3 years but probably 4 or 5 years.

Now, during this period of time, what are we going to do with the facilities that we have, approximately $4.5 billion worth? What are we going to do about people and teams that we have put together? How are we going to keep this team together? I might add parenthetically that the team has been lowered from 420,000 people 3 years ago to approximately 190,000 today, and it will reach approximately 144,000 at the end of fiscal 1971. There is certainly very little fat, if any, in our space program.

You are going to hear a lot about the space shuttle today. Everybody says that in the space program we should use our money better. I think we all agree with that, and that is the reason for the space shuttle. The space shuttle is the way to use a vehicle over and over again. It will have a booster and orbiter, and it will move men and satellites into orbit, and both the orbiter and booster will return. The requirement is that you can use it at least 100 times. It will carry about a 50,000-pound payload.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREY. I yield to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida on his last statement. I would like to point out to the House that we have to start building this space shuttle, and we have to do it because we have some very expensive satellites that are now in space, such as the space communications satellites and the other satellites that we have all heard about.

Yet when one of those goes dead now it is dead. It is lost forever. Eventually we have to have a vehicle that can go to these satellites and refurbish them, perhaps change the powerplants, or to do repair work. They have to be given the same kind of treatment as any other type machine needs. So that is the theme that we are working for, and are looking for in this field now.

I am very much of the impression and opinion that within the next 10 years we are going to see vehicles of this kind that can take off perhaps with regular conventional power, go through the earth's atmosphere, and turn on a different type of power, perhaps nuclear energy—that is one of the things we hope for—and that can then pick them up and bring them back to the earth's atmosphere. Instead of having to splash down, be able to land on conventional runways just as we now land our planes.

This is the development that we wish for, and hope for, and I am satisfied one that will come about.

Again I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for introducing this aspect of the space program.

Mr. FREY. Mr. Chairman, I thank our distinguished chairman for the leadership that he has exercised in the growth of our space program, and for his continuing leadership under which our space program will continue to develop.

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

Mr. FREY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman from Florida for his foresight.

Prior to the gentleman coming to Congress I served on the Committee on Science and Astronautics for 2 years. I was a hardliner on costs, mainly because I wanted to see something practical developed whereby we could recover vital hardware that time and time again we have lost. The explanation the gentleman has given today I am sure will not be lost on this august body.

Those Members who have fought hard against the costs of the program and who have screamed about the loss of vital hardware I believe would now have to support the shuttle that the gentleman is talking about.

To me it is very important to be able to go up into space and photograph something in space and then come back and have that object retrieved and be able to use it all over again.

The statement the gentleman has given us is one of the best explanations I have heard in quite some time. His contribution to a sensible project is commendable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FREY. Today the cost of putting a pound in space runs between $500 and $1,500.

The space shuttle will hopefully allow us to put the same pound into space at $50 a pound or less.

Many people believe that this is really the DC–3 of the future—well, no one really knows. But it is certainly possible.

If we cut out $190 million in the manned space portion of the budget for the shuttle, we are really cutting out money that goes to research and design. This is not hardware money. This is money necessary to look into the question to see if we can build a shuttle and see if we can do it economically; to see if we can develop the engines, wings, and materials necessary.

I certainly believe in economy. I certainly believe we need the space program. I think that with the space shuttle, these two items are wedded.

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

Mr. FREY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. A few moments ago the gentleman spoke about a reduction in personnel. I think it should be pointed out at this time that that reduction the gentleman from Minnesota voted would be in effect even if the full amount that the committee requested is granted and it could be even more if a further reduction is made in the program.

Mr. FREY. I thank the gentleman and I stand on that statement.

For instance, in our Cape Kennedy, if we have a gap of 5 years in the space program, it has been reduced to over 10,000 people now, and I foresee it just down to a skeleton crew, if we do not continue the manned space program. We have $4.5 billion in facilities, as pointed out before, and not to expend this $190 million we are going to lose more of that in plain operating costs in mothballing and in the teamwork we have built. This cost would be much greater than the $190 million for the space shuttle.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WYDLER).

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, when the first trouble appeared on the Apollo 13 flight, what the public expected to be a routine mission to the moon became instead an exciting and dangerous adventure.

The three American astronauts found themselves aboard a spacecraft whose air was limited and polluted, and whose water and other life support systems were in danger of contamination and extinction.

In many ways, the condition of the astronauts in their spacecraft was similar to the condition that mankind finds himself facing on earth. Their environment was endangered. The astronauts did not respond to this serious problem with despair, although they had every reason to react in that way. They did not radio Houston to the effect that they wished to be returned to the earth now and demand that all their problems be immediately solved. They did not allow themselves to become objects of self-pity but instead went to work with ingenuity and determination to improve their conditions and save their environment.

This past week we have celebrated as Environmental Week, including Earth Day. Individual effort and sacrifice will be necessary to clean up our air and water, but new technology is necessary to see that we can maintain the benefits of industry without the horrors of pollution.

No program offers greater hope to produce the necessary technology for this effort than the space program. It can be, and is, our scientific leading edge in the fight against environmental polution. Its spin-off, in the areas of medicine, communications and weather reporting is already paying dividends for a better life here on earth. Americans can be proud of our astronauts and their bravery and the competence and resourcefulness of our space team.

They succeeded and, in so doing, gave to America a lesson it could well take advantage of in this decade of ecology.

From Long Island's point of view, the most significant fact was the magnificent performance of the LEM module, which took over the job it was not designed to do and became the "lifeboat" that returned our three astronauts from the far reaches of space to an almost perfect splashdown in the Pacific. This performance by the LEM and Long Island technology once again establishes beyond question our area's competence in space work and nationwide leadership in future space programs and business.

I intend to see, as a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee in the House, that the Congress is made well aware of Grumman's and Long Island's past contribution to the space program and the necessity that such performance be rewarded by our area's inclusion in a major role of the space effort of the 1970's.

The value of moon rocks is now clearer than ever and we on Long Island will be able to see one of these rocks displayed in Town Hall in Hempstead during the week of June 9 to 18. I was glad to arrange this, with the cooperation of NASA and the presiding supervisor of the town of Hempstead, Ralph G. Caso. Long Island will have a chance to see some of the rock that was gathered on the face of the moon by astronauts who landed there on Long Island-built spacecrafts. We on Long Island are especially proud of our performance in what was one of the finest hours of the American spirit.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may use to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PRICE).



Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 16516.

As a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee, I feel I have gained a certain insight in this bill that I would like to share with my colleagues.

H.R. 16516 authorizes appropriations of $3.63 billion to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1971. As such, the committee's recommendation represents a total increase of $279.9 million over the NASA budget request for the same period.

This increase, however, is a selective one. The committee added $145 million for manned space flight in an effort to improve the scientific return from lunar exploration. An addition of $75 million was made to reduce the leadtime necessary to take up the program slack when production of the Saturn 5 vehicle is resumed. The committee provided an extra $80,000 to increase the return to be gained from establishing and operating an orbital laboratory, and to develop a low-cost space shuttle and space station for operation in this coming decade.

In perspective, the committee action has given the manned space program a needed selective infusion of operating capital. These dollars will help the program yield even more valuable benefits to mankind, as well as help reduce the risks inherent in manned space travel.

History has handed this generation of man the unique opportunity for our species to escape the earth's surface and to begin exploring the solar system. What we will find we do not know. We do know, however, that this Nation stands poised on the threshold of a great opportunity, one which will not go unavailed of if we turn our backs on it. Russia is still trying to surpass our space efforts, and if it does, experience indicates the Communists would not hesitate to use this achievement as a lever in their quest for world domination.

In addition, as was made fully apparent during an extended discussion on the House floor this past Tuesday, the manned space program has yielded a giant harvest for mankind. At the present time, more than 2,500 technological products have originated directly from our space program, and thousands more have profited from space research activities. To name but a few:

Miniaturization advanced for the space program has been the source of tiny appliances, improved color television, and surgical instruments.

In major hospitals throughout the Nation, tiny television transmitters which can be swallowed in a capsule are being used for visual examination of the inner workings of the human stomach.

Refrigerators which move at a touch, aid the housewife.

Sportsmen have been provided with a "space blanket" which fits in a shirt pocket to provide him with warmth and comfort.

Space research has discovered a way to use energy generated within the body to provide power for hearing aids and for the direction and control of artificial limbs.

Operational meteorological satellites now assist in the analysis and forecast of the world's weather.

Forecasting weather up to 2 weeks in advance is considered a realistic goal using advanced meteorological senors already under development.

Surveys of the surface of the earth from orbiting spacecraft will soon lead to more effective exploration, management, and conservation of our natural resources.

Military defense satellite systems keep a constant watch on our enemies looking for military movements and arms buildups.

Finally, the most important thing to remember about the applied benefits from the space program is that compared to this coming decade, the present yield from space research and activities is but a trickle. The future holds a storehouse of value from space research. We need but vigorously pursue our efforts and the rewards will be ours.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has recommended authorizing approximately $3.63 billion for NASA operations in fiscal year 1971. This amount should be considered in light of other Federal and private expenditures. This is less money than the welfare program that passed the House last week cost. It represents but 5 percent of our defense budget. On the consumption side of the ledger, the $3.63 billion is less than the Nation spends for pet food each year. And, it is only 10 percent of what is spent annually on women's dresses. In terms of per capita cost, the space program costs less than 40 cents per person per week.

As regards the question of whether space spending should be deferred until our domestic problems are solved, let me say this. If the initiatives taken by Western man throughout history were forced to meet this test, we still would be painting our bodies blue to ward off evil spirits and diseases, and living in mud huts and hillside caves.

Historically, progress has not been the hand servant of social ills. The reason for this is clear. Progress creates new wealth, which in turn provides society with an increased ability to distribute its wealth and beneficence. In present times, man's efforts to conquer space represent the epitome of technological progress. It is a significant means by which social progress and social justice can be brought in greater measure not only to Americans, but to people throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, these are but some of the possibilities that await for us as part of our space program, a program which can only function in accordance with the money the Congress provides it. The Science and Astronautics Committee has worked long and hard in arriving at this austerity budget for NASA; I urge my colleagues to support the committee's recommendations.

(Mr. WEICKER (at the request of Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Chairman, the opponents of the space program repeatedly beat the drums in an effort to reduce the Nation's space work. They ask what has

the space program done for the man in the street?

The space program has been eminently successful in meeting national goals in addition to providing an output of value to our taxpayers. This goal of placing America first in aerospace technology and assenting the Nation's preeminence in space research, in fact rather than inuendo or propaganda, has been clearly demonstrated. As a result, we have concrete benefits that have resulted from this challenging work.

I realize that we proponents of the program have talked about the educational impetus, the interest in science and technology, and the enthusiasm generated in our Nation by the space program as well as our space accomplishments. These issues are genuinely felt by our taxpayers and these feelings are higher than most of you think. We have not heard very much about the technical excellence that must be an accomplished fact to have a successful space mission. I ask my colleagues just what value do they place on interest by both consumer and manufacturer on the demonstrated reliability of technical equipments, electrical and mechanical, that have to perform as designed to carry out these goals? These accomplishments are readily appreciated by industry. Manufacturing and testing techniques are incorporated into consumer products as rapidly as possible consistent with the economics involved. NASA has established the Office of Technology Utilization which has in turn established—dissemination centers to speed the flow of this and other innovations into the economy. This flow of material has grown year by year and this year the Committee on Science and Astronautics recommended an increase in funds to be used specifically for speeding the flow of technology relating to the solution of urban development and environmental quality problems.

Now, if you ask me when the man in the street will realize benefits from improved reliability and improved urban and environmental quality due to space spin-off, the answer is they have and are continuing to benefit from space work. If you ask when the man in the street will begin to appreciate these space-related improvements, the answer is, "when you tell him about them." You should join the team and give these reasons as influencing your support of a viable space program. From my association with the NASA program I am convinced of the value of this work and believe that the request of 1.6 percent of total Federal budget for fiscal year 1971 is well worth its expenditure for space.

It must be emphasized that space research is not, and cannot be primarily oriented toward producing immediate benefits to our citizenry. Long-term gain is generally the result of any technological improvement and this should be the expected results of the space program. I ask, do we expect the same immediate benefit from other Government expenditures or from other technological advancement? Has this been true in any other technological expenditure?

Lest my colleagues forget or believe that there is only long-range gain from the space program, let me remind you of the multimillion-dollar space communications industry that has grown up as a direct result, the weather forecasting and storm warnings that have saved our Nation and the world untold lives and millions of dollars. Is it expected that every year NASA must discover a new and startling space business equal to these two contributions to our Nation? I should remind you also that 99.9 percent of the space appropriations are spent in this country and that the thousands of space workers and their families do not believe that such innovations of the magnitude of these two need be forthcoming each year for the program to be beneficial to them. A large portion of the aerospace industry, employing over 1 million people with an annual payroll of over $14 billion is supported directly and by the research and the technology transfer supported by this program. To reduce the program and not support this important segment of our industry would be a folly which would seriously weaken a vital national resource.

You have heard of the potential advantages of space related research for worldwide navigation improvements for aircraft and ships, a better understanding of weather and weather phenomena, an opportunity for better cooperation between nations bceause of scientific interchange, mutual economic worldwide advantages in education and technology and many, many other thoughts that have broad impact. Have you, however, heard of the following:

A NASA developed accelerometer which is the key item in the development of a direct reading drilling direction indicator, a tool that is expected to have major impact on the entire well-drilling industry.

A device for precise positioning of spacecraft models in test rigs has been applied to the design of a commercially marketed digital clock.

NASA research on foam and honeycomb core sandwich construction has led to development of a new process in the production of truck body construction material.

In-space eating research brought forth the commercially available "space food sticks" whose marketing success inspired development by the producer of a whole new line of nutrition foods.

Hand-sized TV cameras, developed to photograph rocket stage separation, are being used to monitor industrial processes, and for crime detection and prevention.

A method of damping vibration of engine compressor blades has found applicability in the manufacture of clutches for heavy duty trucks to overcome problems of virbration in gear trains.

In the field of medicine which has been a prime beneficiary of space research, the following has resulted:

A NASA developed system designed to monitor pilots' heart action can be attached by spray action and used to radio electrocardiogram signals to hospitals to assist in emergency treatment of cardiac patients. This equipment is commercially available today.

A method of measuring breathing functions especially applicable to infants and small children who suffer breathing difficulties, allowing immediate corrective action to prevent brain damage due to lack of oxygen.

The fluid-cooled undergarment for the space suit is used to cool the body and slow body processes for surgery and therapy.

The lunar gravity simulator has been used as a rehabilitation aid for long bedridden patients who must learn to reuse muscles in order to walk.

In addition, there are many other items such as minature telemetry systems, new resins for use in bone repair, radio monitoring systems for hospital automation allowing a more efficient hospital design.

In other fields, the leadership that NASA has displayed in technology transfer is bearing fruit in a number of ways. Unique and valuable relationships between NASA, and federal and state agencies concerned with application of engineering and management technology to medicine, mine safety, pollution control, law enforcement, and transportation have been established. These cooperative efforts are being assisted by two new technology application teams. Each team is composed of people from a variety of scientific and engineering disciplines. Their assignment is to transfer aerospace technology to areas of concern in the public sector through an interdisciplinary approach to problem solving. The teams are located at the Illinois Institute of Technology Research Institute, Chicago, and the Stanford Research Institute, Menlo Park, Calif. These new groups, along with the two previously formed biomedical application teams, constitute a significant new resource to transfer aerospace technology.

The user agencies with which NASA has worked on the Federal level include the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration—in the Department of Justice—the Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Mines, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration—in the Department of Interior—the Bureau of Solid Waste Management and the National Air Pollution Control Administration—in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—the Department of Transportation; and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Public agencies on the State and local level with which NASA has worked include the Los Angeles, Seattle, New York, and Chicago police departments; the Maryland and Illinois State crime commissions and the New York Office of Crime Control Planning; the Bay Area, Los Angeles, and Seattle air pollution control districts, plus other local air-pollution authorities; the Los Angeles and Bay Area Rapid Transit authorities; and the Chicago, Boston, and Los Angeles fire departments.

These cooperative problem-solving efforts have begun to pay off. Among recent transfers are a compact, self-powered, easily portable device for monitoring dust particles in coal mines; a sensor for the measurement of low-velocity air flow in coal mines; a scanning instrument for the detection and recovery of indented writing in criminal

laboratories; an instrument to determine the sensitivity of automobile drivers to various air pollutants; the application of NASA mass spectrometers for monitoring air pollution; and the development of a portable life-support system for use by firemen.

We have been told over the years and it is true that U.S. leadership has been based on our ability to transfer scientific and technological output into useful instruments for the betterment of our citizens. This is a cliche. However, because of our world leadership we should not abrogate our leadership in science and technology because we demand an immediate output that has a short range objective of meeting an immediate aim, that of requiring as a prime requisite an immediate usable output of complex technology. We should pursue our technological effort with prudence and with confidence that our ability to transfer this technology has not abated.

(Mr. GOLDWATER, at the request of Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, we are now realizing the tremendous benefits of America's space technology. If we were to cut off NASA's budget now, we would be losing the interest on our investment.

Early this week, many of my colleagues and I discussed the numerous spinoffs from the NASA program. It is not necessary to repeat these facts at this time, but I would like to insert my comments in the RECORD following these brief remarks.

Certainly, no one can contend that the NASA budget is large. It is only 1.5 percent of the entire Federal budget. However, severe and immediate cuts in the NASA budget would seriously damage our Nation's economy.

My home State of California's aerospace employment has suffered tremendously, due to the present reductions. These reductions are now having a serious effect on all sectors of California's economy.

The State's aerospace/defense employment dropped by nearly 60,000 in just the past 18 months. North American Rockwell has already announced that they will lay off 8,000 more people between now and November. Most of these people are in southern California.

Therefore, the administration has already cut the budget and any further reductions will simply do more damage than good.

America's men of space have reinspired the American spirit. Our astronauts have made tremendous sacrifices for our Nation. Let us live up to the challenge that they have given us. Let us give our complete support to America's space program.

I include the following:

BENEFITS FROM THE SPACE PROGRAM

(Press release of BARRY GOLDWATER, Jr.)

The launching of Apollo 13 to the moon is less than a month away and again many Americans ask: "Is it really worth all that money?"

Certainly, this is a fair and legitimate question.

The American people should be reminded that this astronomical outlay has not been wasted, but has paid off in saving the lives and improving the lot of mankind. Fascinating, indeed, are the bonuses and benefits of the taxpayers' investment in space.

Most everyone knows of the more direct benefits—communication satellites linking us to all peoples of the world—weather satellites saving lives by advance warnings of killer hurricanes—navigation satellites adding to the safety of travel by sea and by air—surveillance satellites which may soon strip secrecy from the deadly weapons of every nation—and the prospect of cruising manned spaceships to fend off enemy attacks from outer space.

Dramatic as are these direct results, we are prone to forget that the unplanned, indirect benefits, by-products of space exploration and the moon shot, may prove far greater. New devices for space travel will have a mighty impact on our daily living. They range all the way from the very ordinary to the miraculous, from a super glue which you can now buy at the hardware store to the last word in electronics which before long may virtually restore sight to the blind.

An electromagnetic hammer for fabricating rockets is being tested for construction of ships and automobiles, shaping metals without weakening them. It may soon give you a cheap *and* strong automobile. A canopy or "glass sandwich" preventing the spacecraft from icing will be a cradle cover affording precise temperature control for prematurely-born infants. An adult version is already saving lives of those with heretofore fatal burns. And speaking of temperature, you may soon use a super-insulated blanket of aluminized mylar, similar to metal developed for the Echo Balloon Satellite. It will keep you cool when it's hot, warm when it's cold, and dry when it rains. It can be a shelter in the forest, or a wrapper for the fish you just caught, or a radar-reflective, air-sea rescue signal; a multipurpose item and a potential lifesaver. Space clothing will make your life more comfortable. Developed for astronauts to withstand lunar temperatures, it will lead to suits that are lightweight and wear-resistant. Instead of a bulky overcoat, you may be wearing a thermo-electrical weave with built-in temperature control. Thermal underwear is already on the market.

Spray-on electrodes will take a heart patient's electrocardiogram while he is being rushed to the hospital in an ambulance and flash it to the waiting doctor, so he will know exactly what to do the instant the patient arrives. Sudden clogging of the tracheotomy tube has strangled many patients, especially small ones. A NASA-developed sensor will sound the alarm within ten seconds of the slightest change in breathing.

A switch, controlled by the eye, gave astronauts the equivalent of an extra pair of arms. This has been adapted for the paralytic. By a flick of his eyes, he can activate a call board or even manipulate a motor-driven wheelchair. Similarly, an eight-legged lunar walker prepared for use on the uneven surface of the moon offers fuller life for the handicapped, allowing him to go places on his own where a wheelchair could never go. Even if he cannot use his hands, it can be controlled by a chin cup.

Complex electronic components devised by space research makes possible a small TV camera, which, worn on the forehead, will scan a blind person's surroundings and reading matter. Then, bypassing the sightless eyes, it would transmit an image to a tiny, teflon-insulated receiver in the visual cortex of the brain, enabling the blind to "see." The camera might eventually be miniaturized to fit into an eye socket. It may take a decade to perfect this marvel, but it is well on its way.

There are numberless other benefits, small and great—scar-proof, long-wearing, fire-resisting paint, a whole new family of plastics which will transform the automobile of the future and a computer filter process which provides infinitely clearer X-rays, adding speed and precision to medical diagnosis.

The total number of benefits are too numerous to mention here. However, as the Apollo 13 lifts off for the moon on April 16, let us take a moment to remember the tremendous benefits that America's space program has brought us—right here on earth.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE).

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to read a letter which I was afraid I would not have the chance to read later.

This letter is from probably the most knowledgeable person in our country so far as manned space flight is concerned. He is Dr. George E. Mueller who was associate administrator of manned space flights up until the time when we first landed man on the moon.

This, Mr. Chairman, is his letter:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *April 15, 1970.*

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,

*Chairman, Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight, Committee on Science and Astronautics, House of Representatives Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: I am pleased to respond to your request for my thoughts about the space program at this critical moment in the formulation of our future space efforts.

Now before the Congress is the proposal to proceed immediately with studies for the development of the space shuttle. These are the funds necessary to confirm previous studies which indicate the efficiencies we expect of this new low-cost space transportation system. It is my considered opinion that this single development is the key to all of our future space activity, both manned and unmanned. By drastically lowering all costs of operation in space, we can afford to move forward rapidly into this new territory for exploration and exploitation. Our studies already show that the shuttle will reduce costs by at least tenfold at the outset, and with the maturity of the space shuttle, by as much as twice that amount.

The characteristics of the space shuttle, as it is being designed, provide for economies in every aspect of space operations. Reusability is the primary factor. At least 100 round trips into space will replace the one time use on a one way trip of all present launch equipment. The ability of the space shuttle to return men, cargo, and equipment back to earth will significantly reduce the cost of all equipment. First, because the low transportation cost and the benign launch environment will permit us to use heavier off-the-shelf laboratory and production equipment. Secondly, with the space shuttle in operation, on-orbit maintenance can be supplemented by return of instruments to earth for repair. Another special capability of the space shuttle is its use for space rescue.

As we look to the future, it is possible that the most important role of the space shuttle will be in our national defense. There can be no doubt that the space shuttle is the key to control and utilization of outer space. That control may well be decisive in preventing future wars. In that regard, timing is of the essence. The lead time for carrying out the development and putting into operation a new concept of this magnitude is very long—seven to ten years. We know that this concept has been under study by many people in many countries for at least a decade. Now that the technology for building a space shuttle is available, we need to im-

plement an orderly program—or we will again face the necessity of having to produce such equipment as a crash program at much greater expense. I believe that we, as a nation, cannot afford to delay an orderly development program, now! If we should fail to grasp the initiative, we risk being confronted with an alien space shuttle which will give its developer effective control of space.

In summary, the space shuttle will save billions of dollars in our space activity. It will provide a barrier to technological surprise. It will be an effective shield for our national security. I urge you and your Committee to support the development of the space shuttle.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. MUELLER.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that he is asking $190 million to further study and confirm studies that have already been made?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No; not to confirm studies but to continue studies that have been started or are being made.

Mr. HAYS. $190 million, at $25,000 apiece, would give you 7,625 experts to study it. It seems to me that would be a lot of studying.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. When Mr. Nixon became President, he appointed a very distinguished panel to make a study of this subject.

Mr. HAYS. He has appointed other——

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Let me finish my statement. That panel came back with the recommendation of $4 billion for a space program this year. This panel came up with $3.3 billion. So our committee is in between.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman impressed now?

Mr. HAYS. I am not impressed.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he desires to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BURLISON).

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the administration has requested authorization for more than $3.3 billion for the space program in fiscal year 1971. The Science and Astronautics Committee increased this amount by nearly $300 million, with the entire increase earmarked for the manned space flight program.

The accomplishments of the space program have been spectacular to say the least, but that fact alone cannot justify continued multibillion dollar appropriations. Expenditures for space must be considered in the context of the total needs of the Nation. The Government does not have an unlimited amount of money to spend. If one program takes a large piece of the fiscal pie, other programs must take smaller pieces. The issue is: Which programs are most important to the general welfare of the Nation.

The listing of pressing problems is staggering. Vast amounts of money are going to be necessary to clean up our polluted environment. Large infusions of money are needed to restore prosperity to our rural areas. Local communities already saddled with debts are in need of new water systems and sanitary facilities. Police forces need upgrading for the fight against crime. Federal contributions to education have been inadequate and people are waiting in line to get into hospitals that have been forced to keep patients in hallways for lack of rooms.

In view of these high priority problems I feel that we have an obligation to take a long hard look at the money that is devoted to space exploration, particularly those fantastically expensive manned space projects. With this in mind let us examine what is being proposed.

This year $190 million is authorized for a "space shuttle." The National Aeronautics and Space Administration conservatively estimates the total cost at approximately $14 billion. This space "bus" would launch 20 astronauts into orbit and bring them back again, at a cost of $50 per pound. But before you begin to see visions of space vacations, you better take a look at your savings account.

By the time we add up the ton or more of life support equipment required for each person and the program development costs the price comes up to about $1 million per person per trip and that only if 20 persons go each time. Why we would want to send up 20 at a time is a complete mystery.

The most costly program under consideration is Vice President AGNEW's pet project, the mission to Mars. NASA predicts that with a crash program we could land a man on Mars by 1983. The cost would be paid in installments. A little over $4 billion in 1971 climbing ultimately to nearly $10 billion per year by the 1980's. Some have estimated that the total cost might reach $100 billion. We can probably do it, but is it worth the cost? Dr. Bruce Murray of the California Institute of Technology and a member of the team analyzing the findings of the unmanned Mariner 6 and 7 thinks not. He called the manned mission to Mars in the 1980's a "stunt." Joshua Lederberg, a former member of the Space Science Board of the National Academy of Science expressed his belief that the cost of sending a man to Mars far outweighed any possible contribution he could make to the mission.

I think NASA should devote its attention to the use of automated spacecraft. At a fraction of the cost, automated spacecraft have proven to be much more effective in the acquisition of scientific knowledge as well as having practical application such as communications, air traffic control, weather prediction, and earth resources survey.

The cost contrast of manned flights as against automated flights is striking. Explorer 35, a 2-pound lunar satellite requiring only seven-tenths of a watt for power, has been circling the moon since July of 1967. It never sleeps, requires no oxygen, no food, no toothpaste, and no sanitary facilities. The whole surveyor program which soft landed five vehicles on the moon cost no more than it costs to launch a single Saturn V moon rocket.

The United States has spent $50 billion on space programs in the last 10 years. The Apollo moon project cost about $2.5 billion per year for that decade. While we were spending $2.5 billion a year to put a man on the moon, we were spending $500 million less than that each year on elementary and secondary education. To my mind this is a tragic misapplication of national resources. We are saying in effect that it is more important to send two men to the moon than it is to educate the more than 55 million children who are in elementary and high schools throughout the country, or to keep our farm economy going. Our Government pays our farmers very little more than the $2.5 billion in a year.

We seem to be working on the proposition that if a thing is technologically possible it should be done. We have put a man on the moon. The scientists and engineers tell us it is technically possible to put a man on Mars. Therefore, we should do it. Noted physicist and Nobel Prize winner, Max Born once commented that the manned space program was a "triumph of intellect but a failure of reason." Intellect he said distinguishes between possible and impossible. Reason distinguishes between sensible and senseless. To his mind the manned missions were senseless because their cost so far outweighed their scientific value and the money was so badly needed elsewhere.

Mr. Chairman, that is the point I am trying to make. If money were no object I would say send a man to Mars. Send him to Venus. But, we simply cannot do that. Money is an object and the money we have is desperately needed for other programs. On the other hand, I am not in favor of abolishing the space program. Some phases of it such as the unmanned projects have great potential. All I am saying is that we should not get so carried away with the spectacle of space travel that we lose sight of what is really important. In view of all these considerations, Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to vote against this legislation.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he desires to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON).

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman, and wish to acknowledge my appreciation to him and to the chairmen of the two subcommittees on which I serve, Mr. KARTH and Mr. DADDARIO, for their consistent courtesy and consideration.

It is tempting, particularly for the layman including Congressmen, to say, "away with the space program, who needs it? Whoever needed it?" Tempting, but not wise. The technology derived from our space effort to date may have more relevance to spaceship earth's survival prospects than any single development since the discovery of electricity. The weather warning satellite has already saved estimated thousands of lives from the ravages of Hurricane Camille, and maintains a steady watch now over the gulf coast and other areas. The communications satellites will be able to bring into the remotest corners of earth, knowledge, information, and education geared to the economic needs, language, and culture of every family. Perhaps one

day, using simultaneous translation, a weekly conversation between representatives of all the earth's great cultures can bring into every home a new awareness of the joint venture we are engaged in, survival, reducing fear and mistrust, and just possibly the barren machinations and weapons systems they generate. Earth resources satellite, will fly in a few years time and will, with infrared sensors, explore the subsurface of land and water areas, and tell the farmers of the world what the soil needs. It could ultimately save, according to the Department of Agriculture, a billion or more dollars a year in farming costs in the United States alone, one-quarter the current annual cost of the whole space program. It will monitor the oceans as well, and warn man against the depredations of his oil and fishing industries which disturb the life cycle of the sea, possibly even jeopardizing the orderly process of oceanic photosynthesis from which most of our oxygen is derived.

Now, what of man in space? Yesterday, Earth Day, I met hundreds of students and academicians who voiced the firm opinion that all investments in space should cease at once in favor of investments on earth. Yet, a curiously dominant thread ran through their prescription for earth: population control, and the need for Government to take a more active part in achieving it. It is clear that those who reject the importance of space technology claim with equal fervor that the effort to keep earth livable cannot possibly succeed unaccompanied by firmly enforced worldwide population management. Up with Malthus; down with NASA. And it occurs to me that today we may be implicitly deciding, in a very small way to be sure, between two alternatives. First, predictably costly first steps that could lead in a century or more to the expansion of civilization into the universe. Second, an unpredictably costly determination to contain the expansion of civilization on earth. Undoubtedly a beneficent world order will determine which seeds shall multiply and what spaces shall be allotted them with appropriate sanctions to secure compliance.

In the meantime there is another relevance to manned programs difficult to tag with a price. It comes in two perspectives. The earth as seen by man in space and the man in space as seen from earth. The earth was seen and described on this floor by the first man from the far side of the moon—Frank Borman—as a tiny ball hanging in the black stillness of space, with no sustaining help from the galaxies, entirely dependent on man's own initiative, and, as Borman said, his sense of brotherhood. Not a bad perspective, while cities burn, hungry reach up in Biafra, and bodies float down the Mekong.

The second perspective we saw last week in a space shot that failed. Or did it in all respects? How do we measure failure, and how success? If an aborted effort to land and return men from the moon was failure, we failed indeed. But the world was used to success. Would success in that limited sense have focused the prayers, hopes, and yearnings of men too deep to describe? Or did it take failure to do it? All of us were on that ship, in the LEM, in the command module. And we wanted to come home safe. That tiny struggle in the sky meant more to the watching world than any part of its own anatomy of chaos down here. It succeeded in suggesting that great ventures should be joint ventures. And I would hope that as we look ahead to more Apollo flights, consideration be given to initiatives to incorporate a Soviet experiment if not a scientist-astronaut on one of them, or one soon thereafter. The more we link hands in realizing the joint dreams of man, the fewer hands we will have free to fight with, and the less inclination to do so. Great wars cost great sums—hardly compensated by the concomitant reductions in population. What price then may we place on small embraces between great powers? If men on earth should work together to make their planet spaceship more livable, and less likely to blow out a panel, or dissipate its oxygen, maybe that lesson must come from men in space. Heaven knows it has not come from men on earth.

As Teilhard de Chardin holds, "Things rising converge." Perhaps that is true of the hopes of man.

Mr. FREY. Mr. Chairman, on Tuesday of this week, together with other colleagues on the Science and Astronautics Committee, the space program was discussed at some length. We tried to place it in proper perspective. For instance, it was pointed out that the proposed budget request is approximately 1.7 percent of the total Federal budget. Interest on the national debt for fiscal year 1970 would be 18.8 billion or close to 5½ times the amount budgeted for space. In terms of the gross national product we spend approximately four times more for alcohol and twice as much for cigarettes as we do on our space program.

We also attempted to detail the direct and indirect benefits of the space program and what it has meant to the average American. For instance in 1969, Hurricane Camille killed 256 persons, while another 68 are missing and presumed dead. The hurricane's damage was estimated at $1.42 billion. This deadly hurricane's path force and extent were predicted early and accurately enough by satellite to permit the evacuation of 70,000 people from the affected gulf coast State. Without this warning, ESSA estimated that 50,000 people might have lost their lives. New sensors will be tested through Nimbus satellites and application technological satellites by 1972. If all goes well, we should know the weather up to 2 weeks in advance by the end of the 1970's. In a 1966 speech, Dr. Seaborg, presently Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, estimated that if weather could be accurately predicted even 3 days in advance, man could save $60 billion a year. This estimate was based on a comprehensive 17 volume study made by the IBM Corp. Even if this prediction is 90 percent in error, a saving of $6 billion and untold human lives a year is a significant return of our space dollar.

Other spinoff benefits of the space program were discussed in detail and included such areas as communications, the earth resources program, medicine, education, the NASA information bank, the management of large urban areas, information systems, transportation systems, power generation, collision avoidance, aircraft control, computer technology, and oceanography. I hope that those who say "the space program is not helping on earth" will take time to review the RECORD of Tuesday, April 21.

I did like to direct my attention to several points that have been raised regarding the future of the Apollo program and the overall manned space flight effort.

It has been estimated that we have spent approximately $22 billion to date on the Apollo phase of the program. Some people would have us stop the program because of the problems of Apollo 13. These people forget that the purpose of the Apollo program was not just to get to the moon but to galvanize the scientific, technological, and human resources of this country in order for men to be able to operate in, survive in, and understand space. Space is there. If we are not able to use it, other countries certainly will. The Russians proved this. Not to do so would be like Columbus making his voyage to the New World and no one following it up. History teaches us that the nation that is first in science and technology has the best opportunity to create a better life for all its citizens. Our space exploration program offers us a chance to recoup material returns of immeasurable value and to maintain our technological superiority.

Specifically, regarding the Apollo program, we have seven Saturn V's left and six are programed for moon landings. The other Saturn V is to be used in the AAP program in 1972. After this year's authorization and appropriations, in essence we have paid for all the hardware needed for the Apollo program. The estimated runout costs for these six remaining Apollo missions after fiscal year 1971 through fiscal year 1975 total $2.710 billion. It would not make sense to build a fleet of airplanes and then not fly them. We, of course, must first correct the problems of Apollo 13 before continuing our flight program. We all realize now that in any program such as this, the astronauts' safety cannot be guaranteed, but we have a responsibility to do everything we can to make our spacecraft as safe as humanly possible. Those who oppose the continuance of the Apollo program on the basis of saving money are in essence asking us to throw $22 billion away just when technological and scientific returns are beginning. Those who oppose the continuation of the Apollo program or think it should be cut back, are asking us in essence to waste $22 billion previously spent because they do not wish to spend $2.710 billion more to complete the program. This just does not make sense.

Another question is of course what is the future of man in space. The future

as outlined by the space task force group headed by Vice President AGNEW lists as one of the keys the development of new capabilities for operating in space. The emphasis would be on the three factors of commonality, reusability and economy. These factors are found in the so-called space shuttle which consists as presently conceived of a reusable booster and orbiter. It will be designed to perform at least 100 missions with minimum maintenance, carry at least 12 passengers to and from the earth and have a payload capacity up to 50,000 pounds. Instead of paying between $500 and $1,500 a pound to get an object in space, we will hopefully be paying less than $50 a pound by use of this space shuttle. It is surprising to me that those who are complaining about economy in our space program can find fault with the space shuttle. Indeed the estimates of the space shuttle over the approximate 7 years of the development program amount to $5.7 billion or approximately 20 percent of the Apollo program cost. The space shuttle will be the DC–3 of the future. It can be used for transporting crews to space stations, for carrying and positioning satellites in orbit, for retrieval and maintenance of satellites. The latter can be extremely cost productive in that today satellites must be engineered to perfection because of the inability to correct problems in space. Simpler and cheaper satellites can be put into space when we have the ability to go to the source and correct malfunctions. Furthermore, the space shuttle can serve as an orbital staging platform for automated planetary probes and spacecraft. Of course, one other important function which really hit home during Apollo 13 is that the space shuttle will be designed so that it can be maintained in a state of launch readiness for lengthy periods and be launched within several hours' notice. With this rescue capability, Apollo astronauts could be rescued in earth orbit without the need for reentry.

Based on our present program, we today face a gap in our manned space flight program from 1975 to 1977. If the shuttle money is taken out of this budget this gap will be stretched even further, possibly 1 to 2 additional years. When the money in the budget at the present time, $190 million for both the space station and space shuttle is compared against the storage and mothballing costs, the loss of human resources caused by the delay and the scientific and technological loss, there can be no question that there is true economy in leaving the money in the budget for development for the space shuttle. It should be noted that the money in the budget for both the space shuttle and space station is not for the development of hardware. The budget includes $12 million for experiment definition, $48.5 million for shuttle engine definition and design, $22.5 million for shuttle air frame definition, $6 million for station definition, and $101 million for the shuttle station preliminary design verification. We have taken the necessary steps to insure that we will have economy and reusability in our future manned space flight programs.

Because of some misunderstanding that has developed, I wrote a letter to NASA Director Tom Paine requesting that he set forth supporting data regarding the Apollo program and shuttle. His letter is as follows:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
*Washington, D.C., April 23, 1970.*

Hon. LOU FREY, Jr.,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. FREY: Dr. Paine asked me to send the attached responses to the questions you asked of him in your April 22, 1970, letter.

Sincerely yours,
GERALD J. MOSSINGHOFF,
*Acting Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs.*

---

Question A: Based upon the President's FY 1971 space program, what have been the total Apollo program costs to date, and what is the estimated runout cost?

Answer: The annual cost of the Manned Lunar Landing program through July 31, 1969, following completion of the Apollo 11 mission, was $21.3 billion as summarized on the attached Table. Since that historic event, additional costs have been incurred through March 31, 1971, of $1.3 billion, thereby increasing the total costs of this program through March 1970 to $22.6 billion. This includes the cost of Apollo 12 and most of the checkout and other preparations for the launch of Apollo 13. The $22.6 billion also funded $1.4 billion of flight hardware which is now in inventory or in the production line and available for future missions. It also provided capital assets of about $2.8 billion, which are of a continuing national value such as the manned space flight centers; unique production, test, and launch support equipment; the worldwide tracking communications and data acquisition network; instrumentation ships, etc.

The Apollo R&D program, through March 1970, accounted for $17.8 billion of the total Manned Lunar Landing costs of $22.6 billion. The remainder, $4.8 billion, is attributable to Tracking and Data Acquisition, Construction of Facilities, and Operations of the Manned Space Flight Centers.

Apollo program costs for the remainder of FY 1970 are estimated to be between $375 to $400 million, thus increasing the Apollo R&D costs through FY 1970 to approximately $956 million for Apollo R&D in FY 1971. The funding required to maintain the Apollo program through completion in the first half of FY 1975 is dependent on many factors. However, under the existing guidelines, schedule, and assuming early resolution of the Apollo 13 anomalies and no further problems, our current estimates for the program by fiscal year are as follows:

| Fiscal year: | [In millions] |
|---|---|
| 1972 | $880 |
| 1973 | 780 |
| 1974 | 740 |
| 1975 | 310 |

These estimates assume continued lunar exploration flights through Apollo 19 in late Calendar Year 1974 and that during this period, the Apollo program will continue to bear the costs of maintaining the development, production, test, and operational capabilities to meet the common requirements of all manned space flight programs. To the extent that new programs are undertaken and would bear their proportionate share of these relatively fixed costs, i.e., Space Station, Space Shuttle, second Skylab, the costs allocated to the Apollo program would, of course, be reduced.

Questions B and C: What is the total cost of the Space Shuttle and the Space Station programs?

Answer: Current estimates for the Space Station and Space Shuttle are based on preliminary studies used in developing the Space Task Group report and can be regarded only as approximations of the total cost. The Space Station costs, in particular, are subject to variation, depending on the experiments selected for flight. Preliminary analysis indicates that Space Station costs for development and initial flight hardware will be in the range of $5 billion and that development and initial flight hardware of the Shuttle will require about $6 billion. These estimates are in terms of 1969 dollars. Studies of the Space Station and Shuttle, which are in progress in FY 1970 and will continue in 1971, will provide more comprehensive definition of the development and operational programs and the resources requirements to support these efforts.

Question D: Aside from the requested $110 million identified specifically for the Space Shuttle/Station in the FY 1971 Space Flight Operations line item, how much is included elsewhere in the FY 1971 request for the Space Shuttle/Station, and what is the tentatively planned use of these funds?

ANSWER: In addition to the $110 million identified in Space Flight Operations in the FY 1971 budget for Space Station and Shuttle, a significant portion of the Office of Advanced Research and Technology effort is applicable to these same two programs. In each program between $30 to $40 million will be applied.

The major portion of the Shuttle and Space Station effort was already underway in OART before a specific program of Shuttle/Station technology was formulated. Many program elements have been accelerated or amplified in support of these two programs, but only minor funding is associated with new effort undertaken to meet specific Shuttle/Station requirements. Technology effort in the following functional areas has been identified as being associated with the Shuttle:

1. Aerothermodynamics and configurations;
2. Structures and materials;
3. Propulsion work;
4. Integrated electronics; and,
5. Biotechnology.

The Space Station technology development effort includes the following areas:

1. Information systems;
2. Structures, dynamics, stabilization, and control;
3. Power generation and distribution;
4. Space medicine and human research;
5. Life support and protective systems; and,
6. User technology.

Question E: Based upon your projections as to space funding levels for the future, what do you foresee as the relative percentile balances between the manned and unmanned flight programs?

Answer: Based on the total NASA budget for FY 1971, the percentage of R&D funds allocated for manned space flight activities approaches 45 percent and nearly 20 percent for unmanned activities. As you are aware, our FY 1971 budget request is based on the STG report to the President which recommended "that this Nation accept the basic goal of a balanced manned and unmanned space program conducted for the benefit of all mankind." With the normal growth in programs already approved and underway for space applications and planetary exploration and on the assumption that future budgets (including FY 1971) will be approved at levels which support the major program elements in the STG report, the R&D funding applied to unmanned activities will increase over the next several years.

MANNED LUNAR LANDING COSTS

[In millions of dollars]

| | April 1961 estimate | March 1964 estimate [1] | March 1966 estimate [2] | April 1969 estimate [2] | Actual cost through July 31, 1969 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Apollo spacecraft | | $5,053 | $6,642 | $7,945 | $6,939 |
| Saturn launch vehicles | | 7,702 | 8,941 | 8,770 | 7,940 |
| Engine development | | 1,190 | 1,053 | 854 | 854 |
| Operations support | | 863 | 1,077 | 1,393 | 1,137 |
| Total MSF R. & D. | | 14,808 | 17,713 | 18,962 | 16,870 |
| Tracking and data acquisition | | 776 | 730 | 664 | 541 |
| Facilities | | 1,664 | 1,773 | 1,830 | 1,810 |
| MSF center operations | | 2,253 | 2,502 | 2,421 | 2,128 |
| Total | $20,000-40,000 | 19,501 | 22,718 | 23,877 | 21,349 |
| Flight hardware available | | | | | −2,000 |
| Net total | | | | | 19,349 |

[1] Based on assumption of timely initiation of follow-on program.
[2] Based on assumption that there would not be timely initiation of a follow-on program; also reflects the effects of program stretchout

Today we stand on the threshold of the greatest era of exploration in the history of man. We explore space not because it is there—but because exploration of the unknown is inherent in man and a vital part of the American spirit. The space program is returning more to us than the money we have invested and will invest. To stop this space program which directly benefits and improves the quality of life here on earth would be to fail in our commitment to the future generations of this country.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, NASA officials have testified that initial cost estimates for development of the space shuttle are $6 billion. They concede that this preliminary estimate cannot be relied upon. NASA admits that design and development of the space shuttle represents a new and formidable technical challenge, and will require maximum innovation on the part of the aerospace industry. Specifically, the space shuttle will require advances in technology on several fronts:

First. Structures and materials, especially related to reentry heating.

Second. New high performance propulsion systems.

Third. Integrated electronics for guidance and control.

Fourth. Configuration and aerodynamics, which will permit vertical launch, hypersonic reentry, and controlled subsonic horizontal landing.

By contrast, the Saturn V launch vehicle was based upon technology developed over many years beginning with the German V–2 rockets of the late 1930's and extending through a long progression of missiles and launch vehicles developed by the United States on which many billions of dollars were spent. In short, the technology was well in hand when development of Saturn V was undertaken. Nevertheless, the cost of development of Saturn V was almost $5 billion.

In view of the extremely difficult technological problems which must be solved, the $6 billion preliminary estimate for development of the space shuttle appears unrealistically low. Some knowledgeable people believe it will cost three or four times that much.

COST OF OPERATION

Proponents of the space shuttle assume that operations utilizing a reusable launch vehicle can be carried out more cheaply than with expendable launch vehicles. Reusable systems may or may not result in some savings—that remains to be seen—but the space shuttle will be much more sophisticated and therefore very much more expensive to build than throwaway boosters. The class of launch vehicles to be replaced by the space shuttle—Delta through Titan—cost from $3.5 million to about $20 million per copy. By contrast, each space shuttle will cost hundreds of millions. It should also be recognized that there will be additional operational costs as well, not incurred by expendable systems—namely, costs of recovery and refurbishment, and associated ground facilities and personnel. Finally, the proposed reuse of the shuttle 100 times seems overly optimistic.

It is even more important to recognize that total mission costs are much more sensitive to the costs of development of spacecraft and experiments, and to ground operations—tracking, data acquisition and analysis—than to the cost of procurement of launch vehicles. In fact, launch vehicle costs account for a relatively small part of the total costs of a given space mission. Launch vehicle costs typically represent from 10 to 25 percent of total mission costs, with the largest expenditure normally for the spacecraft. Thus, it appears that if major economies are to be made in the space program, they will be achieved by sharp reductions in spacecraft and experiment development costs, costs of ground operations, and not simply by reducing launch vehicle procurement costs. It should also be noted that NASA has stated that "expendable launch vehicles could be developed that would be considerably cheaper than our present systems." This may turn out to be the most effective way of reducing launch vehicle costs.

OTHER ARGUMENTS DON'T STAND UP

Even if the space shuttle were now in existence, and the cost of operation of the space shuttle were extremely low, the high utilization rate needed to justify its high development costs and its high procurement costs would require a considerable expansion of the scope of U.S. space activities. Specifically, NASA officials have testified that the space shuttle will provide a capability for placing 50,000 pounds in orbit, and that they anticipate a minimum of 30 flights per year by NASA and an equivalent number in support of DOD programs. During the entire decade of the sixties, NASA exceeded 30 launches per year only once—36 in 1966—including Scouts and Saturn V's, which are not to be replaced by the space shuttle. Assuming the spaces shuttle's payload capacity would be fully utilized on each of the projected 60 yearly flights, this adds up to 3 million pounds of payload launched into orbit each year. Could the United States afford such an ambitious space program? Would the American taxpayer be willing to support such an ambitious space program?

How does 3 million pounds of payload in orbit compare with the space program of the past? In terms of cumulative payload launched, 1969 was NASA's biggest year with 442,358 pounds, over 97 percent of which was attributed to the four Apollo flights. It follows that space shuttle advocates must anticipate a greatly expanded manned space flight program—30 flights per year by NASA alone—one which the Nation might be unwilling or unable to support. Note that the NASA budget has declined each year since 1965. It would have to increase dramatically during the next few years to support the development project if the space shuttle is to fly 1977, and then increase even more after the shuttle becomes operational, in order to support the kind of ambitious program it is designed to serve.

The Titan III experience may be instructive. Development of Titan III was undertaken in the expectation that, once operational, there would be 50 to 100 launches per year. The high utilization rate was the justification for investing $1 billion for development. Currently, there are three Titan III launches per year.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, the move to increase NASA's spending on manned space flight is another sad example of scrambled priorities.

Every bit as important as a balanced Federal budget is a better balance in what we choose to spend our money on. We went to the moon in the 1960's. Our next mission should not be to land a man on Mars, but to see what we can do for the United States in the 1970's.

Yet this NASA authorization bill would give an extra $298 million worth of liftoff to manned space flight and apparently launches a man-on-Mars mission.

It does this by adding $80 million to the $110 million requested by NASA for a space station and shuttle program—a program to build a permanent space station for up to 100 men and a reusable shuttle for transportation to and from the earth's surface.

I find this recommendation premature, to say the least, inasmuch as we have not yet determined whether man can live and work in space. A big space station has little value unless it is intended to be a stepping-stone to Mars.

The feasibility of long-termed manned operations in a space environment will not be known for 3 years, until we finish our 8-month experiment with a small orbiting station to be launched in late 1972.

It strikes me as strange indeed to authorize construction of a giant space station before we have even flown the

small one which is supposed to test the concept of space station flight.

I think we should delete this $190 million fiscal booster for the space station and shuttle. NASA would still have ample funding for the experimental space station, which ought to come first anyway, as well as $80 million for research and technology studies for future space flight.

Mr. Chairman, my evaluation of manned space flight has nothing to do with the failure of the Apollo 13 lunar mission. The accident which befell the Apollo 13 spacecraft was serious and disappointing, but it was not so surprising that something could go wrong on a mission of such complexity.

To me it is rather a question of priorities, and not whether a particular mission succeeds or fails. I believe the space program should be controlled, not killed.

We are naturally curious about man's ability to perform in space, but we can determine that in a fiscally responsible manner. Right now, we should seek to extend man's capability to live and work in his cities, and in rural America.

Fancy programs are fine, but how in conscience can we support added effort in space when human need cries out all around us—for hospitals, for doctors and nurses, and for cleaning up our environment.

The quality of our education, of our air and our water will determine whether we are a great nation—not being first to land a man on mars. There simply is not enough money to do everything we would like, and it is a mistake in values to put the glamor of space ahead of the realities of our corrupted environment and our crippled health care system.

NASA requested $3.3 billion—a not inconsequential sum. Given our many terrestrial problems, this is no time to be generous with our space program. Even without the increases recommended by the committee, the NASA budget is still too high given our other pressing needs. We cannot afford to do all the things we would like to do tomorrow. Let us face that fact and exercise some restraint on programs such as this, which are marginal, at least in terms of their contribution to the welfare of the individual American citizen.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 16516, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for 1971. On July 20, 1969, the United States did indeed land men on the moon and bring them back safely to earth. The challenge laid before us by President Kennedy in the 1960's has been fulfilled. Now it is time to place greater emphasis on other challenges.

The challenge of our polluted environment is a great one, one that will require just as much, if not more, skill and knowledge in the future as had our space program in the past.

This country has many brilliant and talented scientists. I would like to see more time, more money, and more of the talented scientists used to conquer the pollution of our air, our water, and our cities.

Let me illustrate what I mean. It would seem to me that there must be a better way to clean up oil spillage than by spreading straw on a polluted shoreline, or by simply putting a layer of clean sand on top of an oil-soaked beach. And it would seem to me that there must be methods—literally waiting to be discovered—to recycle and make useful a vast amount of what now passes for waste. I believe that if we draw on the minds and the computers that can land a rocket on the moon or can return a crippled spaceship from hundreds of thousands of miles in space, we can certainly find the answers to the many problems that confront us here at home in what appears to be a long, costly, and difficult battle to reclaim what we have squandered for so long.

The decade of the 1960's was the age of space and landing men on the moon. The decade of the 1970's should be devoted to cleaning up our home, the spaceship earth.

Let me make it clear that I do not believe we should abandon our space effort; far from it. I believe that we should continue our space program, but, for the time being, on a more modest scale. Our all-out effort to land men on the moon before 1970 has paid off. We have done it. Now is the time to reevaluate our goals in space and proceed at a more reasonable speed.

In addition to solving the problems of pollution, it seems to me that there are other areas here on earth where the money could be more wisely spent. For example, expanded research in cancer and heart disease, two of our most serious killers, could possibly yield untold benefits for not only our Nation, but all mankind.

I think it is time for us to devote ourselves to solving the problems we face here on earth. I think it is time we began to clean up our polluted environment and support research directed at finding cures for the diseases that cripple and kill mankind, such as cancer and heart disease.

For these reasons Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against the bill presented before this body today, H.R. 16516.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, scientific information has increased enormously since Sputnik I went into orbit only 13 years ago. A study made by Stanford Research Institute indicated that astronomy had been most enriched. However, many other sciences have also been impacted. One of the most important discoveries was that of the Van Allen radiation belts, result of the first U.S. satellite.

Since that time we have learned the true shape of the earth for the first time, the true distance between the earth and the moon, the approximate age of the moon—at least at two sites—some information about the moon's magnetic field and some information about its mineral content.

One of the most exciting discoveries, not yet explained, is the behavior of some plants when lunar dust or soil is added to their growth medium. Amazing increase in size and color were noted, but the reasons for these reactions are still a mystery. On another experiment, certain viruses, difficult to destroy on earth, were killed by lunar dust. Virologists are diligently searching for the answers.

The laser-reflector array which was left on the moon is already returning valuable information, never before available. We have been able to determine relative earth-moon distance to an accuracy of 1 foot. Distance measurements can supply precise information on lunar orbital motion and periodic oscillations of the moon. It is hoped that they will also lead to understanding the fluctuations in the rate of the earth's rotation. The drift of the continents can be measured with this equipment as can the variations in the wobbling of the earth's rotational axis. Some geodesists believe that there is some association between the wobbling of the earth's axis and major earthquakes. Therefore, an understanding of this phenomenon may aid in the prediction of such disasters.

Among the most important results of the space program are the innumerable developments and discoveries which have biomedical application. The need to remotely examine the astronauts while they were in space has given rise to a whole new class of aids and instruments, combining our ability to miniaturize with our expanded computer capabilities. The heart monitor is only one of the notable developments. A group of doctors, the biomedical applications team, has found over 200 answers to medical problems within space medicine. They have assisted in the transfer of information from space to general medicine.

The need to maintain continuous study of the men who have been in space and of those who are preparing to fly has occasioned the constant medical supervision of our astronauts. Thus a body of information about well men is being compiled, more extensive than any study previously done. When the SkyLab goes into orbit in 1972, even more intensive work will be done on the three teams who will man these flights, the first for 28 days and the second and third for 56 days each. Because of enhanced facilities, very much more biomedical work can be done in SkyLab.

In the research centers of NASA, where fundamental research is being conducted, two recent discoveries which may give valuable clues in the conquest of cancer have been made. They both concern the behavior of cells and their composition and are under study because of our need to know as much as possible about the behavior of human cells in space.

Meteorology has probably been more advantageously affected than any of the other sciences which affect our daily lives. The weather satellites which daily survey the cloud-cover of the earth and regularly report to earth receiving stations, have brought extra facility in weather reporting and weather analysis to all nations who have chosen to query them.

It has been possible, using information from the weather satellites, to predict some major hurricanes in time for preventive action to be taken by the people in their paths. With more sophisticated satellites scheduled for service, meteorol-

ogists hope to be able to predict weather at least 2 weeks in advance.

Earth sciences have already profited greatly from work done in space. With the earliest photographs from Gemini, through those taken on Apollo, and the extensive multispectral camera experiment performed on Apollo 9, knowledge of the earth has grown significantly. It is possible to ascertain the composition of soil, the kind of growth, the condition of growth and the extent of forest cover, all from photographs from near-earth orbit. Geologists believe that ore concentrations can be discovered; hydrologists expect to be able to predict floods from analysis of snow-cover; examination of the temperature of water in the oceans of the world is another project of oceanographers which promise to produce fundamental knowledge about our environment.

Practically every major scientific regime has been stimulated and challenged to new research and discovery by the demands of the space program. And one must realize that this newest area of man's interest has only begun to return results. With two new territories for exploration, the sterile vacuum of space and the surface of the moon, we can expect a scientific "golden age" within the next decade.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 16516 to authorize funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1971. There are those today who say we spent too much money in our national space program. I would like to remind those who express this view that this money is spent in the most advanced science and technology known to man. It pays the wages to those who push back the frontiers of the unknown. It betters the skill of over 150,000 Americans. It provided not only hardware but know-how to tackle the difficult problems that our Nation faces in the years ahead. It contributes many of the management innovations necessary so that we may deal not only with the complex problems of operating an adequate space effort but may also help many of the difficult problems that we face in environmental improvement, crime prevention technology, and resources development within our Nation.

When the detractors to our national space program say that funds devoted to the space program can better be devoted to our social needs I ask all of my colleagues to consider that this is exactly what our expenditure for our national space program does. It aids the solution of many of our pressing problems in our Nation today. We need improved communications at a lower cost. Our national space program is contributing everyday to this area.

We need improved ability to assess the availability of natural resources. Our space program contributes to this every day. We need better management talent and better management procedures for complex governmental programs. Our space program contributes to that every day. If we are to continue to progress as a nation, we must remain in the forefront of technical development. Since the beginning of the industrial revolution our Nation has depended on its competitive advantage through technology to maintain its world position in the marketplace. Both in aeronautics and space flight development NASA is contributing to this advance of technology. Consequently, this represents one of the most important reasons for continuing to support an aggressive national space program.

The Committee on Science and Astronautics and the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight have worked long hours and studied thoroughly the bill you have before you today. We received testimony from key industrial contractors and NASA field centers in hearings before the committee. All of this is a matter of record in the report of hearings accompanying this bill.

The changes made in the budget proposal submitted by NASA for fiscal year 1971 are largely associated with manned space flight. In summary these changes provide for a forward-looking and adequate space effort in the 1970's.

The committee added $145 million to the Apollo line item requested by NASA. It should be noted that the NASA request was over $725 million less than that for fiscal year 1970. It is a budget which terminates Saturn V production and reduces the Saturn V launch rate to two lunar exploration flights per year until the remaining Saturn V's are expended. The addition of $145 million by the committee provides sufficient funds so that the last two lunar missions with the sixth and seventh Saturn V vehicles will have increased scientific payloads and longer stay time on the lunar surface to gain the maximum return from these flights. These same funds would also provide for early work on a spacecraft for an eighth lunar exploration and a preliminary investigation of scientific payloads for that same flight. In addition to this the committee added $100 million for long leadtime hardware for improved Saturn V vehicles. These same funds would also be used to allow critical vendors and contractors that have been phased out of the Saturn V program to accomplish sufficient work to maintain their skills and provide limited equipment so that Saturn V production may be reinitiated without delays at a later date. Particular emphasis will be placed on work for engine components since these are the longest leadtime items associated with the production of the Saturn V vehicle. The Saturn V is the only vehicle available to the United States that lifts payloads in excess of 60,000 pounds into earth orbit.

The leadtime required to build these large complex vehicles is in the order of 4 years and the funds which have been included by the committee will materially reduce this leadtime. If we are to assure that this Nation has a large payload capability in earth orbit and deep space in the mid-1970's it is essential that these funds be included as recommended by the committee.

In the area of space flight operations the committee has increased the NASA budget request for fiscal year 1971 by $155 million. It was the view of the committee that the addition of $75 million for the Apollo applications program workshop, now called Skylab, would provide funds to augment the development and qualification of the spacecraft and workshop for long duration missions in 1973. These same funds would also provide for the development of additional experiments that will improve the return on the investment made in the Skylab. These experiments were excluded from the program because of funding limitations.

The $80 million was added to space flight operations to provide for more extensive analysis and engineering studies for a space station to follow Skylab in the late 1970's and to provide advanced testing and verification of early designs in the low-cost recoverable space shuttle design effort now being undertaken by NASA. These funds will provide additional information so that when the Congress is asked to make a commitment to the development of a low-cost recoverable space shuttle system the information will be in hand to make that important decision. The low-cost recoverable shuttle represents, in my view, the most significant aspect of the national space program in the late 1970's. Developing a reusable space transportation system operating much like commercial aircraft will provide broad new opportunities to utilize space and conduct scientific explorations at a significantly reduced cost. With such a system available, recovery, repair, and maintenance of automated spacecraft, low-cost visits to manned space stations and the commercial application of space not only for expanded communications but also in the area of earth resources will be enhanced.

The opportunities for international cooperation with a low-cost shuttle system available will be significantly improved simply by virtue of the fact that the cost of operating in space will be brought to a level that many of the developed nations of the world will find attractive.

With these facts in mind I urge your favorable consideration of H.R. 16516.

INCREASES IN THE BILL

Mr. Chairman, so that there will be no doubt as to the importance or nature of the increases in the bill I wish to identify them for the benefit of the Members.

The proposed $45 million for Apollo/Lunar payloads will provide funds to permit effort in fiscal year 1971 on spacecraft and payloads for the Apollo 18, 19, and 20 missions. This effort will include systems improvements and augmented scientific payload components to enhance the data return from these missions based on experience from earlier Apollo flights. The proposed additional funds for Apollo/Lunar payloads will provide resources for the following:

The sum of $5 million: Funds will be used to resume work on the Command and Service Module—CSM 115A—for Apollo 20. This spacecraft was placed in storage at the North American Rockwell plant following initial systems installation in line with the decision not to provide funding in the fiscal year 1971 budget for a Apollo 20 mission or follow-on Saturn V production.

The sum of $7 million: The Lunar Module—LM 14—which would be used on

Apollo 20 is in storage at the Grumman plant. In accordance with the earlier decision to delete Apollo 20, all fabrication was stopped during structural assembly. Additional funds will be utilized to reinitiate production of this spacecraft.

The sum of $11 million: These fiscal year 1971 funds will be applied to the development of equipment for orbital science experiments proposed for Apollos 18, 19, and 20. This equipment includes: 24-inch panoramic cameras; 3-inch mapping cameras; FAR UV spectrometers; IR SCAN radiometers; and subsattellites with: S-band transponder particle measurement, magnetometer, and a laser altimeter.

The sum of $16 million: Development and initial fabrication of surface science experiments will also be covered by the additional funds for Apollos 18, 19, and 20. Funds for this effort and the orbital science effort were deferred in the original budget request. Equipment for several of the experiments that would be funded in this category include: Passive seismology; lunar surface magnetometer lunar hand-held magnetometer; mass spectrometer; gravimeter; and field geology investigation equipment.

The sum of $6 million: Funding will provide for equipment to enhance astronaut activities on the lunar surface including lunar roving vehicles, additional portable life support systems—PLSS—lunar drills, lunar surface cameras, and other miscellaneous Apollo/Lunar equipment required for the Apollos 18, 19, and 20 missions.

The proposed $100 million in funds to sustain Saturn V production will minimize the production gap, reverse the almost complete phaseout of vendors and subcontractors, and continue to provide the country with its only operational launch vehicle capable of placing large payloads in earth orbit or sending spacecraft on lunar missions in the mid-1970's. The additional funds will be utilized as follows:

The sum of $20 million: These funds will be used to requalify and reassemble the vendor and subcontractor structure of the Saturn V team which have been completely phased out of the program. With all of the Saturn V stages nearly completed, large groups of the prime contractor's work force will have to be reassembled and retrained to assure a high quality and reliable vehicle.

The sum of $35 million: Engine funding will have the highest priority due to the long leadtime associated with engine production and installation. As the last Saturn V engine of the present buy was delivered in January 1970, the engine production base must be reestablished. The funds would also be utilized to qualify the J–2S engine and cover the final design and engineering changes required to incorporate the J–2S into the follow-on stages.

The sum of $30 million: These funds support the purchase of standard material and parts, and for the procurement of critical long leadtime hardware items such as: actuators, relays, transducers, pumps, and propellant systems, heat shield panels, retro-rockets, instrument unit components, castings, valves, bearings, and sensors.

The sum of $15 million: Initial production efforts, including fabrication of basic stage and engine parts, by the prime contractor or contractors, will be provided by these additional funds. Early initiation of production in fiscal year 1971 would result in the first delivery in this buy of Saturn V vehicles in 1974.

The proposed addition of $75 million to the Skylab program will be applied to increasing the assurance of Saturn Workshop I's success, initiating experiments previously excluded from the program due to funding limitations, and the preliminary design of a second Workshop mission in which incorporation of an artificial gravity environment will be of prime consideration. This effort will not only enhance the first Skylab mission, but will provide additional design studies for an upgraded Skylab Workshop II mission. Specific application of the proposed funds follows:

The sum of $20 million: These funds will principally be used to increase and augment the development, verification analysis, and qualification testing of major systems—workshop, spacecraft, and airlock—to increase success on the first mission and to provide confidence in planning missions of longer duration for future flights.

The sum of $25 million: Funds will be utilized to upgrade the presently assigned experiments program with increased emphasis on identifying and developing those experiments which prove to be of significant value in the areas of earth resources and medicine. Other experiments previously deferred due to funding limitations will be incorporated into the program and will enhance the scientific knowledge and direct benefit to be achieved in the Skylab program. Effort will also be initiated to develop an on-board biomedical monitoring system and an on-board data processing system for all major experiments.

The sum of $18 million: Funding will be devoted to the development and qualification of improved life support and other critical systems. Through increasing both the reliability and capacity of the major systems and subsystems, not only will the assurance of mission success be increased, but the operational capacity of the Skylab will be expanded to a point approaching continuous operation.

The sum of $12 million: These funds will be applied to the procurement of additional hardware and experiment systems as spares to more fully support the Skylab program. In addition, the backup ATM hardware will be upgraded to provide a qualified flight unit. The present backup ATM is a refurbished qualification unit and some work is necessary to assure flight worthiness.

SPACE STATION—$30 MILLION

The space station module is conceived as being the basic element of future manned activities. The long-duration subsystems developed for the station would have application for, not only earth orbit missions, but planetary missions, possible future lunar missions, and adaptation for use on major systems for both planetary and lunar surface bases. In this connection, the additional funds will be applied to increasing our understanding of the systems and requirements of this significant undertaking and will be applied as follows:

The sum of $6 million: These funds will be used to complete studies in areas in which firm conclusions have not as yet been reached such as experiment information management, both on board the station and on the ground, and crew structure and management. Some functional mockups will be fabricated to be used for simulation and design testing. In addition, development of critical subsystems will be initiated, such as: fabrication of a completely functional full-scale prototype of a 25-kilowatt solar array-battery power processing system; initial hardware breadboard and programing for a high data rate computer system for on-board screening, editing, processing, analysis technique computer system; and improved radiators; coating and analysis techniques to optimize space station thermal design.

The sum of $12 million: Funds will be applied to augmenting the planned experiment payloads definition effort and the preliminary design work on the experiment module. An early and better understanding of the operational and environmental requirements of the experiments will provide the necessary data which can be incorporated into the design of the basic space station. Funding will also be used to identify the station and experiment module interfaces with the space shuttle and space tug.

The sum of $12 million: These funds provide for more extensive and inclusive trade-off analyses, verification of the selected preliminary design and advanced prototype and proof-of-concept testing to increase the assurance that the design and development of the station is proceeding on a strong technological basis.

The primary objective of the space shuttle is to transport effectively a varying mix of personnel and cargo to low earth orbits and return. This system is considered the key to the success and growth of future space flight developments for the exploration and exploitation of near and far space. To this end, the additional $50 million will be utilized to provide a much more penetrating design and performance analysis of potential shuttle engines and airframe configurations thus greatly increasing assurance that the best possible engine and configuration will be selected. This greater understanding would decrease the possibility of significant design difficulties which produce higher costs being discovered later on in the program. In addition, as with the space station, funds will be applied to design verification, prototype and proof-of-concept testing to increase the assurance that the design and development of the shuttle will proceed on a strong technological basis. The proposed funds will supplement our budget request as follows:

The sum of $15 million: These funds will augment the present engine definition and design effort to assure the selec-

tion of the best possible shuttle engine and to define engine test facility requirements.

The sum of $15 million: Increased effort in defining the most desirable airframe configuration will be funded including definition of all required ground support equipment.

The sum of $20 million: This funding supplements the important preliminary design verification and proof-of-concept testing effort.

FUTURE PROGRAMS

The future space programs planned by NASA are guided by the goals of exploration, scientific knowledge, and practical applications to man here on earth. To illustrate the significance of these future plans to maintaining our Nation's preeminence in space, I would like to briefly touch on each one.

We will continue to explore the moon. Present plans call for seven more flights to different locations on the moon—the flatlands, the rugged highlands, the giant craters, and the mysterious channelways called the rilles. When this phase of lunar exploration is completed in 1974, our scientists hope to have information on which to evaluate the moon's natural resources, better understand the history of the earth and our solar system and apply this knowledge to problems of the earth such as predicting earthquakes. They also believe that we may find that the moon is a convenient offshore base for further exploration of the planets.

In late 1972, the Skylab program will get underway. This program is designed to capitalize on the techniques and hardware developed in the Apollo program. The heart of the Skylab concept is the orbital workshop which is actually the third stage of a Saturn V launch vehicle fitted out with a laboratory and living quarters. Attached to the workshop is the Apollo telescope mount, a solar astronomy module for detailed studies of the sun whose energy provides the driving force that controls our environment.

The Skylab program will provide data on the ability of men to live and work in space for extended periods and the experiments conducted will provide advanced knowledge on improving conditions here on earth. Terrain photography will improve mapping techniques of the earth. Mineral, agriculture, and ocean resource surveys will be made. And experiments with measurements and remedies to reduce pollution in the earth's air and water will be conducted.

After the workshop is placed into near-earth orbit, a Saturn IB launch vehicle will carry three crewmen aboard an Apollo spacecraft to rendezvous and dock with the workshop. These astronaut-scientists will then enter the workshop and begin an open-ended 4 weeks of scientific experiments. At the completion of this period, the crew will reenter the Apollo command module and return to earth. Two more visits to the workshop are planned, each with a duration of about 2 months.

With the conclusion of the Skylab program, information for evaluating the need for a second, more advanced workshop will be available. Also, the Skylab program will serve as a progenitor of the large space station in earth orbit.

The development of the space station, in conjunction with the space shuttle, will form the basis of the next major advance in manned earth orbital flight.

In the next fiscal year, NASA will continue space station design studies. The space station will serve as a servicing and maintenance platform for both manned and unmanned spacecraft in earth orbit or in transit to and from the moon or deep space. Additionally, the station will support beneficial space applications programs, scientific investigations, and technological/engineering experiments.

The space station will provide living accommodations for a crew of 12, some responsible for maintenance and operation of the station and others for the conduct of experiments. Further into the future, the space station could be developed into a large space base in earth orbit by clustering other space stations and specialized modules. The base would initially accommodate 50 persons. Growth to a 100-man capacity would be possible.

In an attempt to slash the cost of space operation, NASA has intelligently been looking at less costly and less complicated ways of transporting payloads into space. This summer, space shuttle design studies will be initiated as a followon to earlier feasibility studies.

With the shuttle for transport, we will be able to launch automated satellites and probes, to maintain, refuel, repair, and refurbish them or to reposition or retrieve them for return to earth. Another major purpose of the shuttle will be to rotate crews and provide logistic support to the space station.

The shuttle will be a two-stage reusable space vehicle consisting of a booster stage and an orbiter stage. The shuttle will be launched vertically by its booster stage, much as today's rockets are launched. High above the earth the booster stage will separate from the orbiter stage and will be piloted back to earth for a horizontal, aircraft type landing on a conventional runway. The orbiter stage then will power itself into orbital flight. Later, the orbital stage of the shuttle and its crew can also return to earth and land at an airport. The shuttle will be designed for at least 100 round trip flights with minimum maintenance.

Development of the NERVA nuclear engine will continue. This engine, for use between earth and moon orbits and for propulsion on interplanetary missions could be operational by 1978.

In the decade of the 1970's, NASA will launch unmanned probes to all planets of our solar system in attempts to explore and learn more about our universe. A Mars orbiter will be launched in 1971, a Jupiter probe in 1972, and in 1973 a Venus-Mercury flyby. In the mid-1970's, an unmanned vehicle will be sent to land on Mars and to investigate its surface.

In the last half of this decade the positions of the outer planets will offer a unique opportunity to launch missions which can visit several of them on a single flight. These "grand tour" missions will study the planets of Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, Neptune, and Pluto.

Present plans call for launching earth resources satellites in 1972 and 1973. These satellites will be capable of surveying crops, locating mineral deposits, and measuring water resources. They will enable us to assess our environment and to use our limited, earthbound resources more effectively.

In 1973, an applications technology satellite will be launched with a number of technical and engineering experiments aboard. One of these experiments will be the first large-scale test of instructional television to demonstrate the potential value of effective mass communications in developing countries. The United States and India will cooperate in using this satellite to bring instructional TV programs to some 5,000 Indian villages. The international character of this satellite demonstrates the remarkable potential that space offers in fostering global cooperation.

These space projects of the 1970's that I have outlined are not political ventures nor programs for the sheer fun and exhilaration of exploring the unknown, rather, they are realistic and responsible projects for gaining the greatest returns on the groundwork that was laid by NASA in the 1960's.

MAN IN SPACE

The magnificent flights of Apollo have caught the imagination of men everywhere. In the eyes of the world, these demonstrations of our excellence in science, engineering, and management have restored the United States to preeminence as the leading technological nation.

It is a truism that man relates only to man. This was emphasized by the contrasting reactions of men everywhere to the daring planetary expeditions of the U.S.S.R. and to the manned flights of Apollo. No single act of the United States has ever elicited such enthusiasm around this planet. A recent Gallup poll conducted in 12 countries asked, "Which nation will lead in science in 1980?" Fifty-four percent said "the United States." A similar poll in 1959 gave the United States only 23 percent against 42 percent for the U.S.S.R. Mechanical wizardry intrigues us, but the daring of the men who walked upon the moon, and the dedication and brilliance of those who sent them there is truly awe inspiring.

Critics of manned space activities essentially have only one objection—that they are today more expensive than unmanned operations. Yet tomorrow we will be able to move men, equipment, and supplies into earth orbit at a fraction of today's costs with the low-cost space transportation system. The first element of this system, the space shuttle, is now in phase B development.

With the activation of this system, we will be able to make optimum use of men in space. For man has three sets of capabilities that make him extremely hard to replace with any machine: First, he has a very wide-band set of sensors for acquiring information, second, he has in his head a built-in memory and computer for unprogramed calculations that cannot yet be matched by our largest and fastest machines; and finally, third, he has a remarkably versatile capability for action and physical operations with his body, hands, and tools. These three capabilities, as well as his unique talent

for innovation and emergency reaction, make men such a valuable element in space science and applications that we need to take advantage of him at the site of operations whenever this is feasible.

There are many tasks in space that we will want men to perform as soon as the round-trip reusable shuttle is available. We will want him to hasten the development of earth-oriented sensors for use on automated satellites. At present extrapolation from man-tended airplane sensors is being made to sensors to be flown on automated satellites for a year or more. Under these circumstances, considerable time must elapse before improvements can be made in a next generation of sensor on a later launch.

In the future, manned spacecraft with large payload capacity and several trained crewmen could carry out prescribed tests on a battery of developmental earth-oriented sensors under actual space conditions. With a versatile set of equipment modifications and options planned for the test program, perhaps in the breadboard stage, the space crew could carry out a series of developmental and operational steps on the sensors in one mission which would have required several years and many launches of automated equipment. Such a program would not only lessen the cost of equipment development, but would bring earth sensing activity into practical use at a much earlier date.

Today, if some failure occurs on an automated satellite, it must be completely replaced in orbit. With the space shuttle in operation it will cost us much less to send men up to rendezvous with a complex automated satellite in an accessible orbit and make repairs there or return it to earth, than to send up a new satellite.

In addition to maintenance and repair, men will be needed for the deployment and calibration of many of the large space systems of the future, such as assembly and checkout of large antenna for communications satellites, or initiating operation of large astronautical satellites.

With respect to selected sensing operations, we will want to join the advantages of manned operation to the superb vantage point for viewing the earth offered by space installations. Trained men will be able to conduct special observations related to atmospheric circulation, heat balance, air pollution, and meteorologic and oceanographic dynamics. Thus we will be able to obtain information not available from the preprogramed observations of automated instruments. By taking full advantage of both manned and automated conclusions from earth sensing from space, we will have the analyses as well as unexpected knowledge in order to make the most rapid utilization of new information about our planet.

In the laboratories in space which will follow the initial workshop, scheduled for launch in 1972, the effects of the space environment on men, animals, and plants will be studied. With increased knowledge of living systems we will be able to improve certain conditions on earth. The work of scientist-astronauts in conducting tests, making observations on man, plants, and animals in situ, using microscopes and other scientific equipment and returning specimens to earth, will make enormous progress in the life sciences possible within minimum time periods.

Manned astronomical observations will begin in the Skylab workshop with the activation of the Apollo telescope mount. For the first time men will be able to explore the sun using sophisticated instruments from beyond the veil of the earth's atmosphere. In later space stations, we can expect to see a high energy cosmic ray and a high energy physics laboratory. Studying the cosmic rays for their own properties will tell us something about the nature and origin of the universe; such observations cannot be made from earth or even from high altitude balloons. Letting the rare but extremely high energy particles from the cosmic rays interact with chosen forms of matter, such as hydrogen, astronaut-physicists may test theories on the nature and properties of nucleii. Such a high energy physics laboratory, at a modest incremental cost to a space station, could accomplish studies impossible with the largest nuclear accelerators which may have been built on earth by that time—and perhaps even at a lower cost.

Another set of space laboratory studies which will demand the innovative and inventive powers of man will be research into the behavior of materials in the vacuum, sterility, and weightlessness of space. The production of a vacuum within our "ocean of air" resulted in the vacuum tube and the age of electronics. The possibility of escaping from our "ocean of gravity" may well open a whole new phase in our technical history.

The development of new materials has been basic to our industrial progress. Within the past 50 years advances made have resulted in new industries, new products, the development of backward areas, and to a large extent, our burgeoning economy which we enjoy today.

Therefore, experimental work designed to explore and to use a completely new set of physical circumstances can be expected to yield totally new results from relatively simple research. In the area of purification of materials, levitation casting has been effective on magnetic materials. In space nonmagnetic materials may be purified by a simple process. Molten metal, outside of a gravity field, should be subject to surface tension only and should take the shape of a perfect sphere. Therefore, small droplets of molten steel should form perfect ball bearings. In our mechanized society, perfect ball bearings, reducing friction to a minimum, would be revolutionary.

Large perfect crystals, essentials of the electronics industry, may very well be grown in space. The two conditions most often responsible for imperfections are convection currents and contamination from molds or supports. A facility in space where growing crystals can be floated free of all supports for hours or even days, should produce large perfect crystals. Large perfect mirrors and lenses might also be produced for use in space-based astronomical apparatus. The distribution of gas bubbles can be controlled in space, making theoretically possible the production of steel with the weight of balsa wood. Very high strength materials with unique thermal characteristics may result from uniformly mixing ceramic crystals in a metal, not possible in earth's gravity.

When we realize that the production of even one new fundamental material might justify the cost of the entire space program, experimental work in this new environment seems to be a particularly good idea.

Wherever men go, they pay their way, from the depths of the oceans to the surface of the moon, and on into the solar system. Wherever intelligence is required, men must go. Even our largest and most sophisticated computers are only adding machines—designed by men, built by men, programed by men, and interpreted by men. So far we have not been able to construct a substitute for him—on earth, in the sea—or in space.

KEY VIEW ON THE SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, because of the importance of the bill before us today I have asked six key leaders of NASA to provide their views on the future of the space program. Their letters are as follows, Mr. Chairman:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
*Washington, D.C., April 21, 1970.*

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight, Committee on Science and Astronautics, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request that I describe the future of space flight as it appears to me. As you know, the new work I have recently undertaken on behalf of NASA's planning for the future is still in the preliminary stages. However, the President's Space Task Group (STG) has already outlined the basic aspects of our future in space. The STG's report points toward a broad-based program of exploration and applications, emphasizing value and dividends for the people of the nation. Additional planning and review, in which I have participated since the report of the STG, continues to confirm the validity and balance of the overall programs outlined by the STG.

In the next several years, the Skylab Program will be able to fulfill its objectives with a foundation for long-range returns from space. These returns will be in the form of increasing capability to use a platform in earth orbit as an experimental laboratory for scientific experiments and for applications work which will help us learn more about the resources and environment of our planet. Astronomers in the Skylab Workshop will use its solar telescope to learn more of the relationship of the earth to its power source, the sun.

Automated missions to learn more of the solar system are being refined so that as we learn more of our planet with the Skylab and advanced satellites we also will learn more about its relationships to the sun and neighboring planets. The flights we have planned for the seventies will send machines out to the planets on their fact-finding tours. I fully expect that man from planet earth will ultimately observe his sister planets first hand, building upon the knowledge we hope to gain in the next decade.

The lunar landing in 1969 climaxed a decade of development that saw this country move forward in launch vehicles, spacecraft, testing and operational facilities, and trained manpower as it developed a great space capability. In addition, the space program brought renewed strength in national leadership, in security, in education, and in science and

technology, and in the will of America to succeed. The temporary setback suffered in Apollo 13 should serve only to intensify that will as this country moves ahead with lunar exploration.

In the final analysis, the key to our future accomplishments in space will be our willingness to undertake the developments that will advance this nation to new plateaus of operational flexibility and will give us the technological advances needed to assure economical operations in space. No one would question the justification for a jet aircraft that can be flown over and over again instead of just once. With the space shuttle and the space station we will have the space age equivalent of the jet liner.

Many times in the past I have pointed out my views regarding our current achievements. Magnificent as they are, they must, in the long run be considered but a mere beginning in our conquest of space and our mastery of knowledge that will greatly enhance the lives of this and future generations of this planet. The international leadership of this country is linked with our space leadership as clearly demonstrated by the events of this past week and the all but unprecedented interest in Apollo 13 by men of good will from all nations. If this nation views what it has gained in space and considers what space activities can win for us in the future based upon normal technological growth, then that future will, I am convinced, exceed our most optimistic expectations of today.

You have shared my confidence in years past and you have supported the national space effort vigorously, for which we at NASA are most grateful. I am confident that in the future we will continue to justify your support of this nation's efforts to maintain leadership in space.

Sincerely yours,

WERNHER VON BRAUN,
*Deputy Associate Administrator.*

---

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
*Washington, D.C., April 22, 1970.*

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight, Committee on Science and Astronautics, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: I am pleased to respond to your request for my views on the future of this nation's manned space program.

First, I think it important to stress that the future as I see it will not be clouded by the difficulties encountered during the flight of Apollo 13. Much was learned from that flight, not the least being the flexibility of the lunar module and the magnificent abilities of flight crews and ground controllers. We also verified the effectiveness of the contingency planning for mission emergencies and anomalies. This long-term planning, in my judgment, saved Apollo 13.

I am confident that we will find the cause of the accident and that the result will be a better spacecraft. Dr. Paine has appointed a Review Board to investigate the incident and the Board can be expected to move ahead without delay. Since only one spacecraft subsystem is involved and volumes of data already are available for analysis, the Board and its supporting teams can go directly to the problem.

The objectives of the post-manned lunar landing period are, of necessity, somewhat different from the clearly defined national goal of the last decade. The objectives of the Apollo Program were those of a single major program which demanded the achievement of rapid technological progress in the new field of manned space flight. Today, as we move into the 1970's, we have in addition to the continued lunar science program of Apollo, multiple programs with emphasis on economy and additional uses of space technology for the benefit of man. The realization of these objectives to achieve greater returns from space for the man in the street while increasing the economy of space operations certainly is a challenge to match that of the previous decade.

The Skylab Program, with its experimental space station, is a major step toward the use of space for the benefit of mankind. It will use modified Apollo hardware to provide the first opportunities for a laboratory environment to learn more of the earth's resources and the sun's energy.

The reusable space shuttle will offer many economies and benefits. It will be available for use by more than one agency or one program. Its development will stimulate both space and aeronautical technology. It will reduce the cost of payloads by allowing retrieval or repair of satellites in orbit and the transportation of cargo and passengers to and from orbit. It will have a quick response time and significant space rescue capability. Its design will provide for 100 or more flights without overhaul.

In earth orbit, a space station supplied by the reusable shuttle will provide additional economic gains and practical benefits. The space station will reduce operating costs by its long life and its flexibility, combining many operations such as research, applications, and support of space flight operations. It will be designed so people on board will be able to carry out their technical tasks without special flight training. The space station modules may be used in various earth orbits, and ultimately, in lunar orbit or on a planetary mission.

The operation of the space shuttle and the space station will permit a considerable expansion in the scope of space activities and a steady increase in the number of visitors into space. The expanded, more economical flight activities made possible by these advanced systems will conceivably open space to a broad range of public and private interests.

The future programs I have mentioned cannot be considered with an awareness of the management challenges involved. We must bring available technology to bear in an optimum manner as we develop new technology needed in the programs of the 1970's. We must use all resources wisely, including the intimate participation of our colleagues in the NASA Offices of Space Science and Applications, Advanced Research and Technology, and the cooperative support of the United States Air Force. We must manage prudently and effectively if the objectives of this decade are to be reached.

The Lunar Landing Program in moments of success and difficulty was made possible by a strong spirit and dedication that characterized the government, industry, and university teams. Today there is a need to maintain this same spirit and dedication as we focus on our new objectives in the Manned Space Flight Program of the future.

Sincerely,

DALE D. MYERS,
*Associate Administrator for Manned Space Flight.*

---

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
MANNED SPACECRAFT CENTER,
*Houston, Tex., April 21, 1970.*

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: I welcome the opportunity to respond to your query concerning the future course of the nation's space activities. This is a particularly significant time since we have just faced adversity during Apollo 13 and lead times are such that we need to move forward toward future hardware developments if we are to maintain reasonable continuity to our manned space flight program.

It can be expected that the Apollo 13 incident will necessitate a reexamination of our plans. It may also provide the opportunity for some to suggest that we slow down, defer, or make major changes in our present and future plans. I am personally confident that the hardware failure encountered during Apollo 13 will be understood and that we will be able to make timely corrections. The failure encountered was most critical and the mission objectives had to be abandoned. However, it was encouraging that we did have the systems capability both in flight and on the ground combined with the teamwork between flight and ground personnel to safely return the crew after a major subsystem failure. I feel that we have put our best possible efforts into Apollo and that the basic system is sound. We cannot, however, expect to push back the space frontier without some difficulty. When the full report from Apollo 13 is in, I am confident that we will again be able to fly to the Moon successfully.

In evaluating the possible directions in the post-Apollo time period, I firmly believe that the reusable space shuttle and the large space station are vital elements which must be developed in our national program. We are presently completing the program definition phase on the space station and plan to complete a similar phase of study of the space shuttle over the next year. Our studies to date have given us confidence that both systems are technically feasible and our definition work planned over the next year should enable us to proceed with a decision on the hardware development phases of these systems. It now appears that the reusable earth-to-orbit shuttle is the keystone to our post-Apollo activities.

Developing these classes of hardware is, to my thinking, the next logical step in the evolution of our space-faring capability and would put us in a favorable position to maintain a viable forward thrust to our space activities. These systems will allow us to fulfill many of the national objectives outlined in the Space Task Group report and capitalize during the 70's on the foundation that has been developed during our first decade in space.

In conclusion, I would like to include a brief comment on funding rate and priorities. Certainly, the space program must be considered in context with our total list of national priorities and some time phasing of new hardware development will be required in order to meet reasonable budget constraints. The transportation system concept, having the earth-to-orbit shuttle as the key element, as outlined in the Task Group report does provide the building block approach that will allow proper funding distribution. I feel that we are at a critical milestone in space flight vehicle development and we must be willing to proceed with the identification of new vehicle systems if we are to maintain a viable space flight program.

Sincerely,

ROBERT R. GILRUTH,
*Director.*

---

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, GEORGE C. MARSHALL SPACE FLIGHT CENTER,
*Huntsville, Ala., April 14, 1970.*

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: As you know, Dr. von Braun and his associates at Marshall Space Flight Center have for some years been planning extensively for a post-Apollo Program. This planning included both novel launch vehicle transportation systems as well as manned and unmanned payloads. Particular attention was given to launch vehicle development and operational costs for delivering payloads into earth orbit since present

day methods seemed in the long run prohibitively expensive.

It became increasingly clear as we deepened the post-Apollo planning that we could no longer employ the high cost expendable launch vehicle transportation systems used for previous programs. Technical feasibility and economic studies conducted in industry and within the government (NASA and DOD) indicated that a low-cost, highly reusable transportation system was the most optimum means for transporting payloads and cargo from the earth to an earth orbit. We concluded that the answer to the high cost transportation problem was to develop a system which operates much like the cargo and passenger airlines, namely a Space Shuttle System.

Some of the main capabilities of such a system would be as follows:

1. Delivering payloads, propellants, equipment, etc. up to an earth orbit.

2. Supplying a space station and later on a space base with scientific equipment, life support, materials for maintenance, etc.

3. Shuttling scientists, astronauts and support personnel from earth to orbiting stations and back.

4. Providing possibilities for final checkout of payloads in orbit and minor maintenance and repair.

5. Taking expensive payloads down from orbit to laboratories on earth for repair, maintenance, modifications, etc. (reuseability of payloads).

6. Serving as a base for checkout and launching payloads and space craft into higher earth orbits and deep space (manned and unmanned planetary missions).

In summary, such a space shuttle system combines the advantages of manned operations with those of automatic satellites and spacecraft. It is my opinion that if spaceflight is to continue to expand and to progress, the development of a transportation system with above capabilities and of low cost is mandatory.

The next logical step in bringing this planning to fruition should be an exhaustive study leading to a preliminary design of the Space Shuttle—this is what we call Phase B. We plan to award up to three Phase B contracts for both the Shuttle Vehicle System and the Shuttle Main Engine so that the more promising configurations may be examined in considerable depth. In these studies, we will harden the concepts, do additional economic analyses and cost trade-offs, test selected components and sub-systems, do wind tunnel testing of models, and provide a preliminary design for the more promising configurations. The results of these Phase B studies will provide us with much greater insight and confidence in our technical approach as well as in the development and operating cost and thus the economics of such a Space Shuttle System.

Upon completion of the Phase B studies, it is planned that we in NASA with the support of DOD make a comprehensive evaluation of the various configurations investigated for the purpose of selecting the most economical and technically feasible system. Such an evaluation will provide NASA with required information upon which to base their recommendations for proceeding into the development and operational phases of the program.

I consider the approval to proceed with the Phase B studies to be a most important and vital step in the definition of the Space Shuttle System. The failure to approve funds for this activity may well deprive the nation of important returns on the investment already made in space research.

Sincerely yours,

EBERHARD REES,
*Director.*

ADDITIONAL REMARKS OF DR. KURT H. DEBUS IN RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS AT HEARINGS OF THE MANNED SPACE FLIGHT SUBCOMMITTEE HELD AT KENNEDY SPACE CENTER, APRIL 10, 1970

Mr. Chairman, for sake of clarity and completeness, I will include in this statement your questions followed by my responses. In view of your offer to revise and extend my remarks of April 10, I have included some thoughts not expressed at that time.

First question. Would you comment on the following statement? "NASA should defer large-scale expenditures on the Space Shuttle/Station until after necessary basic research can be accomplished on the many technical problems that may be resolved before hardware development can be undertaken effectively."

Response. Having observed technology development over many years and relating this experience to the Space Shuttle, I am convinced that hardware development can and should be undertaken as soon as adequate funding can be made available. Technology development is essential and should proceed on a broad front. Normally, its scope is determined principally by the interest of the original investigators and the monies available for certain investigations. However, in my considered opinion, it takes a specific and carefully formulated goal to focus technology development on those individual problems that must be resolved to support that specific goal. Additional studies leading to improved heat protection techniques is a typical example of an area requiring technology development in support of the Space Shuttle. There is no doubt that a great deal of basic research related to heat protection is now and will proceed on a very broad front. Such general research is essential; however, in order to develop heat protection that will be practical for a given configuration of a reusable shuttle, specific designs must be developed. As an illustration of how hardware and technology developments can proceed in parallel, I would like to note that the ultimate scheme of thermal protection is not a requirement for the first developmental flights. Currently available ablative thermal protection techniques could be used while the development of improved methods proceeded independently. An almost identical method of attack was used by this country during the course of its ICBM development program in the mid 50's.

The first step in the development of a shuttle must be the identification of the system criteria and related specifications. This step is being taken, specific designs are being examined, and, we are concurrently identifying areas where technology advances must be made. This orderly process with periodic reviews to insure the proper phasing of parallel hardware and technology development is, in my opinion, the most intelligent way to proceed at this time.

Second Question. Will you also comment on the following statement? "In addition, it would seem advisable that cost effectiveness studies be conducted comparing operation of the space shuttle with the continued use of existing expendable launch vehicles before sizable amounts of money are applied to the shuttle development project."

Response. Over the past twelve years, more than twenty studies have been made by NASA and DOD on the relative cost effectiveness of reusable versus expendable space transportation systems. These studies indicate a varying degree of cost effectiveness for a totally reusable system that is dependent on the use rate. A low use rate results in lost cost effectiveness, a high use rate results in good cost effectiveness and significant long term economies. Additional studies at this time will neither prove nor disprove conclusively the wisdom of proceeding now with the development of this innovation. For the answer, we must examine and evaluate the past. We must ask ourselves the question, "Must the total use of an innovation be identified before proceeding with the development of that innovation?" In all recorded history innovations have been made without identifying all the uses and applications. You can almost start with the wheel . . . the telephone, the car, the airplane. All these resulted from our curiosity of the unknown, our instinctive need to understand our world, and the desire to contribute to a better way of life. Once in existence, the innovation is then used by society in ways that were never predicted or even predictable. When the airplane development was commenced, it was not done because there were large numbers of people waiting to be transported across the ocean in six hours. That utilization developed as the airplane developed and became a useful tool. The same is true for the telephone. The telephone was not created because people wanted to have a telephone. But, once it was there, it quickly became a necessity for our civilization and society. I firmly believe that once we have opened this new frontier to space and made its use economical, then many broad areas of application will appear that cannot now be forecast and, therefore, cannot be currently assessed.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that we should proceed now with the development of a fully reusable space shuttle. I acknowledge the possibility that the course and schedule of such a program may require modification, depending on the results of technology developments and the scope of identifiable uses. However, these possibilities should not prevent immediate initiation of this vitally important development.

---

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
*April 15, 1970.*

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight, Committee on Science and Astronautics, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: I am pleased to respond to your request for my thoughts about the space program at this critical moment in the formulation of our future space efforts.

Now before the Congress is the proposal to proceed immediately with studies for the development of the space shuttle. These are the funds necessary to confirm previous studies which indicate the efficiencies we expect of this new low-cost space transportation system. It is my considered opinion that this single development is the key to all of our future space activity, both manned and unmanned. By drastically lowering all costs of operation in space, we can afford to move forward rapidly into this new territory for exploration and exploitation. Our studies already show that the shuttle will reduce costs by at least tenfold at the outset, and with the maturity of the space shuttle, by as much as twice that amount.

The characteristics of the space shuttle, as it is being designed, provide for economies in every aspect of space operations. Reusability is the primary factor. At least 100 round trips into space will replace the one-time use on a one-way trip of all present launch equipment. The ability of the space shuttle to return men, cargo, and equipment back to earth will significantly reduce the cost of all equipment. First, because the low transportation cost and the benign launch environment will permit us to use heavier off-the-shelf laboratory and production equipment. Secondly, with the space shuttle in operation, on-orbit maintenance can be supplemented by return of instruments to earth for repair. Another special capability of the space shuttle is its use for space rescue.

As we look to the future, it is possible that the most important role of the space shuttle will be in our national defense. There can be no doubt that the space shuttle is the key to control and utilization of outer space. That control may well be decisive in preventing future wars. In that regard, timing is of the essence. The lead time for carrying out the development and putting into operation a new concept of this magnitude is very long—seven to ten years. We know that this concept has been under study by many people in many countries for at least a decade. Now that the technology for building a space shuttle is available, we need to implement an orderly program—or we will again face the necessity of having to produce such equipment as a crash program at much greater expense. I believe that we, as a nation, cannot afford to delay an orderly development program, now! If we should fail to grasp the initiative, we risk being confronted with an alien space shuttle which will give its developer effective control of space.

In summary, the space shuttle will save billions of dollars in our space activity. It will provide a barrier to technological surprise. It will be an effective shield for our national security. I urge you and your Committee to support the development of the space shuttle.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. MUELLER.

BENEFITS FROM SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, I have entitled my remarks, "Dividends of Discovery" because I feel quite strongly that some of the troubles the space program has encountered—both in Congress and among the general public—can be attributable to a lack of knowledge of the enormous benefits the average civilian American is reaping—and will reap in the future—from the scientific advances which have made our adventures in space possible.

We have heard criticism of the space program—people, well-intentioned but ill-informed, declaring that we would be a lot better off spending our treasure on earthbound projects instead of squandering it among the stars.

To hear them talk one would think that the United States was spending all that money on the moon, instead of here on earth. But the money is being spent on earth—here in the United States—and it is creating hundreds of thousands of new jobs which would not have existed otherwise—and with its incessant demands for new manpower, it is creating vacancies—job openings—in tens of thousands of industrial operations outside the space industry.

Let me cite you a few figures: During fiscal 1969, NASA was doing business with 14,369 prime contractors, located in 1,882 different communities, scattered among all 50 of our States. During fiscal year 1969 these contractors and subcontractors shared $3.07 billion of U.S. dollars. The effect on our economy has been incalculable. In these troubled times the space program has been an indispensable factor in the preservation of our prosperity.

Let me cite you another set of figures. We are all aware that most of our universities—even the most highly endowed ones—are in financial trouble. During the years 1959 through 1967, NASA spent $2.07 billion on grants and research programs, carried out in 223 universities in all 50 of our States, as well as the District of Columbia. The programs involved have not only added immeasurably to the scientific vigor and scope of the universities affected, but it has, in many cases, been able to alleviate some of their most pressing financial problems, also.

Very well, you might say, that is enough of generalities, let us get down to some specifics. What has the space program been doing for me lately? And personally?

How about the simple matter of survival? Our complex and wasteful life in the 20th century has been having the effect of changing and disturbing the natural balances of elements in the air we breathe. As we continue to pollute the atmosphere and to trouble it with unnatural disturbances, we are changing the amount of oxygen available to us. We could seriously deplete our oxygen supply—and our survival would be seriously threatened.

One spin-off of the space program is that it has given us the capability of anticipating such a change before it could happen, and it has given us the opportunity of remedying the situation—or adapting to it—before it is too late. I consider this a basic plus.

Our progress in space has also vastly increased our ability to locate major food supplies—both under the sea and on the land—which could be a vital survival factor in an overpopulated world. In the space program they have also developed scores of perfectly nutritious, perfectly sustaining synthetic foods which could eventually mean the difference between famine and survival in certain areas of the world. The food may not be as yet "finger lickin' good," but it is edible, and in times of starvation, all foods taste good.

This may sound like a remote benefit at the moment, but there are informed people who maintain that large areas of the earth's surface will be experiencing famine conditions within 10 years, unless we control our population explosion and improve the efficiency of our growing and harvesting of crops.

The space program has vastly increased our capability in weather forecasting. Already, the Tiros satellite program, in just 10 years, has been very successful in tracking—and giving advance warning of—typhoons and hurricanes, with an enormous resultant saving in lives, property, and crops.

When the equipment is available to implement the know-how of the meteorologists, we shall be able to predict accurately the weather over a 5-day span, at least, and probably up to 2 weeks.

Former President Lyndon B. Johnson once said that the ability to forecast the weather just 5 days in advance would result in an annual saving of $2½ billion in agriculture: of $45 million in the lumber industry; of $100 million in the transportation industry; $75 million in retail marketing, and untold millions in the recreation industry.

We have learned from our program in space that many phenomena on earth can be properly understood only from a great distance. This stretches all the way from the mapping of terrain to the discovery of natural resources.

A Gemini crew, for example, photographed 80 percent of the land area of Peru in just 3 minutes. Much of the area photographed had never been properly or accurately mapped before. We are even certain, for the first time, of the actual shape of the earth on which we live, because of the success of our efforts in space.

Through space, we have been able to make enormous strides in such areas as detection of crops and forest disease; classification of vegetation; the measurement of water transpiration and the discovery of new sources, and the detection of insect migrations. We have been able to utilize infrared photography from space to locate fresh water escaping along our coastlines, a step which will help us to preserve what resources we have left to us.

We have taken almost for granted the progress in communications which have come to us through space. The enormous expertise which permitted television cameras, quite small in size, to transmit to the television sets of America pictures from the moon, has been reflected in many other ways, also.

We have grown almost blase about satellite transmissions of television pictures—but this is a direct dividend directly attributable to space.

Perhaps the most immediate and identifiable dividends of space discovery can be found in the development of new products and materials. Space-proof materials, for instance, are being used in the development of practically indestructible refrigerators which will be almost impervious to outside temperatures. These materials, in a few years, will have an enormous effect on the development of air conditioning and heating systems in America's homes.

Stoves and other appliances will be better because of materials developed in the space program. Pots and pans right now are being coated with variations of the same material developed to protect spacecraft from the extreme heat of launching and reentry.

In the automobile industry, advances are already being made, and others are in the offing—particularly in the area of sealants and caulking materials.

There have been tremendous advances in the manufacture of new types of glass which will soon become commonplace in the average American kitchen.

Ever since Wally Schirra started taking over the Nation's railroads there has been a marked increase of interest in the development of space techniques within that industry. Railroad tank cars are now being produced from lightweight plastics developed for NASA for use in rockets. The cars weigh only half as much as the steel cars, and are at least as sturdy and durable.

I could go on indefinitely on the subject.

But, before completing my remarks, I want to touch upon some of the most obvious and significant developments in medical equipment and techniques which have been directly derived from the space program. For example:

Pressurized space suits have been adapted for use by victims of strokes, enabling them to become ambulatory, and thereby hastening their recovery.

The ultrafast dental drill with minute

ball bearings, which most modern dentists use today—and which has so significantly reduced the pain of dental work—is a direct result of the space program.

Supersensitive infrared detectors, developed in the space program, are already proving useful in the early discovery of cancer, and will prove even more useful in the future.

Hospitals are now beginning to use a new type of infrared switch which will allow an immobilized patient to turn lights on and off, to regulate his bed, or even to manipulate his wheelchair merely by a movement of his eyes.

Of course, these developments are still in their infancy—and I have merely scratched the surface in these remarks. One of the developments in the near future, I might say, is a human radar mechanism for the blind which will be powered by the wearer's own body.

And now—as an unexpected byproduct, there is at least a faint hope that moon dust could possibly be effective in combating cancer. If that ever proves even partially true, the entire cost of the exploration of space would be entirely justified.

But I have been talking almost entirely about the tangible, materialistic dividends of the space program. There are other dividends—spiritual, intellectual, psychological—which are even more valuable than those I have mentioned.

Historians have marveled at the enormous impact which the voyages of Columbus, Magellan, Vasco da Gama, and others had on the vision and the mentality of Renaissance Europe. Entire, brave new worlds were discovered—and as the geographic horizons lifted and extended themselves, the mental and spiritual horizons lifted and extended themselves also.

I feel very strongly that our program in space has done this for America.

In the immediate postwar years American industry had shown an alarming tendency to become complacent, self-satisfied—content with its own magnificent past performances and impervious to the attractions of future adventures.

The space program created a renaissance of its own in American industry. It has also stimulated the imagination of the average citizen in a way that nothing else in this century has done.

Among thoughtful people it has demolished the last vestiges of parochialism. It has made almost all of us citizens of the world, and, indeed, of the universe.

I have mentioned a few—a very few instances of what the space program has produced and will produce to make the daily life of the average man more comfortable, more satisfying.

But over and above all this, the program has stimulated industry's thinking. It has fired industry's imagination. As a result of the space program, dazzling new techniques have been introduced in almost every known field of human endeavor. Many of these techniques are only remotely connected with our efforts in space, but they have been directly or indirectly inspired by our achievements in this mighty program.

In many subtle, intangible ways the mental outlook of every American has been changed because of what we have done in space. Ever since the first man placed his foot on the moon, every American has viewed the world around him in a different way than he ever did before.

Within the next few decades the human race must face incredible challenges. It must meet those challenges successfully if it is to survive—let alone prosper.

Not only must we learn to live together in peace, we must learn to cleanse and preserve our environment; we must learn to feed and house countless billions of human beings; we must learn to conserve our human resources, through improved educational techniques on the one hand, and improved medical techniques on the other.

It is more than apparent now that a slavish adherence to the techniques and customs of the past will not do the job. We must pioneer in human engineering just as we have pioneered in science and astronautics.

Because of what we have done in the space program I feel confident that we in America shall be able to meet the staggering challenges of the future.

If it had not been for the space program, I feel that our chances of meeting those challenges would have been almost nonexistent.

In my opinion, our space program is just as important as that. Because of what it has produced for us—in materials, in techniques and in intellectual and spiritual stimulation—it literally holds the key to our survival in a world that is growing perilously small and perilously unproductive in the face of exploding populations.

Thank you very much.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, did you perchance have an opportunity to view the moon last night? I did and what a beautiful sight. If you saw what I saw, if you could have seen the moon as I saw the moon, there would be no argument, no debate, in fact, not even mild discussion as to whether or not we should authorize the money asked for in the bill before this committee.

Mr. Chairman, ask yourself the question, or perhaps I should say questions, who made the moon? Who made the earth? Who discovered America? Why is there a United States? Why did Armstrong and Aldrin walk on the moon? Why did Lovell, Swigert, and Haise return to the good earth in 7 days without having walked on the moon? Mr. Chairman, why have I asked these six questions? Any one of the six can be answered if you have the answer to the first question "Who made the moon?". In my book—God did. Oh, I know in this modern age we talk about priorities and I know we all realize that it is perfectly safe to walk in space, but not on the streets of our Nation's Capital.

We are all aware that money is needed to break the pockets of poverty, but if we are realistic, poverty cannot disappear until people learn to earn. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, who is to decide what is to be first, second, third, fourth, fifth, or even sixth or seventh priorities. I presume we would each have our own priority.

In 1492—the answer to the third question I previously asked is known to all—Christopher Columbus had to convince a lady with money to sponsor his voyage. Without that voyage who knows whether there would be a United States of America. I wonder what the Queen thought when an Italian merchant with vision, courage and conviction, said the world is not flat, the world is round, and if you give me the money to sail across this body of water I shall return and prove to you that the world is not flat. I can imagine the Queen looking into the heavens and asking Mr. Columbus, "If the world is not flat how can that moon in the heavens lighten all of Spain?". Yes, Christopher Columbus proved his point and that was less than 500 years ago.

We are living in an age that behooves all of us to do our best to make certain the future is not ignored. In October of 1957, I was in Rome, Italy, when the Russians launched Sputnik. For a few hours I was an embarrassed American, all I heard was "Oh, your country is big, your country is powerful, your country is rich, but the Russians did it—not you." I called a small press conference and invited my foreign friends. I predicted that my country, the United States of America, would in the near future not only have a Sputnik in the heavens but a man would circle the earth space. I was thrilled on May 5, 1961, when Comdr. Alan Sheppard—a gentleman I had become acquainted with in the 1950's when he was working on Capitol Hill as a Navy liaison officer—tested the heat shield. A brave man—he could have fried. Then in 1962, when a native of my State, not where I was born, but where I reside and have had the privilege of representing the 14th District of Ohio for nearly 20 years, made my prediction of 1957 come true. Yes, another great Ohioan, Neil Armstrong, was the first man to set foot on the moon. His words as his foot touched the moon were echoed around the world "One small step for man, one giant leap for mankind" and with those words America's faltering prestige rose to the greatest heights ever known to our country, and the free world breathed a sigh of relief. "America can do it," were the quiet thoughts in all of their hearts. Now just last Friday, April 17, three brave men who had hoped to repeat and go a little farther than did Apollo 12. No obstacle is so great that dedicated, God-fearing, brave men, coupled with Yankee know-how, cannot overcome.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, less than 200 years after 1492, brave men decided America would be the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Apollo 14 must go forward and in my heart I cannot help but feel that the man above the moon will look down on those astronauts on the moon and say "Well done thou good and faithful men, return to earth and tell the story as Columbus did to the Queen who sponsored him."

Mr. Chairman, I suggest in spite of all the political pressures, in spite of all the elections that Members are faced

with, that we be brave and vote for the bill pending before this committee. This is not the time to cut—this is not the time to gut. This is a time to have faith—this is a time to display courage—which is always the master of fear.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, today we are deliberating a bill which closely follows the dramatic recovery of the Apollo 13 astronauts and their disabled spacecraft. Much is being and will be said publicly about the direction our effort in space should take now that we have demonstrated our capabilities, and properly so.

We have achieved our breakthrough. We have proven what we can do. Our leadership in space is a tribute to our know-how, our industry, our technological genius, and our unbeatable ability to accomplish monumental tasks when we set our minds to them and pull together with a common national will. And we will not halt our exploration of the heavens, nor will we surrender the scientific achievements that have resulted from the public investment in NASA.

But it appears self-evident to me that the time is long overdue to take pause and place our entire space effort into perspective.

Now that we have our lunar rocks from the surface of the moon, we must look around us and take a searching look at the prospect here on the surface of our earth, the planet which looks so welcome to those voyagers returning from outer space. We find our cities steadily decaying, our urban centers becoming blighted no-man's terrain. We find polluted rivers, smogged skies, the earth fouled, and even greater encroachment on the green space so necessary to our physiological and spiritual survival. We find our roadways festooned with trash, our streets littered with drug addicts dying and dead of overdoses. We have a massive outburst of violence, a spiralling crime rate, and finally we must come to realize that what we are witnessing is no less than the rending of the social fabric which gives meaning and purpose to our individual lives and without which the journeys into space lose their grander definition.

Mr. Chairman, if we want our astronauts to be assured that there will be a livable planet for them to return to after some future prolonged mission in space, we had better wake up now and take the desperately needed measures becoming increasingly crucial for our very survival. The Nation beyond the city limits of the District of Columbia is trying to tell us something, and those of us who are listening take these warning signals to be a mass plea for a redirection of the energies of our people.

Mr. Chairman, we can well afford at this time to curtail the manned exploration of space in favor of the more productive—from a scientific viewpoint—unmanned probes, which are infinitely less expensive and do not involve the risk to human life the Nation so breathlessly witnessed last week.

The NASA authorization before us today came up from the White House with a $3.3 billion price tag, Mr. Chairman, and I can only view with dismay the $300 million increase added to the request by the Science and Astronautics Committee. Instead of pruning excess fat off this authorization, the committee has reported out a $3.6 billion heavyweight.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is motion in the wrong direction. With 30 million poor people in our populace, with widespread hunger and inadequate medical care, rising unemployment, and proliferating urban blight, we are obligated to reduce our space effort to dimensions more consistent with other aspects of our national life demanding attention. First to be deferred should be the space shuttle/station for which the administration requested an outlay of $110 million and which the committee increased by $80 million for 1971. This is a project that is going to run into astronomical expenses in the coming decade, with estimates ranging as high as $40 billion. It is simply not the appropriate time to undertake such expensive hardware development when we have not yet applied ingenuity to such problems as the mass production of inexpensive housing.

I find it unbelievable, Mr. Chairman, that the budget request for earth orbital manned space flight for 1971 is $490 million and for lunar exploration $947 million, at the same time that the estimated net budget outlay of Federal funds for all housing programs in the same fiscal year is only $732 million. The perfection of manned space vehicles must not, cannot, be given higher priority than the provision of adequate shelter for all Americans. With an agreed-upon goal of 26 million new housing units over the next 10 years, the administration found room in its budget for Federal assistance for completion of only 989,000 units of new or rehabilitated housing for occupancy in 1971, and of these, only 418,000 are to be subsidized for low- and moderate-income families.

Mr. Chairman, it is past due time to explore the possibilities of life on earth. The crime-breeding ghetto must be eradicated, the shacks of the rural poor must be immediately replaced. What national pride can we take in viewing the lunar terrain when the view at eye-level is cause for disgrace? Not only is there no commitment here to reach for the minimum number of new or improved housing units needed in this decade, but we are sliding backward as our population growth continues apace. True, the NASA authorization is a decrease from fiscal 1970's outlays, and I welcome the trend, but we must go further. Boldness is called for on terra firma to match that in outer space, and it is up to us to exhibit that quality here and now.

Compare further—$3.6 billion to explore the heavens and $104 million to clean up the air we breathe. By any measure the same picture emerges in clear focus. It is simply incredible that those of us who are well-fed and well-housed cannot see where we as a nation are headed. Are we to concur in the indifferent attitude of those who declare that when you have seen one ghetto, you have seen them all, or are we to put our resources to work for survival here on spaceship earth?

This authorization must be cut, Mr. Chairman. We can trim manned space flight off the budget this year, and continue the training of our astronauts in our elaborate ground facilities while continuing the exploration of space with unmanned vehicles. I am convinced that the American people will stand firmly behind us if we take the reins now and announce a crash program to rebuild our society. We do not have the luxury of time to procrastinate at this critical juncture, and the quality of life for generations to come is in the balance. Not next year—now.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, while I shall vote for the NASA authorization bill this afternoon, I want to make my position very clear on the matter of funding for our space program. I feel the amounts contained in this authorization bill are beyond the needs of an effective and rationally funded operation. For that reason I also supported the Karth amendment which would have cut what I consider to be unnecessary funding from this bill.

I am reserving final judgment on this measure pending presentation of the conference report. If I feel at that time that the bill has been scaled down to acceptable proportions I will gladly support the conference report. If however, the final version still contains excessive funds I will be forced to oppose acceptance of this report. I will also reserve these same options when Congress considers the NASA appropriations bill.

I want it understood that I support continued development of our space program. But, this program must be kept in perspective. We must look to our total package of national priorities in order to make constructive spending decisions.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the space program and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration authorization bill which we passed.

Through the NASA program, Americans have faced the challenge of forging ahead in lunar exploration, in satellite communications, in navigation, medical research and practical benefits to mankind. We have renewed our faith in man's capability to conquer the elements.

In March of this year, I visited Cape Kennedy with the United States-Canadian Interparliamentary group. I was surprised that Cape Kennedy was almost a ghost town, with many of its facilities shut down.

I am well aware that we have other priorities, but I see the NASA program as a continuing and important part of our national commitment. I feel it is important to realize we need a strong foundation in our space program. The technical knowledge we gain from our space efforts is applicable to our domestic problems and our industrial growth.

The triumph of the human spirit and competence in the recent safe return of Apollo 13 has no equal as an example of the energy and determination of the American nation. We began as pioneers,

and must continue to pioneer new frontiers for mankind.

Some Americans feel that the space program climaxed with the first moon landing of Apollo 11. But to abandon this effort at its beginning stage would waste billions of dollars we have invested in this exciting new generation of technology. Not all of the goals of this program are as spectacular as the moon landing—but they are just as essential if this is to be a worthwhile effort.

The space program emphasizes several objectives: to preserve the leadership of U.S. technology, engineering, and science; to provide maximum economy and efficiency in all space programs; to broaden the contribution of technical research to the U.S. economy, and to develop practical, usable benefits.

Mr. Chairman, I continue to take pride in the advances of our space program, and the new spirit it infuses in our American life.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I ask that the bill be read.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 88]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Adair | Fraser | Patman |
| Alexander | Fulton, Tenn. | Pepper |
| Anderson, Tenn. | Gettys | Powell |
| | Giaimo | Rees |
| Ashbrook | Gibbons | Reid, N.Y. |
| Ashley | Gilbert | Reifel |
| Ayres | Green, Oreg. | Rhodes |
| Baring | Green, Pa. | Rivers |
| Barrett | Griffin | Roberts |
| Brooks | Griffiths | Roe |
| Brotzman | Gubser | Rogers, Colo. |
| Brown, Calif. | Hagan | Rosenthal |
| Brown, Mich. | Harvey | Roybal |
| Brown, Ohio | Hébert | Scherle |
| Bush | Holifield | Scheuer |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Jacobs | Schneebeli |
| Cabell | Johnson, Calif. | Sebelius |
| Carey | Kastenmeier | Slack |
| Celler | Kirwan | Smith, Calif. |
| Clark | Kuykendall | Smith, N.Y. |
| Clay | Kyl | Snyder |
| Conyers | Landrum | Stanton |
| Corbett | Leggett | Stephens |
| Cowger | Lennon | Stokes |
| Crane | Long, La. | Stratton |
| Dawson | Lowenstein | Stuckey |
| Dellenback | Lukens | Sullivan |
| Dickinson | McCarthy | Taft |
| Diggs | Madden | Teague, Calif. |
| Dingell | Meskill | Tunney |
| Dorn | Mikva | Udall |
| Eckhardt | Mink | Vanik |
| Edwards, Calif. | Mollohan | Waldie |
| Edwards, La. | Moorhead | Watkins |
| Esch | Moss | Watson |
| Feighan | Murphy, N.Y. | White |
| Flynt | Nedzi | Wilson, Charles H. |
| Ford, William D. | Nichols | |
| | O'Neal, Ga. | Wright |
| Foreman | Ottinger | Young |

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 16516, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 313 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration:

(a) For "Research and development," for the following programs:

(1) Apollo, $1,101,500,000;

(2) Space flight operations, $670,200,000;

(3) Advanced missions, $1,000,000;

(4) Physics and astronomy, $110,400,000;

(5) Lunar and planetary exploration, $144,900,000;

(6) Bioscience, $12,900,000;

(7) Space applications, $172,600,000;

(8) Launch vehicle procurement, $124,900,000;

(9) Space vehicle systems, $30,000,000;

(10) Electronics systems, $23,900,000;

(11) Human factor systems, $18,300,000;

(12) Basic research, $18,000,000;

(13) Space power and electric propulsion systems, $30,900,000;

(14) Nuclear rockets, $38,000,0000;

(15) Chemical propulsion, $20,300,000;

(16) Aeronautical vehicles, $87,100,000;

(17) Tracking and data acquisition; $293,800,000;

(18) Technology utilization, $4,500,000.

(b) For "Construction of facilities," including land acquisitions, as follows:

(1) Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, California, $1,525,000;

(2) Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland, $2,050,000;

(3) Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, California, $1,950,000;

(4) John F. Kennedy Space Center, NASA, Kennedy Space Center, Florida, $575,000;

(5) Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Texas, $900,000;

(6) Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Alabama, $525,000;

(7) Nuclear Rocket Development Station, Nevada, $3,500,000;

(8) Various locations, $17,950,000;

(9) Facility planning and design not otherwise provided for, $5,000,000.

(c) For "Research and program management," $693,700,000.

(d) Appropriations for "Research and development" may be used (1) for any items of a capital nature (other than acquisition of land) which may be required for the performance of research and development contracts, and (2) for grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or construction of additional research facilities; and title to such facilities shall be vested in the United States unless the Administrator determines that the national program of aeronautical and space activities will best be served by vesting title in any such grantee institution or organization. Each such grant shall be made under such conditions as the Administrator shall determine to be required to insure that the United States will receive therefrom benefit adequate to justify the making of that grant. None of the funds appropriated for "Research and development" pursuant to this Act may be used for construction of any major facility, the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $250,000, unless the Administrator or his designee has notified the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility.

(e) When so specified in an appropriation Act, (1) any amount appropriated for "Research and development" or for "Construction of facilities" may remain available without fiscal year limitation, and (2) maintenance and operation of facilities, and support services contracts may be entered into under the "Research and program management" appropriation for periods not in excess of twelve months beginning at any time during the fiscal year.

(f) Appropriations made pursuant to subsection 1(c) may be used, but not to exceed $35,000, for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

(g) No part of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(c) for maintenance, repairs, alterations, and minor construction shall be used for the construction of any new facility the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $100,000.

(h) No part of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) of this section may be used for grants to any nonprofit institution of higher learning unless the Administrator or his designee determines at the time of the grant that recruiting personnel of any of the Armed Forces of the United States are not being barred from the premises or property of such institution except that this subsection shall not apply if the Administrator or his designee determines that the grant is a continuation or renewal of a previous grant to such institution which is likely to make a significant contribution to the aeronautical and space activities of the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall furnish to the Administrator or his designee within sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act and each January 30 and June 30 thereafter the names of any nonprofit institutions of higher learning which the Secretary of Defense determines on the date of each such report are barring such recruiting personnel from premises or property of any such institution.

Mr. GROSS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first section be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KARTH

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KARTH:

Page 1, line 7, strike "$1,101,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,051,500,000" and on page 2, line 1, strike "$670,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$480,200,000".

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me say that I have the greatest high regard for the gentleman from Texas, Mr. TEAGUE, chairman of the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee, and also for the committee, because I know beyond any question of doubt whatso-

ever, that the subcommittee is an extremely hard working committee, and that never has been in question.

The thing that is in question is the amount of money and the speed by which we proceed into a new multibillion-dollar manned space flight effort. In that regard I suppose my position is probably closer to the position of the total scientific community, certainly in terms of total dollar amounts it is closer to the administration's position, and in total dollar amounts I guess I could honestly say it is even closer to the agency's position.

Mr. Chairman, very simply, the amendment specifically reduces the line item in space flight operations referred to as the space shuttle station by $190 million, and reduces the level of the effort of $100 million that was added by the committee to $50 million.

I suppose I should begin by telling you a little about what the space shuttle station program really is. It is a manned space flight concept involving a reusable launch vehicle that will go from earth to a suborbit, and a second stage that rides piggyback on this first stage will go from there to orbit, and both of them, theoretically, will return to earth like an aerodynamically designed aircraft would land.

The space station—and I want you to understand the shuttle station is one program—the space station is a station that would accommodate from 50 to 100 men in earth orbit and is part of the multibillion-dollar new start that I address myself to at this point.

First of all, I want to make perfectly clear that my amendment does not eliminate all funds, and therefore does not cancel out the space shuttle and space station program. It merely reduces it, and if my amendment carries, there is still another $60 to $80 million in this program in the Office of Advanced Research and Technology portion of the budget for this purpose.

Then there is another $40 million for the nuclear propulsion module which I am not touching, but which is a program that is associated with and I might even say an integral part of, the space shuttle station program, and that brings the amount of money for this particular level of effort to between $100 million and $120 million. So all my amendment does, Mr. Chairman, is say: Let us not rush into this new multimillion-dollar program, let us not have design definition and let us not answer the question about what kind of space shuttle station we will have before we begin to design anything.

Mr. Chairman, $80 million is for study and research, and incidentally during this fiscal year we will have spent $24 million on study and research—and it is almost more study and more research than all the laboratories in this country can effectively and intelligently spend in 1 year on one program.

I asked a very able and distinguished Air Force general, whom I consider to be a friend of mine, if he could intelligently spend on research and study $80 million in 1 year on a new project, and he said he probably could if he had to, but he really did not know how. I asked him whether or not he could spend $270 million in 1 year on a new project for study and research, and he said it was impossible. That is how much money is in this bill for the space shuttle station program.

Why do I say we should slow it down? For two reasons. First, we do not know what kind of system we are going to use. We do not know at this point in time whether or not we are going to involve ourselves with, or use the concept, of a completely reusable shuttle or whether we are going to have the first stage as a throwaway booster for the shuttle. Second, this in my judgment at least—and there is a great deal of evidence to support the theory—is the beginning of a manned Mars landing program. That national policy determination, Mr. Chairman, has not been made. This decision as to whether or not we embark upon a $50 billion to a $100 billion manned space flight landing program to Mars, is something I think we ought to debate loud and clear.

I understand that the American taxpayer probably would not agree with the start of this kind of program without knowing fully what kind of commitment is being made in his behalf and what kind of tax dollars for the future we are calling upon him to pay.

The space shuttle station in my judgment is a start, I think an essential start to the manned Mars landing program. I think it is the first step, because without the space shuttle and without the 100 man space station to assemble the various spacecraft and other paraphernalia to get them to Mars and to the huge space station, no Mars program is possible, and I defy anyone to dispute that.

Without this goal of man to Mars in the 1980's there is really no need to rush the program. All I am saying is we should slow it down. If we think there is among the experts no evidence of disagreement, or no evidence to substantiate that there is disagreement, let me refer to an article recently reported in the Aviation Week & Space Technology issue dated April 13, 1970. There is a headline entitled "NASA Divided Over Space Shuttle." It is a two-page article. I commend it to the Members, and I think they ought to read it.

The fact of the matter is, perhaps the best known and qualified rocketeer of them all is in disagreement with the space task group on which direction we ought to travel or what course we ought to pursue, in the design and development of the space shuttle station.

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

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

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I am trying to follow the argument of the gentleman. I have read his remarks in the back of the report. Does the gentleman's amendment reduce the level below the budget request?

Mr. KARTH. My amendment for the Apollo program would remove $50 million of the $100 million that was added in committee, so as a result of that it would still be $50 million above the budget request, or the administration request.

Mr. CASEY. How about the other?

Mr. KARTH. The space shuttle station program is one for which $80 million was added by the committee. There is $110 million in the line item, and from $60 million to $80 million in another portion of the budget for its study and its research. I would take $190 million of that $270 million out.

Mr. CASEY. Is this below the budget request?

Mr. KARTH. In this particular instance, for this particular program, it would be below the budget request, yes; in fact, some $30 million.

Mr. CASEY. I have always recognized the gentleman in the well as a really stanch supporter of the space program. I hope he is not playing into the hands of someone in the Republican administration, who might say that the Democrats are cutting the space program.

Mr. KARTH. I assure the gentleman from Texas that is not the case. There is still some $60 million to $80 million in the budget. I say $60 million to $80 million, because that is what NASA said. When I asked the question as to whether or not there were other funds in the space shuttle station program, other than those which appeared on line 2 of the budget, the answer was, "Yes, from $60 million to $80 million." I do not know whether it is $60 million or $80 million. I would guess $80 million.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I should like to yield most of my time to the gentleman in the well (Mr. KARTH), but first I want to say that I wholeheartedly support the gentleman's amendments, for the reasons I stated earlier in general debate.

To recapitulate, I merely wish to point out to the Members that the bill as it stands before us would authorize some $300 million for the manned space program over and above the request of the Nixon administration.

I believe the budget request as given us by the administration was a sound request. It is a fairly lean budget. I believe this is a time for a lean budget. This is a moment of transition, having completed the program of the 1960's and looking into the 1970's. I believe this is a good time to go slow, to take pause, and to reconsider.

Especially I believe it is not the right time to make a new start in a tremendous shuttle program without answering first some of the questions the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH) is raising. Therefore, I do support his amendments, which would reduce by $240 million the $300 million added by the committee, above the budget request. It would not reduce the figure as much as I would like, but at least he is going about it in a very sensible way.

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

Mr. MOSHER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, let me say that there is not anywhere near unanimity of opinion within the space agency itself as to whether or not we

ought to proceed with the space station shuttle program at this level of effort this year. There is a great deal of difference of opinion. There is even a great deal of difference of opinion within industry itself. Certainly most of the scientific community support the position that we ought not embark upon such an extravagant effort at this time in a new program area.

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

Mr. MOSHER. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I have followed very intently the proposition of the gentleman from Minnesota and his argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER) has the time.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I yielded briefly although I want to give as much time as possible to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I just want to take a moment to point out that the scientists are indeed in disagreement. Van Allen has recently published an article which appeared in a daily paper indicating that probably we ought to have second thoughts on this and withhold on the manned space program until we find out more about the information we already have.

So I support the gentleman's position.

Mr. MOSHER. I thank the gentleman for his support of the amendments.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me with the consent of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. MOSHER. Does the gentleman from Minnesota consent to that?

Mr. KARTH. Yes, I do.

Mr. MOSHER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH), and also the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER), and I urge that this amendment be adopted.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield further to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, we never have enough time on these very important matters, but let me try to conclude by saying that this reusable shuttle and space station is probably the most sophisticated combination of aerodynamics and ballistics ever undertaken in the history of our space program. I have already explained how it is proposed to operate, but let me tell you that we are involving ourselves in a program that in turn demands terribly high specific impulses never before achieved in a hydrogen-oxygen engine which is essential to this program. We are involved in reentry, cryogenics, and combinations never before attempted, and they are a must for this program. We are involved in new structures and materials and propulsion agents, aerodynamics and electronic controls, because they are all a part of this program. The only thing I am saying is, indeed, it is challenging—and some day we may want to do it as a nation and as a national priority item—but let us now take it slow and easy and not waste millions of tax dollars traveling in one direction and find out later on that we have traveled down the wrong technological road, forced to retrace our steps and for all practical purposes discard the designs we made and start a new course with the taxpayer picking up the bill.

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

(Mr. FUQUA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance that I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my good friend from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH).

I have served on the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee for 8 years now. During that time under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas, this subcommittee traveled all over the United States in reviewing and trying to familiarize ourselves with and bring ourselves up to date on this program and particularly the space shuttle program. Only this past year we traveled to the west coast and visited with all the manufacturing companies in the aerospace industry. We received their views as to what level we should proceed. We visited all of the NASA centers relating to manned space flight. This subcommittee was very wise, I believe, when it unanimously—and again I say the subcommittee unanimously—approved the addition of these funds for the space shuttle and space station.

NASA requested $268 million from the Bureau of the Budget. That figure was reduced to $110 million. We added $50 million for the space shuttle and $30 million for the space station work. We still have a great deal of work to do. If we proceed with the moneys that have been provided today, it would still be the year 1977 or 1978 at the earliest before they would become operational and effective. There is nothing in this and no decision has been made to make a manned trip to Mars. NASA would have to come back to this Congress for the approval of those funds. Again I say there is no money in here for a manned trip to Mars. I have second thoughts about that with the technology we have now.

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

Mr. FUQUA. Let me conclude my remarks and then I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman, we must proceed with the design of the vehicle and the facilities and find out what we need in this program. This is not a development program.

I might point out that there was testimony in the committee provided by Dr. George Low that over $30 million to $40 million in this program for which we are asking is already underway and only $8 million of this would be added—would be for direct research in the space shuttle program.

Mr. Chairman, there is much work that could be done at the present time. This is not a development program. There is not 1 cent in here for hardware and other items for flight operational vehicles. It has been mentioned already that we have a space team together and that we cannot disseminate that team. We need to keep it together. For the best expertise we have been able to develop this would provide for an orderly and efficient program of development.

We cannot start out suddenly and then say next year because maybe some other country might develop a space shuttle program, we cannot get into it in a very fast manner. This is not a crash program. I think as we go down the line we will find that this program has a great deal of benefits to the national security of this country. It has a great deal of benefits for future commercial development. It has been referred to as being probably the DC–3 of the future. I think this is true. I think in many years to come it will have a tremendous commercial benefit as well as peaceful benefits in space.

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

Mr. FUQUA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KARTH. I just wanted to challenge the gentleman insofar as his suggestion that this is not a crash program.

I am honestly and sincerely convinced that one cannot spend $270 million in 1 year to study and to research one single program. There is a lot of design definition in this package for the governing of the shuttle space station. It just cannot be any other way. And, insofar as my point is concerned about this being the start of the manned Mars program, I would only refer the gentleman to an answer in response to a question which I raised during the course of our hearings this year about NASA's plans for the 1970's—it happens to be in the hearings—and the answer was that as soon as this program has been developed NASA plans to spend $100 million in fiscal year 1977 for a manned Mars exploration program, $300 million in fiscal year 1978 for a manned Mars exploration program and $1 billion in fiscal year 1979 for that program. That is why I say it is the beginning of the manned Mars landing program.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FUQUA was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FUQUA. I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Regardless of what the gentleman from Minnesota says, the truth of the matter is that a panel made up of the Vice President, Mr. AGNEW; Mr. Seamans, Secretary of the Air Force; and Dr. Paine recommended more money than we have in this bill.

Mr. FUQUA. I might also point out—and then I shall be happy to yield to my colleague from Florida (Mr. FREY)—the gentleman is talking about the future

plans that NASA may have in the years 1977 and 1978. We are considering here the fiscal year 1971 budget and not the fiscal year 1977 budget.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman did not really understand my argument. My argument is that we cannot properly begin a manned Mars program until after the shuttle station, 100-man station, has been developed, and their program shows precisely that is what they plan to do.

Mr. FUQUA. No decision has been made by Congress or this committee to proceed with a manned Mars landing program and I do not believe we can until we have more and further development. This was pointed out, as the gentleman from Texas pointed out, is what the space task force group recommends.

Mr. KARTH. I appreciate what the gentleman says. He is absolutely correct. This Congress has not made that national policy determination. I resent the agency coming in the back door and making it possible by suggesting this kind of a plan but at the time saying this is not the beginning of the manned Mars program, because in my judgment the evidence proves that it is.

Mr. FUQUA. I must respectfully disagree with my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, because I think that before any decision of that magnitude is made this Congress must make that decision.

Mr. FREY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FREY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would ask the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) if it is not true that part of the money that we are talking about for the purpose of advanced missions research, according to the testimony, much of this was under way and ahead of time anyway, and according to the testimony only $8 million in one section of this is going directly to the shuttle as a result of the program?

Mr. FUQUA. Only $8 million.

Mr. FREY. And much of the other money was being spent in other things that not only applied to the space shuttle, but to the space program, so when we talk about $80 million, it is not the correct way to describe it.

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

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I ask the gentleman to yield at this time because I am puzzled by the statement that the shuttle is in some way mixed up with the Mars landing, when nothing is further from the truth.

The shuttle we are proposing in this bill has absolutely nothing to do with the exploration of space further than the Apollo program has already taken us, and I am sure the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH) knows that. The purpose of the space shuttle is simply this: to go out and work on satellites such as communication satellites, to refurbish them, and to take men to and from a space station in a near earth orbit.

Mr. FUQUA. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KARTH

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH).

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. KARTH:

On page 1, line 7, strike $1,101,500,000 and insert $550,750,000, and on page 3, line 15, strike the period, insert a comma and add the following:

"*Provided, however,* That including the reduction in the item contained in line 7, page 1, selective reductions shall be made in one or more of the items contained on pages 2 and 3 to the end that reductions in authorizations for appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall total not less than $1,500,000,000."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I support the intent of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH), but the gentleman does not begin to go far enough in cutting down on the lavishing of money upon this program.

My amendment would cut the Apollo program exactly in half, a 50-percent cut of $550,750,000. It also provides that including the 50-percent cut in Apollo, selective cuts must be made in the rest of this $3.6 billion authorization bill so that the reductions total $1.5 billion.

There has been much talk about austerity here today. Well, anyone would have to have moon rocks in his head to believe there is any austerity in this program. As a matter of fact, with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH), it is still above President Nixon's budget. And that is austerity?

Where are we in this country? This morning it was announced that the cost of living increased another five-tenths of 1 percent in March, or about the same 6-percent annual rate of last year. And inflation is increasing going right along with it. Continue this kind of a program, and try to fund all of the other programs that we are approving in Congress, and the increase in the cost of living will not be five-tenths of 1 percent a month, or an average rate of 6 percent a year. Inflation and costs of living will be going up 8 or 10 percent a year.

Let us have the good sense and courage to do what needs to be done here and cut $1,500,000,000 from this program.

The gentleman from Florida earlier said this space outfit has 144,000 employees. These are among the highest paid of all employees in the Federal Government. With the pay increase bills that have been passed, where is it proposed to get the money to pay the increases for agencies of this kind as well as all other Federal employees, and the military?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. The gentleman talks about our committee lavishing money on this and he made a remark about the tremendous level of expenditures.

I wonder if the gentleman is aware of the fact that every dime of this authorization bill was authorized and the Committee on Appropriations in their generosity gave us every cent that we are asking for here—and that it will still be less money than we spent last year. The gentleman is aware of that; is he not? This is a decrease—not an increase.

Mr. GROSS. Well, so what? It was far too much last year.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Well, so what? I just thought the gentleman's memory should be refreshed, because he talks about the money that the Government is spending here.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think it might be a good idea to let some other country do a little spending and experimenting in space and on moon-doggling? They have lots of money; we do not have it. Has the gentleman not heard that there is no money in the Treasury and we are going to have to pass another debt ceiling increase this year? Has he not heard about that?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. The gentleman has heard about it and he has repeatedly voted along a line that would save money for this Nation, the gentleman knows that.

Mr. GROSS. No; I do not know that at all.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I am telling the gentleman in the well that it will.

Mr. GROSS. It will not save money.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. What the gentleman from Iowa says is not true.

Mr. GROSS. Why do you not want to save money on this moon-landing business?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. The gentleman should know that this is the smallest authorization bill that this committee has brought out since 1962.

Mr. GROSS. But there is still $3,600,000,000 in this bill and for what? The gentleman is aware that we now have the rocks and moon dust down here. How much more of this do we need? Let some other country that has a lot of money do this.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. The gentleman's own State of Iowa has a piece of that rock, may I say to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Go out and sell this $3,600,000,000 deal to your people in Indiana. I have no intention of trying to sell it to the taxpayers of Iowa.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. It is very difficult to sell, I will have to admit.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS), for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 16, noes 67.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I am sure that everyone would agree with me that it would be wonderful to be

a Member of Congress if you could always know truth and if you could always know what is right and what is wrong.

About 65 years ago the Members of Congress were debating whether or not to spend some money on aviation research. Some people were told that they had rocks in their heads. Some Members got up and said the airplane would never contribute to the economy of our country.

Today it has to be most difficult for Members who do not work on the committee to know what is happening. I wish it were possible for the Members to know how much work our committee did on the bill. First, I would like to point out that when Mr. Nixon became President, he appointed a task force to advise him what to do on the subject of space. That task force was made up of Vice President SPIRO T. AGNEW, Robert C. Seamans, Secretary of the Air Force; Thomas O. Paine, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, science adviser to the President. In addition, U. Alexis Johnson, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs; Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission; and Robert P. Mayo, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, were advisers.

They came back to the President and recommended a $4 billion budget for this year. Then the Bureau of the Budget cut that amount to $3.3 billion, and that was the amount of money that was recommended to Congress.

I would like you to know that our subcommittee has talked to practically everybody there is to talk to about our manned space program. We have talked to the people at North American, the engineers and scientists at McDonnell-Douglas, Boeing, Lockheed, and every major company involved in this program. Our subcommittee has talked to those engineers and scientists and listened to them.

When our subcommittee met, we considered the fact that this very distinguished panel had recommended $4 billion. We considered the fact that the Budget people had cut it to $3.3 billion. We agreed in our subcommittee that we were going to add some money, and we almost split the difference between what the task force recommended and what the Bureau of the Budget recommended. Then we went back to NASA and asked them where they would put that money to use.

Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of people who do not think the space program amounts to anything. I happen to believe it amounts to a lot. I happen to believe that in the future of this country, in defense alone it means so very much. In the arena of national defense, if we are going to control the ocean, the surface and underseas, control the ground and control the air, the next area will be space, and for certain we do not want to be second.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I join with the gentleman in his remarks. I have been working with him over a number of years on the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee. It is a question of whether we will lead in space or become second and begin to drop out. This is a real challenge both for peacetime and for military purposes.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the amendment has great merit. Aside from the motion to recommit, this is the only opportunity that we will have on the floor this afternoon to bring the program back more closely to the President's initial budget recommendation.

At this point I would like to yield to the sponsor of the amendment, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH).

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for yielding to me. First of all, I would like to say to the gentleman from Indiana that I have done my homework on this subject.

I would suggest, if he is really interested in finding out whether or not there is $8 million left in this bill for research and study of the space shuttle/station, if my amendment should prevail, rather than the $60 to $80 million that I suggested is in here, I would only suggest he read page 324 of our own hearings.

In answer to a question, Mr. Chairman, that I asked during the hearings this year—and that question was how much money is in other parts of the budget—this is the answer on page 324:

> In addition, the Office of Advanced Research and Technology will be conducting significant work, approximately 30 to 40 million dollars each, in support of both of these programs.

I repeat, that is for each of the shuttle and space station area.

Also, Mr. Chairman, let me say I have heard a great deal today about the defense of this country and how important this project might be—and I am all for maintaining a strong defense—but I also happen to have read the Organic Act that created the Space Agency, and the things we should be interested in are those things involving the civilian space program, and those things that might have a military effect ought to be done by the Department of Defense, if I may point out that jurisdiction.

The fact of the matter is, as far as the manned orbiting laboratory, MOL, is concerned, which was an Air Force-Department of Defense man in space project, I understand it has been canceled. As far as establishing priorities for that agency are concerned, they found a man in orbit apparently was not important enough to find its way into the priority structure.

There has been a great deal of argument too, Mr. Chairman, about how much more cheaply we could put pounds of payload in orbit if we had the shuttle. I dispute that.

No. 1, the launch vehicle associated with every single satellite program we have had is one of the smallest parts of the total cost of that program. So if we really want to start putting pounds in orbit at a cheaper rate, we ought to do it with the satellite and not work on the launch vehicle, since the launch vehicle is only 10 to 25 percent of the total cost on all programs—except for a very few, where the cost was 35 percent, and that was probably in the manned space flight program.

It has been suggested we could lower the cost of satellites by lowering the redundancy now involved because man cannot go into space and make repairs. I do not believe that can be done, because if we reduce the redundancy, we increase the failure rate. And if we do that, we will have shuttles running around repairing satellites and doing nothing else.

What an expensive way to repair satellites. The fact is, if you have had trouble with a television set lately, even though the truck is parked outside with all kinds of equipment, more than likely they will have to take the television set to the shop to make repairs before they can do a really good job. I question whether an astronaut in the hostility of outer space can repair or replace black boxes in a satellite, and I question whether it is even feasible for us to suggest traveling this route.

The reason I mention this, Mr. Chairman, is because I am convinced, after looking at all aspects of this program and all the arguments that have been volunteered, I believe the only reason for development of the space shuttle 100-man space station is indeed to eventually send a man to Mars. Really it has very little practical use other than that.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I hope the remarks of the gentleman will be heard.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think there has been a great deal of fog created in this room today, and we ought to penetrate a little bit of it. I bow to the gentlemen on my committee who have done an excellent job and I do not want to criticize them, but I think I know a little bit about this business too.

I have never heard the desire to place the shuttle air space station or manned orbiting laboratory as part of the parcel going to Mars. I would be quite critical of going to Mars until we have developed techniques to do it, if it is ever done.

I do not know that it will be done.

When I say this I offend some of the great scientists. One of them was just mentioned by my friend on my left to me, by name, but I will not bring his name into this. I know I offend him, because he would like to go to Mars.

We do need, in my estimation and considered judgment, the ability to go into space and to come back from space. We are going to have to repair some of these satellites—perhaps generations we do not know very much about right now—in space. What we have to do is go forward with the development of the

facilities to go into space and to stay in space.

We have heard about the criticisms which came when we wanted to develop the airplane. One can go a little further back. A little more than 140 some years ago a man stood in the Senate of the United States, a great Senator, when they were discussing the feasibility of building a railroad across the United States, and he said, "What do we need these States for? They are desert States covered with cactus. Nothing but rattlesnakes live in them. They have high mountains covered to their base with snow. What do we want to spend our money here for? We do not need them, and I will not spend 1 cent to bring the West 1 mile closer to Boston than it now is."

I am very glad that he did not prevail.

I want to say, we have to begin. We cannot dismiss the teams and the people who have done such a good job in this thing without putting them together again at a future date when it is going to cost much more.

I have no criticism of the gentleman who puts in the amendment, but I sincerely believe it should be defeated.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH). While one who is not a member of this committee hesitates to take a position on these matters, with the proposal of one as experienced as the gentleman from Minnesota, one can feel greater confidence in such action.

Many people have reservations about the timing of this authorization bill, especially after the Apollo 13 flight. There is much opinion that this whole program should be reviewed before any final action is taken on it. Questions have been raised about the size of the amounts expended in this program and their possible use elsewhere. Other questions have been raised about the validity of some of the programs authorized in this bill. Of particular doubt is the space shuttle program which this amendment seeks to reduce.

I believe that it is time we set about cutting this bill. Even if the Karth amendment were passed, the total authorization would still be above that requested by the administration. For these reasons, I support this amendment and I hope that it will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH).

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

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. KARTH and Mr. MILLER of California.

The committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 53, noes 53.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN:
On page 2, line 15, strike out $38,000,000.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, once again I rise to discuss the NERVA nuclear rocket engine program which this year carries an authorization in this bill of $38 million, which my amendment would strike out.

In the past I have pointed out that, although there was no specific mission assignment for this engine, it was in reality part and parcel of NASA's plan for a manned Mars mission sometime in the 1980's.

Over $1 billion has thus far been spent on this project, and its completion through the building of a flight engine will cost at least another $1 billion.

In past years justification for proceeding was that the expenditure was for research and development on the technology to build a nuclear rocket engine. That justification no longer exists, for it is clear from the hearings that the technology phase has ended. Milton Klein, the manager of the Space Nuclear Propulsion Office of NASA testified, and I quote, "The past year marked the completion of the NERVA technology program."—Hearings, page 1436.

So, Mr. Chairman, whatever justification some saw for developing the capability to build a nuclear rocket engine now has been met. The $38 million which this bill would authorize today is to institute a second phase of this program, the development of an operational rocket engine for flight. I think we should very carefully examine the implications of that. The proposal is to move from the technology phase into the flight phase, yet no specific mission has been assigned publicly by NASA.

Mr. Chairman, if a new phase for NERVA is to be funded, then we should assess its purpose and the ends it will serve. The fact of the matter is, however, that the potential end, for which the NERVA engine will be employed, is not difficult to discern, although NASA refuses to articulate it, and present it so it can be considered by the Congress. The end is the manned Mars mission which was discussed during the debate on the previous amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee (Mr. KARTH.) I pointed 2 years ago to the House, and let me quote—I said then, because I think it is relevant to what we are talking about now, the following:

> Since the NERVA program is actually intended as another step toward a $200 billion manned Mars mission, a goal which has not been approved by Congress, and which even at a "thinkable" cost remains open to serious technical and value questions, it is essential the Congress withhold funds for hardware development in this program pending open and public evaluation of the intended national goal.

Let me also point to the testimony of Mr. Klein at page 1439 of the Hearings on H.R. 16516, where he said:

> "Manned Mars missions are mentioned in the Space Task Group report for an unspecified time in the future to include their influence on the design of earlier systems elements. In this respect, the reusable nuclear vehicle designed for interorbit transportation will be capable of evolving into an inter-planetary propulsion module."

In other words, what I am saying is that we ought to set our goals and clearly define them. If the purpose of developing further the nuclear engine is to land men on Mars, let us face that question frankly and let us determine what the best means is of achieving that goal, if in fact we want to achieve it.

This involves the question of national priorities on the one hand and priorities within the space program on the other hand. The lack of opportunity for Congress to examine the merits of a manned Mars mission is perhaps the most troublesome aspect of the NERVA program, for programs like this, once the investment has been made, make it easy for the NASA bureaucrats to argue that the next step is inevitable, whether the Congress sets the priorities in that direction or not. Then, it is a simple and easy matter to argue that we must go ahead.

When I served on the Committee on Science and Astronautics, in the committee report on the fiscal year 1969 authorization for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, I stated:

> Once NERVA hardware is developed, at the very least Congress would be asked to support numerous lunar or other vastly expensive missions for the purpose of justifying its $2 billion development cost.

I think we should today stop and examine whether or not we want to continue with manned missions in the far reaches of outerspace or whether we should concentrate more on unmanned probes which produce more scientifically at a lesser cost.

Light, unmanned vehicles which are relatively inexpensive and which operate by chemical propulsion currently travel into distant space. Some of the best scientific data received have come from these missions. Manned vehicles, on the other hand, must be bigger and heavier, requiring more powerful and expensive rockets.

As I stated in support of the amendment which I offered to the 1970 NASA authorization bill, H.R. 11271, on June 10, 1969, which would have reduced the authorization for NERVA by $13.5 million:

> Unmanned planetary exploration missions are already underway with conventional hardware and propulsion systems. There is no reason to assume that it will be of interest repeatedly to send extremely heavy manned payloads into orbit or to the lunar surface until further data confirms that man contributes significantly more to space missions than simply additional cost factors and severe weight and safety problems.

Finally, I would note that despite continue and repeated requests, NASA has not developed a detailed, technical comparison between the costs of nuclear and chemical propulsion upper rocket stages, so that an accurate determination of which system is superior can be made.

An unnecessary and long leadtime piece of hardware such as NERVA should not be pursued till the Congress has determined our future goals. Considering the pressing necessity for money to fund urgently needed domestic pro-

grams, any commitment to expensive space programs demands direct congressional analysis. Until such time as this commitment is made through considered and cogent debate and study, we should not allow the National Aeronautics and Space Administration indirectly to commit the Nation to a program that may ultimately cost $200 billion—the manned Mars mission.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, later in my time I shall yield to the distinguished majority leader in order for him to give us the program for next week, but at the moment I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON) to announce the contents of the motion to recommit.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. With reference to the motion to recommit, there will be the amount of $30 million to be stricken. If the members of the committee will look at page 1 of H.R. 16516, at the bottom of the page for the Apollo program, we propose to cut it by $14.5 million. Then at the top of page 2, the first line, under "Space flight operations," we propose to cut that by $15.5 million, totaling $30 million.

This has been agreed to by many on our committee and we believe it will represent a tightening of the program and that such action can be taken without hurting the program.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MILLER of California. I think it is a very good amendment and we shall accept the motion to recommit when it is offered.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Let me make an observation or comment on the space authorization bill at this point. Several weeks ago I had the opportunity to consult with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER). I listened to the presentation they made and in that environment, if that is the right word, I must admit that many of their arguments were persuasive.

I subsequently had the opportunity of talking with others on our side of the committee, and at that point it seemed like the better course of action for those of us in the minority to at least do what was recommended by the President in his budget for the space program. But all of us know that approximately a week ago three of our fellow Americans were faced with a great crisis. All of us, regardless of our individual feelings concerning this program, were pleased and relieved that the three astronauts and their spaceship returned safely. In the interim between last Friday and today there has been a great deal of soul-searching within the agency. There has been a great deal of public concern pro and con as to what the Nation's space program should be in the future and what course of direction it should take in the years ahead. I understand a committee with NASA has been established for the purpose of analyzing the overall program and the mechanical problems in the Apollo 13 flight. In light of the appointment of that particular committee, and the uncertainty as to what they will recommend, it seems to me the wiser course of action on this authorization bill is to take the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It will do no harm to the program and yet will not hamstring the agency as to any new decisions for the future. I think it will show that the Congress, or the House, is interested in a responsible tightening of the authorization as recommended by the committee. We ought to support the motion to recommit, as the distinguished chairman indicated, and as recommended by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON). I do not believe this is any commitment, certainly not a commitment by me, to support a broader program, a long-range program that goes well beyond what we are doing at the present time in a space program. However, the atmosphere and the environment, politically as well as otherwise, is such that I believe the wiser course of action for the House today is to do what the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON) suggests. I urge an aye vote on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Michigan has just spoken for a broader program, and helped to tie the vote and defeat an amendment thus keeping this authorization at nearly $300 million above the budget. Yes, the gentleman is certainly for a broader program.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I voted for the authorization that gives flexibility within the appropriation process, and I made no commitment as to dollars in the appropriation process.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I also rise in strong support for the continuation of our nuclear rocket development, the NERVA booster.

Any delay in the continuation of the development of NERVA would not present to our Nation an adequate future program.

While we recognize today's needs, we must not abandon tomorrow's.

Failure of foresight has cost us dearly in the past.

It can cost us more in the future.

There are important reasons why we should proceed with NERVA, and equally important reasons why we should proceed with NERVA now.

We are at the crossroads of space travel capabilities.

We have now the opportunity to begin thinking in terms of transportation in space; rather than continuing the limiting artillery approach of present systems.

Performance advantages of nuclear rockets range from 65 to 200 percent increases in lunar or deep space payloads thereby saving millions of pounds in earth orbit to perform manned landings or any other missions to the planets. It is approximately 50 percent complete.

The versatility of the nuclear rocket engine will provide enhanced flexibility and technological leadership at less cost than is possible in any other available combination of propulsion developments for these missions.

NERVA can be used as a Saturn 5 upper stage for lunar base support and for sending large unmanned payloads into deep space.

It can be used for maneuvering heavy payloads in earth orbit, and in synchronous orbit—22,000 miles. With refueling, it provides many hours of repeated mission capability.

It can be the building block of large vehicles carrying men to Mars and Venus.

By extending the capability of Saturn V and by greatly reducing the weight required in earth orbit, the nuclear rocket will not only pay for its development in a very few flights, but also opens up many new mission possibilities.

Its adaptability to growth in payloads and operational requirements will assure that only one engine design technology be developed to provide the propulsion modules for decades of space exploration; it will be our workhorse.

The NERVA engine has a potential of approximately 75,000 pounds of thrust with full power operation for periods up to 10 hours, with multiple restart capability.

Compare this with chemical boosters which operate for a maximum of 5 to 7 minutes.

Those who would delay NERVA cite obstacles of cost.

I would ask them not to overlook important cost considerations.

For example, delaying NERVA for 1 year would cost us at least $300 million and 3 years in time just to catch up to where we are now.

Unquestionable savings will result from NERVA's unique capabilities.

To deliver a 47,000 pound payload to the moon, two Saturn chemical systems would be required at a cost of more than $300 million each.

The same payload could be delivered by one NERVA system at a cost of approximately $210 million.

Using the same example a second time around:

The next 47,000-pound payload to the moon by chemical systems would require an additional $300 million.

But the NERVA system could be reused.

This will be possible because of NERVA's transportation characteristics.

After landing on the moon, NERVA can return to earth orbit and be reused, as opposed to the artillerylike

Saturn chemical system which is thrown away after use, like a soft drink can.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to turn our backs on this prospect.

We cannot forever make existing systems increasingly larger to fit our advancing objectives.

The door to space is open.

We will do our Nation and its future generations a devastating disservice if we close that door.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge approval of the NERVA continuation program.

I urge defeat of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, when I was a boy on the farm we had a dog, one in particular who was a pretty good scrapper. He could take on anything that came around. The neighbors would come over and sometimes bring their dogs. In order to keep our dog from killing a neighbor's dog, we had an old piece of dried cowhide and we used to throw that to him. He would take that cowhide and crawl under the porch or go out to the barn and chew on it—and everything was peaceful. That was the way we hoodwinked him.

Mr. Chairman, we have been had here this afternoon. The committee increased this bill about $300 million above President Nixon's budget, and then staged a fraudulent exercise in economy. Now we are about to go through another one in the motion to recommit that has just been announced. They have thrown that old dry hide out to us. We have spent the afternoon talking about that $300 million of sweetening when we ought to have been spending our time cutting a billion dollars or more out of this discredited program.

Yes, we have been had. Now we are about to get a motion to recommit that will do what? Cut a paltry $30 million from this $3.6 billion? This is sponsored and promoted by the minority floor leader of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) who was one of those going through the teller line a few minutes ago and it was his vote that tied and lost the amendment that would have at least cut $240 million out of this inflated monstrosity.

I say again—we have been had as usual here this afternoon, and I do not like it. I voted for this program until 2 or 3 years ago, but not until the financial crisis is met in this country will I vote $3.6 billion a year for a continuation of this moondoggle.

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

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the 5 minutes. But I want to commend the committee on what I consider an outstanding job. I think this program is one that has contributed immeasurably to the total knowledge of mankind. I think we are only beginning to understand what the potentials are.

I trust that the committee's action will be sustained.

Mr. Chairman, I support the recommendations of the Committee on Science and Astronautics contained in H.R. 16516, and I urge my colleagues to do so also.

We have before us a bill which authorizes $3.6 billion for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

NASA was required to present to the Congress a minimal budget to fund its programs during fiscal year 1971. It submitted a $4.5 billion request—the bare minimum needed to implement the recommendations contained in the report of the President's Task Force on Space. The administration pared this request still further and sent to Congress the lowest space budget request in almost a decade, $3.3 billion.

After lengthy consideration, the Committee on Science and Astronautics restored a portion of the funds to the bill now before us. It was the committee's judgment that the total authorization should be increased to $3.6 billion—an increase of some $297 million falling principally in the area of manned space flight.

It has already been said here today—and I am certain that it will be said again—that the central issue in this debate is the question of national priorities—how much we have to spend and where our resources should be applied. We are a rich Nation, but we have many problems demanding solutions and needs crying to be met. No one denies that.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this country can afford to solve its problems and meet its needs without crippling its space program. I further submit that this country's space program is a national priority, and one we can ill afford not to fulfill.

Last year the American people spent twice as much on liquor as this bill proposes we spend on space exploration. Last year the American people spent twice as much on candy as the committee proposes we increase the administration's request. I have nothing against liquor or candy—I cite the figures only to give us some perspective about the scope of our economy. We are the richest Nation in history, and our space budget today represents 1.6 percent of our total national budget—not our gross national product, but our total national budget. Has our space program become such an intolerable burden as to warrant reducing it further? I think not.

Mr. Speaker, rich nations are not rich simply because they are fortunate enough to have plentiful natural resources, for there are many poor nations with abundant natural resources. Rich nations are not rich nations simply because they possess large populations, for there are many populous nations that are very poor. Mr. Speaker, the single most important factor in the wealth of nations is technology, and to a considerable extent it is the future of American technology that we are debating today.

We are a wealthy nation because the value of education and the need to develop technology are permanently ingrained in the character of our people.

I recall vividly the hue and cry which arose in this Chamber in 1957 when the Soviet Union orbited the first manmade satellite, marking the beginning of a period of national self-doubt and reexamination.

In May 1961, President Kennedy announced the intention of this country "to send men to the moon and return them safely to earth in this decade."

What followed was the creation and application of the greatest technological plant in history. The results are known, not only to you, but to almost every person on the face of the globe.

At this moment, there are more than 2,500 technological products, in fields ranging from communications to medicine, which are direct spinoffs on our space program.

Yet, I believe we are just now reaching the point in our space program where major economic, scientific, social, and technological returns and benefits are being realized. I further believe that even greater tangible and intangible benefits lie just around the corner.

It may be that the space program is offering mankind a new perspective of itself which will do more to bring about world peace than all else we have ever attempted.

The space program of the 1960's which brought a man to the lunar surface taught us that there is very little we cannot do if we set our minds to it. The space program of the 1970's, however, will be different. It will not culminate in the achievement of a single, dramatic goal. It will consist of the hard work of exploration, of understanding and learning about new worlds and applying that knowledge to our problems here on earth.

The exploration of space will continue during the 1970's whether we choose to lead it or not. I believe we should continue our leadership.

For these reasons, and many, many more, I support H.R. 16516, and I urge my colleagues to do so also.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do want to say first, I concur in the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS). I do not think I have ever agreed with him before. But I agree with him today.

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

Mr. KOCH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, we may have lost sight of the fact that there is on the floor an amendment which will strike $38 million from this bill. So I urge support for that.

But I would also out of curiosity at least like to ask the chairman of the committee and the minority leader as well as the ranking minority member of the committee, why it is since they have all agreed to accept a cut of $30 million—why we simply cannot do that by an amendment to the bill on the floor. Why not reduce line 7, page 1, by $14.5 million and reduce line 1, page 2, by $15.5 million. It would be so simple and the chairman said he would accept it. Now I ask the chairman if one were to offer that as an amendment, would he accept it now?

Mr. MILLER of California. I said I would accept the motion to recommit. When we go back into the House and the motion to recommit is moved, I will support it.

Mr. RYAN. Would the gentleman support an amendment now on the floor to do exactly the same thing?

Mr. MILLER of California. No, I think I have made my statement, and I told this to the minority side.

I would be running out on an agreement in order to satisfy the gentleman's ego, to get his motion over.

Mr. COLLIER. How can the gentleman refuse to accept the motion to recommit? I do not quite understand from what I heard the gentleman say—I do not understand.

Mr. MILLER of California. No, there is no motion now. I said I would support the motion to recommit.

Mr. COLLIER. But I understood the gentleman to say he refused to accept this cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Authorization is hereby granted whereby any of the amounts prescribed in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection 1(b) may, in the discretion of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, be varied upward 5 per centum to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work authorized under such paragraphs shall not exceed the total of the amounts specified in such paragraphs.

SEC. 3. Not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(a) hereof may be transferred to the "Construction of facilities" appropriation, and, when so transferred, together with $10,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(b) hereof (other than funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (9) of such subsection) shall be available for expenditure to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations at any location (including locations specified in subsection 1(b)), if (1) the Administrator determines such action to be necessary because of changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities or new scientific or engineering development, and (2) he determines that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities. The funds so made available may be expended to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment. No portion of such sums may be obligated for expenditure or expended to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate and to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of such construction, expansion, or modification, (2) the cost thereof, including the cost of any real estate action pertaining thereto, and (3) the reason why such construction, expansion, or modification is necessary in the national interest, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program deleted by the Congress from requests as originally made to either the House Committee on Science and Astronautics or the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

(2) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program in excess of the amount actually authorized for that particular program by sections 1(a) and 1(c), and

(3) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program which has not been presented to or requested of either such committee,

unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and each such committee of notice given by the Administrator or his designee containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such proposed action, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

SEC. 5. It is the sense of the Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whenever feasible, and that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds whenever feasible.

SEC. 6. (a) If an institution of higher education determines, after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending, or employed by, such institution, that such individual has been convicted by any court of record of any crime which was committed after the date of enactment of this Act and which involved the use of (or assistance to others in the use of) force, disruption, or the seizure of property under control of any institution of higher education to prevent officials or students in such institution from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies, and that such crime was of a serious nature and contributed to a substantial disruption of the administration of the institution with respect to which such crime was committed, then the institution which such individual attends, or is employed by, shall deny for a period of two years any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs authorized by the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, the funds for which are authorized pursuant to this Act. If an institution denies an individual assistance under the authority of the preceding sentence of this subsection, then any institution which such individual subsequently attends shall deny for the remainder of the two-year period any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs authorized by the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, the funds for which are authorized pursuant to this Act.

(b) If an institution of higher education determines, after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending, or employed by, such institution, that such individual has willfully refused to obey a lawful regulation or order of such institution after the date of enactment of this Act, and that such refusal was of a serious nature and contributed to a substantial disruption of the administration of such institution, then such institution shall deny, for a period of two years, any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs authorized by the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, the funds for which are authorized pursuant to this Act.

(c)(1) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit any institution of higher education from refusing to award, continue, or extend any financial assistance under any such Act to any individual because of any misconduct which in its judgment bears adversely on his fitness for such assistance.

(2) Nothing in this section shall be construed as limiting or prejudicing the rights and prerogatives of any institution of higher education to institute and carry out an independent disciplinary proceeding pursuant to existing authority, practice, and law.

(3) Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the freedom of any student to verbal expression of individual views or opinions.

SEC. 7. This Act may be cited as the "National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1971."

Mr. MILLER of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments? If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 16516) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 893, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. In its present form I am, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania moves to recommit the bill H.R. 16516 to the Committee on Science and Astronautics, with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

On page 1, line 7, strike the amount "$1,101,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof the amount "$1,087,000,000".

On page 2, line 1, strike the amount "$670,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof the amount "$654,700,000".

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The motion to recommit was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House in the motion to recommit, I report the bill back with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment:

On page 1, line 7, strike the amount "$1,101,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof the amount "$1,087,000,000".

On page 2, line 1, strike the amount "$670,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof the amount "$654,700,000".

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 229, nays 105, not voting 96, as follows:

[Roll No. 89]

YEAS—229

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Brock | Davis, Ga. |
| Adams | Broomfield | de la Garza |
| Addabbo | Broyhill, Va. | Denney |
| Albert | Buchanan | Dennis |
| Anderson, Calif. | Burke, Fla. | Dent |
| | Burke, Mass. | Derwinski |
| Anderson, Tenn. | Burleson, Tex. | Devine |
| | Burton, Calif. | Donohue |
| Andrews, Ala. | Burton, Utah | Dowdy |
| Andrews, N. Dak. | Byrne, Pa. | Downing |
| | Camp | Dulski |
| Annunzio | Carter | Duncan |
| Arends | Casey | Edmondson |
| Aspinall | Cederberg | Edwards, Ala. |
| Ayres | Chappell | Edwards, Calif. |
| Baring | Clancy | Erlenborn |
| Beall, Md. | Clark | Esch |
| Belcher | Clausen, Don H. | Evins, Tenn. |
| Bell, Calif. | | Fallon |
| Bennett | Clawson, Del | Fascell |
| Berry | Cohelan | Findley |
| Bevill | Collier | Fisher |
| Biaggi | Collins | Flood |
| Biester | Colmer | Flowers |
| Blackburn | Conte | Ford, Gerald R. |
| Blanton | Corbett | Fountain |
| Blatnik | Corman | Frelinghuysen |
| Boggs | Coughlin | Frey |
| Boland | Culver | Fulton, Pa. |
| Bolling | Cunningham | Fulton, Tenn. |
| Bow | Daddario | Fuqua |
| Bray | Daniel, Va. | Galifianakis |
| Brinkley | Daniels, N.J. | Garmatz |
| Gaydos | Martin | Roudebush |
| Goldwater | Mathias | St. Onge |
| Gonzalez | Matsunaga | Sandman |
| Gray | May | Satterfield |
| Grover | Meeds | Scott |
| Gubser | Michel | Shipley |
| Haley | Miller, Calif. | Shriver |
| Hall | Mink | Sikes |
| Hamilton | Minshall | Smith, Calif. |
| Hanley | Mize | Smith, Iowa |
| Hanna | Montgomery | Springer |
| Hansen, Idaho | Morgan | Stafford |
| Hansen, Wash. | Morse | Staggers |
| Harsha | Morton | Steed |
| Hastings | Murphy, Ill. | Stratton |
| Hébert | Murphy, N.Y. | Stuckey |
| Hechler, W. Va. | Natcher | Symington |
| Heckler, Mass. | Olsen | Talcott |
| Helstoski | O'Neill, Mass. | Taylor |
| Henderson | Passman | Teague, Calif. |
| Hogan | Patten | Teague, Tex. |
| Hosmer | Pelly | Thompson, Ga. |
| Howard | Perkins | Thompson, N.J. |
| Hunt | Pettis | Van Deerlin |
| Jarman | Philbin | Vander Jagt |
| Johnson, Pa. | Pickle | Vigorito |
| Jones, Ala. | Pirnie | Waggonner |
| Kee | Poage | Wampler |
| King | Podell | Weicker |
| Kleppe | Pollock | Whalley |
| Kuykendall | Preyer, N.C. | Whitehurst |
| Lloyd | Price, Ill. | Whitten |
| Lujan | Price, Tex. | Widnall |
| McClory | Pryor, Ark. | Wiggins |
| McClure | Pucinski | Wilson, Bob |
| McCulloch | Purcell | Winn |
| McDade | Quie | Wold |
| McEwen | Rarick | Wolff |
| McFall | Reid, Ill. | Wydler |
| McKneally | Robison | Wylie |
| McMillan | Rodino | Yatron |
| MacGregor | Rogers, Fla. | Young |
| Mahon | Rooney, N.Y. | Zablocki |
| Mailliard | Rooney, Pa. | Zion |
| Marsh | Rostenkowski | |

NAYS—105

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Hungate | O'Konski |
| Ashley | Hutchinson | Pike |
| Betts | Ichord | Poff |
| Bingham | Jacobs | Powell |
| Brademas | Jonas | Quillen |
| Brasco | Jones, N.C. | Railsback |
| Broyhill, N.C. | Karth | Randall |
| Burlison, Mo. | Kastenmeier | Reid, N.Y. |
| Button | Keith | Reuss |
| Chisholm | Koch | Riegle |
| Cleveland | Kyros | Rosenthal |
| Conable | Landgrebe | Roth |
| Conyers | Langen | Ruppe |
| Davis, Wis. | Latta | Ruth |
| Delaney | Long, Md. | Ryan |
| Dickinson | Lowenstein | St Germain |
| Dwyer | McCloskey | Saylor |
| Eilberg | McDonald, Mich. | Schadeberg |
| Eshleman | | Scheuer |
| Evans, Colo. | Macdonald, Mass. | Schwengel |
| Farbstein | | Skubitz |
| Fish | Mayne | Smith, N.Y. |
| Foley | Melcher | Steiger, Ariz. |
| Fraser | Mikva | Steiger, Wis. |
| Gallagher | Miller, Ohio | Stokes |
| Gibbons | Mills | Stubblefield |
| Gilbert | Minish | Taft |
| Goodling | Mizell | Thomson, Wis. |
| Gross | Monagan | Tiernan |
| Gude | Mosher | Ullman |
| Halpern | Myers | Watts |
| Hammer-schmidt | Nedzi | Whalen |
| | Nelsen | Wyatt |
| Harrington | Nix | Wyman |
| Hicks | Obey | Yates |
| Hull | O'Hara | Zwach |

NOT VOTING—96

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Adair | Dawson | Hathaway |
| Alexander | Dellenback | Hawkins |
| Anderson, Ill. | Diggs | Hays |
| Ashbrook | Dingell | Holifield |
| Barrett | Dorn | Horton |
| Brooks | Eckhardt | Johnson, Calif. |
| Brotzman | Edwards, La. | Jones, Tenn. |
| Brown, Calif. | Feighan | Kazen |
| Brown, Mich. | Flynt | Kirwan |
| Brown, Ohio | Ford, William D. | Kluczynski |
| Bush | | Kyl |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Foreman | Landrum |
| Cabell | Friedel | Leggett |
| Caffery | Gettys | Lennon |
| Carey | Giaimo | Long, La. |
| Celler | Green, Oreg. | Lukens |
| Chamberlain | Green, Pa. | McCarthy |
| Clay | Griffin | Madden |
| Cowger | Griffiths | Mann |
| Cramer | Hagan | Meskill |
| Crane | Harvey | Mollohan |
| Moorhead | Roe | Tunney |
| Moss | Rogers, Colo. | Udall |
| Nichols | Roybal | Vanik |
| O'Neal, Ga. | Scherle | Waldie |
| Ottinger | Schneebeli | Watkins |
| Patman | Sebelius | Watson |
| Pepper | Sisk | White |
| Rees | Slack | Williams |
| Reifel | Snyder | Wilson, Charles H. |
| Rhodes | Stanton | |
| Rivers | Stephens | Wright |
| Roberts | Sullivan | |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Slack against.

Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Carey against.

Mr. Johnson of California for, with Mr. Roe against.

Mr. Caffery for, with Mr. Ottinger against.

Mr. Friedel for, with Mr. Clay against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Barrett against.

Mr. White for, with Mr. McCarthy against.

Mr. Bush for, with Mr. Kyl against.

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona for, with Mr. Watkins against.

Mr. Crane for, with Mr. Dellenback against.

Mr. Chamberlain for, with Mr. Scherle against.

Mr. Williams for, with Mr. Schneebeli against.

Mr. Horton for, with Mr. Brown of Michigan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Pepper with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Stanton.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Sebelius.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Foreman.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Roybal.
Mr. Hathaway with Mr. Stephens.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Rogers of Colorado.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. William D. Ford.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Mollohan.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Tunney.
Mrs. Sullivan was Mr. Wright.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Udall.
Mr. Mann with Mrs. Griffiths.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Rees.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Sisk.
Mr. Hagan with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
Mr. Griffin with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Vanik with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Kazen.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. O'Neal of Georgia.

Mr. WYMAN and Mr. CLEVELAND changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 251. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April 1970 as "National Arbor Day."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10105) entitled "An act to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendment numbered 2, to the foregoing bill.

This message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate (S. 3253) entitled: "An act to provide that the Federal Office Building and U.S. Courthouse in Chicago, Ill., shall be named the 'Everett McKinley Dirksen Building East' and that the Federal office building to be constructed in Chicago, Ill., shall be named the 'Everett McKinley Dirksen Building West' in memory of the late Everett McKinley Dirksen, a Member of Congress of the United States from the State of Illinois from 1933 to 1969," with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF APRIL 27

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I have committed myself to yield to the distinguished majority leader for the purpose of receiving from the gentleman the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District Day, but there are no District bills.

On Monday we will have H.R. 14714, to encourage travel in the United States, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate;

H.R. 14385, to provide authority for subsidized transportation for Public Health Service employees to Rockville, Md., under an open rule with 1 hour of debate; and

H.R. 4599, payments in lieu of taxes for former Reconstruction Finance Properties, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

On Tuesday we will have H.R. 16200, Arms Control and Disarmament Act Amendments, 1970, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate; and

H.R. 15693, to exclude from the mails certain nonmailable matter, under an open rule with 2 hours of debate.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week, H.R. 17123, the military procurement authorization, 1971, subject to a rule being granted.

And of course, Mr. Chairman, this announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program may be announced later.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

## ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, APRIL 27, 1970

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

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

There was no objection.

## DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

## EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN BUILDING—EMERGENCY EDUCATIONAL PAYMENTS

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 3253) to provide that the Federal office building and U.S. courthouse in Chicago, Ill., shall be named the "Everett McKinley Dirksen Building East" and that the Federal office building to be constructed in Chicago, Ill., shall be named the "Everett McKinley Dirksen Building West" in memory of the late Everett McKinley Dirksen, a Member of Congress of the United States from the State of Illinois from 1933 to 1969, together with the Senate amendment to the House admendments, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment to the House amendments as follows:

SEC. 2. Upon a determination that a local educational agency lacks the fiscal capacity to provide an adequate free public education for children of persons who live and work on Federal property, and if such children constitute not less than 25 per centum of the total enrollment, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall make emergency payments from sums already available, but not to exceed $2,500,000, for the current school year to such local educational agency as may be necessary to provide a free public education for such children: *Provided*, That such payments shall not exceed the average per-pupil cost to such agency for all children eligible to receive a free public education from such agency, less Federal and State payments to such agency for free public education.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment to the House amendments was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## DESIGNATING FRIDAY, MAY 1, 1970, AS DAY FOR APPEAL FOR INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE FOR ALL AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR AND SERVICEMEN MISSING IN ACTION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 582) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

H. CON. RES. 582

Whereas the health, safety, and well-being of every individual American serviceman is of great value and importance to this Nation; and

Whereas over 1,500 American servicemen are imprisoned by Communist forces in Southeast Asia; and

Wheras these captors have refused to identify all of these prisoners of war or servicemen missing in action or provide information as to their health and condition; and

Whereas these captors have denied these prisoners of war the right to regularly communicate by mail with their families; and

Whereas these captors have refused to permit the inspection of the facilities at which these prisoners of war are confined; and

Whereas these captors have refused to exchange or permit medical treatment of sick or wounded prisoners of war; and

Whereas the continued callous exploitation of these helpless men brings anguish and sadness, not only to the families and friends of these prisoners of war, but to compassionate people everywhere; and

Whereas the first of May of each year is recognized as a day of dedication to law and justice: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of Congress

(1) That Friday, May 1, 1970, be commemorated as a day for an appeal for international justice for all the American prisoners of war and servicemen missing in action in Southeast Asia;

(2) That men of compassion and good will throughout the world be urged to search all peaceful avenues available to insure that these men be treated humanely and fairly in accord with the standards established by the Geneva Convention;

(3) That every possible effort be made to secure their early release from captivity; and

(4) That copies of this resolution be delivered by the appropriate representatives of the United States Government to the appropriate representatives of every nation of the world.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## HUMANE TREATMENT FOR CAPTURED AMERICAN SERVICEMEN

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the reading

of the resolution has in itself told the story of the great objective which many of us throughout America are seeking; that of humane treatment for those unfortunate American servicemen who are imprisoned by Communist forces in Southeast Asia. Those who are concerned for our servicemen and their families have sought in so many ways to awaken the conscience of the Communists and to induce them to follow at least the basic rules of civilized warfare in their treatment of our servicemen. Yet all of these efforts have been unavailing.

Now we propose on Friday, May 1, 1970, which is the day dedicated to law and justice, that there be a great outpouring of interest and sympathy for our servicemen and their families at Constitution Hall in Washington, seeking again to impress upon the nations of the world America's determination to do everything within the bounds of peaceful endeavor to secure humane and fair treatment and the early release from captivity of American prisoners of war. We must arouse the conscience of the world to greater support for our missing servicemen and their families. Thus we engage in this additional effort to obtain justice, with the prayer that in some way these endeavors will penetrate to the minds and hearts of their captors.

This resolution is in support of the program which is being formulated for May 1 in Constitution Hall under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Kansas, ROBERT DOLE. Serving with him as cosponsors are six Senators and six Representatives in the House. They are: Senators PETER H. DOMINICK, BARRY GOLDWATER, MIKE MANSFIELD, GEORGE MURPHY, EDMUND S. MUSKIE, and JOHN STENNIS; Representatives W. C. DANIEL, MARTIN B. MCKNEALLY, CATHERINE MAY, RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH, ROBERT L. F. SIKES, and OLIN E. TEAGUE.

In addition, there are many others who are cosponsors of this resolution in the House. Their names will appear separately.

Now let me express my appreciation, and that of all sponsors of this resolution and that of all friends of America's missing servicemen and their families, for the outstanding cooperation given by the distinguished Speaker, and the leadership of the House on both sides of the aisle. It was with their help and cooperation that immediate consideration could be obtained for this worthy objective. I have never seen a finer evidence of helpfulness on both sides of the aisle for an important cause than has been shown by Speaker MCCORMACK and both the Democratic and the Republican leadership. America can take heart from examples like this.

Mr. Speaker, we are most grateful.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, let the record show that this resolution was adopted unanimously by those present in the House.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution just passed.

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

There was no objection.

## AUTHORITY FOR CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM SENATE AND SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

## MORE NEWS ON THE ECONOMY: ALL BAD

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

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it has just been announced that the cost-of-living index soared another one-half of 1 percent last month. This brings the rate of increase in the inflationary spiral over the last 12 months to 6.1 percent.

At the announcement of this latest erosion in the purchasing power of our income dollars the White House stated the administration found the news "rather encouraging."

Press Secretary Ronald L. Ziegler said the White House economic advisers were quick to point out that on a seasonally adjusted basis the cost of living actually increased only four-tenths of 1 percent.

This may be encouraging and good news to the White House but it should be utterly discouraging and bad news to the millions of Americans who now find that the result of this unchecked inflation is that the average private payroll worker remaining in the same job is worse off in purchasing power than he was almost 5 years ago.

I doubt also that this latest report from the Bureau of Labor Statistics is good news or encouraging to the 4.4 percent of our work force who are now unemployed, the highest unemployment level in over 4 years.

And I doubt if it is good news or encouraging to the prospective homeowner or the homebuilding industry. Increase in the cost of mortgage money accounted nationwide for 28 percent of the overall price increase during the month of March.

It certainly was not encouraging to one of the President's economic advisers, Mr. Herbert Stein, who termed the increase in the Consumer Price Index a "disappointing number."

In terms of dollars the latest report from the BLS means that it costs $13.32 today to purchase what could have been bought in 1950 for $10. And this is an average of goods and services. Many important items such as homes have become almost prohibitive.

The war in Vietnam and our overall involvement in Southeast Asia is credited as the primary cause of our inflation. Extricating ourselves from that involvement has proven no easy task.

However, when you have inflation you have to deal with it as best you can and it has become apparent that our efforts to date have not been an even qualified success.

While inflation continues the threat of recession grows larger. Take home pay is being eroded. More and more corporations and businesses are reporting losses or reduced earnings. Prices continue to rise and wages continue to chase them.

To date the administration has continued to use one primary instrument to combat inflation, high interest rates. Even though there has been a recent drop in the prime rate of one-half percent, interest rates continue at a depressing level. For almost 2 years now high interest rates have been employed as the major instrument to combat inflation. By now it should be apparent that this approach has not, is not, and probably will not provide the total effectiveness needed.

Mr. Speaker, there are other tools available to the administration. To mention just one package, the selective economic controls which were approved by the Congress last December. The administration is not powerless to adopt new measures. Measures are available.

There has been criticism from certain persons within the administration of our news media for allegedly dwelling only on the negative aspects of the news, for not reporting the news which is rosy or good. Well, no matter how gullible some Madison Avenue advisers may believe the public to be, I doubt very seriously the public would long remain silent if they had an earful of this from the evening news: "Good evening, this is Chet Huntley, NBC, New York. There is good news tonight. The cost of living has increased to an annual rate of 6.1 percent and a White House spokesman has termed this latest erosion of the purchasing power of the dollar 'rather encouraging.' "

## BASIC CHARACTERISTIC OF OUR COUNTRY

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

Mr. MCKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of the Members of the Congress an editorial which recently appeared in the Times Herald Record of Middletown, N.Y.

Because the paper is well managed and well edited, it has achieved a wide circulation which is constantly increasing. The editor of the paper, Mr. A. N. Romm,

recently set out a credo on its editorial page. It is not only worth reading but it is worth committing to memory. It sums up and defines for all of us what has been the basic characteristic of our country. We have always sought to solve our problems and achieve our progress in deliberative and in peaceful ways. Mr. Romm's credo is so sententious and well written that it is worthy of being reprinted, framed and hung on the wall of every congressional office. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Romm received first prize for distinguished editorial writing by the New York State Publishers Association for his credo. I am delighted at this opportunity to bring it to the attention of the Congress.

[From the Times Herald Record, Mar. 25, 1970]

CREDO: OF NOBLE ENDS AND IGNOBLE MEANS

EDITOR'S NOTE.—As reported elsewhere in today's Times Herald-Record, the following editorial, first published May 20, 1969, was awarded first prize for distinguished editorial writing by the New York State Publishers Association.)

Count me as a soul brother of any poor or black man outraged because his child's gullet is stuffed with promises, not food.

List me as a kindred spirit marching beside any man, be he student or adult, who cannot fathom why we began and why we yet continue to wage a war in Vietnam whose military, strategic, and moral value is dubious.

Label me an unredeemed and unrepentant liberal who shares Martin Luther King's dream of brotherhood and indulges in further visions of an educated America, a healthy America, an unpolluted America, a peaceful America, a righteous America.

But omit my name from the roll call of those who believe the better America can arise only from the rubble of a destroyed or wounded land.

DE-RADICALIZATION

If the method must be violent, if blood must flow, if rights must temporarily be laid aside, consider me de-radicalized.

I march under a different banner from all these. For method and means, fealty to due and democratic processes, must be the test of a free and just society, not its sometime handmaiden.

Offer me no substitute yardstick by which to gauge an association of free men than how that association achieves change when change is required. And it is.

Were all other nations of the world perfect in every respect, the models to which idealists in this lesser country could aspire, Valhalla on earth, and were America in a far more aggravated state of disunity and disarray, still there would exist no cause for revolution. Still could America reach her apex in orderly, evolutionary fashion, albeit at quickened tempo, for her problems are grave.

But the truth is that America, despite her imperfections, stands tall, perhaps tallest, among the great powers of recorded history in her devotion to the principles and practices of freedom, equality, and social justice.

DEMOCRATIC PROCESS

All the more reason for her citizens to "mend her every flaw" through due process, not by the sword or its latter-day equivalent, the fire bomb.

What the the ingredients of the democratic process?

We vote for those who would represent us.

Whether our men win or not, we petition the office-holders to enact the laws we favor or repeal those we don't.

We attempt to convince others of our views.

We demonstrate individually or in a body as the occasion warrants, mindful at all times of the rights of those who may disagree.

If our efforts fail through the legislative process, we do not flinch from traveling the court route. We may defy an evil law and accept the consequences, the swifter to challenge that law or test its constitutionality.

Along the way, we speak up whenever we see injustice, for to remain silent or inactive is to have committed the injustice ourselves.

These constitute the arsenal of our republic.

Those—however young, however sincere, however aggrieved—who use coercive methods, those who speak of improving the system but practice junta hooliganism, must be restrained, ever through due process, or the disease of fascism will spread and the democracy surely will collapse.

But even as we reject their unworthy methods, as we must, let us remain steadfast in pursuit—intensified pursuit—of the goals that are worthy.

CAUSE UNSULLIED

Use of extremist and ignoble tactics sullies the perpetrator, not the end he seeks. The cause, if it be of noble quality, like the quest for peace or equality, can never be tarnished.

Such causes require the unflagging devotion of men dedicated to the Constitution and to that nation whose arteries it supplies with life blood.

This I believe.

## THE HUMAN SIDE OF THE WAR

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

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, if anyone asks me why I support the President's position on troop withdrawal from Vietnam, I do not give one argument. I give 115,500 arguments. That is the number of American soldiers who have been withdrawn from Vietnam since the President began his troop withdrawal program. By spring of next year, there will be a total of 265,500 such arguments.

All other arguments—political, philosophical, historical—seem paltry compared with even the single argument of an American removed from danger. The President reminded us that when the crew of Apollo 13 was in danger the whole world offered help for their return. Our President has helped 115,500 men return from danger—he is concerned with human beings and not with rhetoric.

Two hundred and sixty-five thousand five hundred arguments such as these are proof of good policy, good planning, and great leadership.

The President himself now deserves the generous compliments of the American people, for he has followed a difficult policy in Vietnam—one which has been filled with risks as he has acknowledged. Yet, despite the lack of any cooperation from the other side, he has made that policy work. The proof of his success can be measured in objective terms—115,500 U.S. troops withdrawn in the first year and a plan to pull out another 150,000 troops over the next year.

I hope that the leaders in Hanoi were listening Monday night when President Nixon made his speech on Vietnam. And I hope they get a text of that speech and study it very carefully.

For, while the President announced his plans to withdraw another 150,000 U.S. troops in the next year, and while he spoke of our aim and desire for peace, he spoke from a remarkable position of strength.

Hanoi should not underestimate the inference.

Our training and equipping of the South Vietnamese military is going better than expected. They are more and more able to take over the fighting of the war.

Pacification is working. This means that the enemy is losing the countryside.

The President is taking risks for peace, but he warned the enemy that "they will be taking grave risks should they attempt to use the occasion to jeopardize the security of our remaining forces in Vietnam by increased military action in Vietnam, in Cambodia or in Laos."

And the President said: "We shall not be defeated in Vietnam."

President Nixon is for peace and he is taking risks for peace. The point should not be lost on Hanoi: He has no intention of ever accepting a dishonorable peace.

Listen, Hanoi.

## HUGE FARM SUBSIDY PAYMENTS

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues today some information I have just obtained which, in my view, provides a striking illustration of the reason why the Department of Agriculture has consistently opposed all meaningful efforts to eliminate the scandal of huge farm subsidy payments.

According to the Department's own tabulation, put together at my request, 46 members of the Department's Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service State committees hold interests in farms which received subsidy payments in excess of $5,000 in 1960. Whatever else these gentlemen are stabilizing and conserving, it certainly has not been Federal funds. Thirteen of them, in fact, collected over $20,000 in payments. The men in this category represent well over one-fourth of the total membership of 175.

These ASCS State committeemen are the ones Secretary Hardin relies on to manage the subsidy program in the field.

Given the makeup of these State committees and the obvious self-interest of so many members, it is not surprising that Secretary Hardin, and Secretary Freeman before him, have opposed my efforts to put an end to these large payments.

It takes little imagination to figure out what sort of advice on payment limitations the Secretaries have received from such men as William E. Young of California who collected $124,412 in subsi-

dies last year, or from Wilbur H. Wuertz of Arizona who raked in $82,479.

And the man in charge of the whole payments program here in Washington, Kenneth E. Frick, is also a beneficiary of this bonanza. In 1969 his Kenmar Farm in Arvin, Calif., collected $77,981.

This year, of course, the Secretary has finally proposed a limitation. But the levels he proposes—$110,000 per crop, or $330,000 for all three crops—would do little to disrupt the good life that these gentlemen have been living at the taxpayers' expense. More importantly, it would produce virtually no savings. In effect, the Secretary is suggesting the appearance of reform without the substance.

Mr. Speaker, as the author of amendments to place a $20,000 ceiling on total subsidy payments which have twice now passed this body, I am confident that the Secretary's ridiculously high ceiling will be rejected.

Since I intend to offer an amendment again this year—this time at a level of $10,000 per crop—I urge all of my colleagues to consider this new information, which I insert at the close of my remarks.

It provides, as I have said, new evidence that the initiative for reform of our farm subsidy program can only come from the Congress. We will not get it from the Department of Agriculture.

The list referred to follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

*State Committeemen and Payments of $5,000 or more Received under 1969 ASCS Programs. (Excluding Wool, Sugar, and Price Support Loans)*

| | |
|---|---|
| **ALABAMA** | |
| A. G. Mitchell | $9,554 |
| Lawrence G. Davis | 10,694 |
| **ARIZONA** | |
| Arden J. Palmer | 14,497 |
| Joe A. Sheely | 52,262 |
| Wilber H. Wuertz | 82,479 |
| **ARKANSAS** | |
| Aylmer L. Lowe | 13,938 |
| Lowe & Lowe, Inc. (30% of $4,646) | 1,394 |
| Claude C. Kennedy | 8,965 |
| **CALIFORNIA** | |
| Kenneth E. Frick [1]—Kenmar Farm | 77,981 |
| Everett G. Rank, Jr | 21,687 |
| William E. Young | 124,412 |
| John B. Sill—Sill Prop., Inc. (20% of $101,559) | 20,312 |
| **COLORADO** | |
| Robert B. Grauberger | 8,875 |
| **GEORGIA** | |
| Ross P. Bowen | 18,577 |
| David L. Hardegree | 9,104 |
| **IDAHO** | |
| J. Adrian Nelson (Nelson Ranch) | 8,958 |
| **ILLINOIS** | |
| Kenneth T. Benjamin | 15,230 |
| Milton M. Hartman, Jr | 6,526 |
| **INDIANA** | |
| J. D. Thompson ($8,977) (a 60% share on sister's farm, $3,409) | 12,386 |
| **KANSAS** | |
| E. R. Patton | 8,214 |
| Lavern Becker | 6,105 |
| L. Frank Boyd, Jr | 5,729 |
| **LOUISIANA** | |
| Erle M. Barham | 41,902 |
| Barham Bros. (2.9% of $105,702) | $3,065 |
| West, Inc., Leflore County, Miss. (2.9% of $138,022) | 4,003 |
| Earl A. Roque—Roque Bros. (50% of $11,929) | 5,964 |
| **MICHIGAN** | |
| Nicholas Smith—Le Grand and Nick Smith (50% of $6,613) | 3,306 |
| **MINNESOTA** | |
| Alvin Payne ($5,789 portion of Alvin Payne Agt. in Chippewa County—$17,307) | 5,789 |
| Elton Redalen | 8,315 |
| **MISSISSIPPI** | |
| W. L. Prichard | 20,842 |
| Prichard Bros. (50% of $23,377) | 11,688 |
| J. C. Sides, Jr | 9,866 |
| **MISSOURI** | |
| Barry Richardson | 27,891 |
| Grape Ridge Farms (50% of $18,349) | 9,174 |
| Richardson Gin, Inc. (50% of $3,869) | 1,943 |
| **NEBRASKA** | |
| Lowell H. Hummel—Prairie Plains Seeds | 13,331 |
| **NEW MEXICO** | |
| H. E. Gary | 20,123 |
| John R Hadley, Jr | 24,874 |
| **NORTH DAKOTA** | |
| William L. Grandy | 12,941 |
| Howard W. Hardy | 14,870 |
| Gordon Myer | 6,348 |
| **OKLAHOMA** | |
| Beatty Patterson | 17,766 |
| Bart W. Brorsen | 8,407 |
| Raymond Watson | 9,218 |
| **SOUTH CAROLINA** | |
| Leroy S. Epps, Jr. | 47,125 |
| Joseph P. Hodges | 31,094 |
| **SOUTH DAKOTA** | |
| Edwin I. Rudd | 5,343 |
| Ohmer D. Cook | 9,241 |
| **TEXAS** | |
| E. G. Schuhart II | 22,673 |
| **UTAH** | |
| Wayne I. Sandall—Wayne & Dallas Sandall (joint payment $22,765) | 11,382 |
| **VIRGINIA** | |
| Delman R. Carr | 5,725 |
| **WASHINGTON** | |
| Herb Hemingway | 16,680 |
| **WYOMING** | |
| Jack Van Mark | 8,343 |

[1] Administrator of the Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service, USDA.

## EDUCATIONAL TV AND MR. WOESTENDIEK

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

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States has expressed its concern and its support for our Nation's educational television stations in graphic terms: by voting millions of dollars for grants in order that they might continue their important functions.

I served on the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that tailored this important piece of legislation, so I feel an official as well as personal interest in the manner of the firing of a newsman, William Woestendiek, from one of these stations for a reason I consider spurious, at best—because his wife took a job the station management disapproved of.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know Mr. Woestendiek, nor have I ever had the pleasure of meeting Mrs. Kay Woestendiek, the lady whose employment has placed her husband in this situation. I might say, parenthetically, that I would look forward to meeting them with pleasure, if for no other reason than Mr. Woestendiek's reaction when he was asked to tell his wife to quit her job. He is reported to have said he would not even consider discussing it with her, and I commend him for this attitude.

For many years, Mr. Speaker, Mr. and Mrs. Mike McGee worked in my hometown for rival newspapers—he for the Commercial Appeal and she for the Memphis Press Scimitar. Throughout their careers there was never any hint that their journalistic ethics were marred by this arrangement. The same two newspapers, for years, boasted two excellent city editors, Mr. Null Adams on the Press-Scimitar and his brother, Mr. Malcolm Adams, on the Commercial Appeal. There was no compromise of journalistic integrity here.

The firing of Mr. Woestendiek transcends political party lines, Mr. Speaker. If we would believe the administrative chiefs of WETA, Mr. Woestendiek's job would have been jeopardized if his wife had gone to work for anyone in the Government, Republican or Democrat. I find their so-called sensitivity a little hard to swallow.

Is Mrs. Woestendiek, then, a chattel of WETA? Do these sensitive executives demand the right to determine suitable employment for the families of anyone on their staff? I think I know a little about newsmen, and I can warn them here and now that they would be courting full-scale mutiny if they persist in such demands.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my nature to use the Halls of Congress as a sounding board to tell private business how to run itself. But this organization is not private business; it is a nonprofit, educational television station, supported by money from tax-exempt foundations and from the U.S. Treasury, and using the airwaves that this Congress long ago decided were public property.

Other members of my committee are asking these same questions. They want to know if this policy is really a policy, or a convenient subterfuge to express disapproval toward the actions of members of the President's official family.

The entire matter, Mr. Speaker, should be looked into by the Federal Communications Commission, and I urge the FCC to be about this task immediately, because I have reason to believe that my colleague from Massachusetts, Chairman TORBERT MACDONALD, may very well want a report from the FCC before his Subcommittee on Communications.

If, indeed, Mr. Woestendiek was fired for the reasons stated, then WETA's officialdom was guilty of the most haphazard kind of overreacting. I was caught by the editorial in the Washington Post Monday, which reminded us all of James

Thurber's famous moral that "you might as well fall on your face as lean over too far backward."

## COUNTRY NEEDS A JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON PEACE

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, one of our great generals, Douglas MacArthur, proposed 15 years ago in a speech at Los Angeles that the United States proclaim its readiness to abolish war in concert with other powers of the world.

George Catlett Marshall, an American military hero and former Secretary of State, said:

> If man does find the solution for world peace it will be the most revolutionary reversal of his record we have ever known.

These two men of war—and of peace—presented our generation a bold challenge to find a way for men to live in peace.

Our Nation and the world need fresh and sound ideas to help find new ways toward peace on earth. The difficulty of the task should not deter us. War today is a bizarre intrusion from the past, truly anachronistic.

I am introducing legislation which would assist in our country's pursuit of mankind's biggest challenge—to achieve and maintain peace. It would establish a Joint Committee on Peace.

Congress has scores of committees on many matters. Among the important ones are the "Atomic Energy" and "Economic" Committees. Also there are such joint committees as the Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers and the one for the Library. Surely, we could use one on the quest for peace. Millions of hours are spent by Congressmen on an almost infinite variety of investigations and studies. It is time now for Congress to spend a greater degree of time and energy in the quest for peace.

We are living today in an atmosphere that is primed and conducive to world peace. The recent remarks by the United Nations Soviet Delegate Yakov A. Malik that a new Geneva conference could bring about "a fresh solution and a relaxation of tension on the Indo-China peninsula" is indicative of perhaps a renewed effort to halt the war in Southeast Asia.

Of importance also, are the second round of strategic arms limitation talks, SALT, now going on between Russia and America in Vienna. The development of the atom bomb and nuclear weapons have required us to at least talk to our enemies.

A third point to mention is the President's announcement this week that 150,000 men will be withdrawn from Vietnam fighting. While he made this declaration of withdrawal—despite any progress at the Paris peace talks—he also had this to say:

> But I again remind the leaders of North Vietnam that while we are taking these risks for peace, they will be taking grave risks should they attempt to use the occasion to jeopardize the security of our remaining forces in Vietnam by increased military action in Vietnam, in Cambodia or in Laos.
>
> I repeat what I said November third and December fifteenth. If I conclude that increased enemy action jeopardizes our remaining force in Vietnam, I shall not hesitate to take strong and effective measures to deal with that situation.

These are complicated and perilous times. While we have a signal from the Russians that they are willing to cooperate in bringing the Vietnam war to a conclusion and we are discussing with them ways to halt the arms race and the President is trying to grind down the conflict in Southeast Asia, there are still belligerent situations through the world we must cope with and find peaceful answers to. Somehow, we must seek also a lasting peace with China.

A Joint Committee on Peace would be a vehicle to study and consider these grave problems and when proper, to keep them before the public, and thus provide possible answers to peace.

For over a decade I have sponsored and worked for a U.S. Agency for World Peace within the Department of State—H.R. 949 now pending in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. As a matter of fact, I was the first Member of Congress to introduce a bill to establish a Peace Agency, January 6, 1960, which led to the statutory establishment of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in 1961.

While the idea for a further extension of this law, concentrating on peace and research to achieve peace, has been favorably received by the executive agencies involved no support for H.R. 949 has been forthcoming. I quote from a letter from the Secretary of State in the report on H.R. 949:

> The objective of H.R. 949—the achievement of a peaceful world—deserves the full support of the Department of State and the several other agencies of the U.S. Government which are actively and continuously working to foster peace throughout the world and to change or to prevent conditions which might lead to war.
>
> Rather than establish a new agency, however, the State Department is convinced that the objective of the bill can be carried out more effectively through continued collaboration between the agencies already heavily committed to research leading toward a more peaceful world. These include not only such foreign affairs agencies as the State Department, Defense Department, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, United States Information Agency, Agency for International Development, and the Peace Corps, but also the Department of Agriculture, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
>
> The diversity of research approaches among these agencies is of real value in the U.S. Government's search for ways of strengthening world peace. Concentration of all such research in one agency might be less effective in achieving the objective of this bill. Current efforts are proceeding on a broad and comprehensive basis. To concentrate all efforts in one agency could be self-defeating, in that it might limit the breadth of interpretation and even diminish the soundness of the research process and conclusions.

There is executive enthusiasm for the basic purposes of H.R. 949, but none for a new agency in the State Department or for a new department of peace.

The challenges for world peace are, however, of such magnitude we in the Congress should spotlight these challenges. We can do this with a Joint Committee on Peace.

The committee would not establish policy, but would do research on problems related to achieving peace, including an examination of the economic, political, and sociological causes of war and the development of techniques for the elimination or reduction of these causes.

Research on peace would be conducted by the committee and its staff—and I do not envision a large staff, but one composed of experts—similar to that of "war gaming" done by military specialists.

Five Senate and five House Members would make up the committee and they would be required to report to the Congress on activities in the field of peacefinding and peacekeeping. This would not be a legislative committee, but would be a study and oversight committee. Government agencies, concerned with peace, including the Departments of Defense and State, would be required to report to the committee in the field of the committee's inquiries. The committee could also receive suggestions from the general public, thus assuring consideration of every valuable suggestion made in the public area.

As a senior Member of the House Armed Services Committee, I know that the survival of our Nation is our most important goal. But I believe we sometimes overlook the prime target—peace.

The establishment of a Joint Committee on Peace might mean the difference between world progress and world oblivion.

Theodore Roosevelt said almost seven decades ago: "Speak softly and carry a big stick; you will go far." He challenged our Nation to have a strong national defense to support our efforts for world peace and freedom for all people.

I believe in a strong national defense. I also believe we need a Joint Committee on Peace, and I hope Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate will join me in this effort.

A copy of the bill follows:

H.J. RES. 1184

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* that there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Peace to be composed of five Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each instance not more than three Members shall be members of the same political party.

SEC. 2. The Joint Committee shall make continuing studies of ways to achieve world peace. The several departments and agencies of the federal government concerned with keeping and maintaining peace including the Departments of Defense and State shall keep the Joint Committee fully and currently informed. Any Government agency shall furnish any information requested by the Joint Committee with respect to the activities or responsibilities of that agency in the field of peace. The members of the Joint Committee who are Members of the Senate shall no less than annually report to the Senate, and the members of the Joint Committee who are

Members of the House of Representatives shall no less than annually report to the House.

SEC. 3. Vacancies in the membership of the Joint Committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the Joint Committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The Joint Committee shall select a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members at the beginning of each Congress. The Vice Chairman shall act in the place and stead of the Chairman in the absence of the Chairman. The Chairmanship shall alternate between the Senate and the House of Representatives with each Congress, and the Chairman shall be selected by the Members from that House entitled to the Chairmanship. The Vice Chairman shall be chosen from the House other than that of the Chairman by the Members from that House.

SEC. 4. In carrying out its duties under this Act, the Joint Committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings or investigations, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The Joint Committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedures as it deems necessary: Provided, however, That no measure or recommendation shall be reported from the Joint Committee unless a majority of the committee assent. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the Chairman of the Joint Committee or by any members designated by him or by the Joint Committee, and may be served by such person or persons as may be designated by such Chairman or member. The Chairman of the Joint Committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. The expenses of the Joint Committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives and one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers signed by the Chairman or Cochairman of the Committee.

SEC. 5. To enable the committee to exercise its powers, functions, and duties under this joint resolution, there are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives on vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman of the committee.

SEC. 6. The Joint Committee may classify information originating within the committee in accordance with standards used generally by the executive branch for classifying restricted data or defense information.

SEC. 7. The Joint Committee shall keep a complete record of all committee actions, including a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded. All committee records, data, charts, and files shall be the property of the Joint Committee and shall be kept in the offices of the Joint Committee or other places as the Joint Committee may direct under such security safeguards as the Joint Committee shall determine in the interest of security.

## MASTON O'NEAL HAS SERVED NATION WITH DISTINCTION

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

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, during the nearly 7½ years I have been privileged to serve in the Congress, I have known many fine men. But I can say in all truth that of all those men, there is none finer nor more gentlemanly than our colleague from Georgia, MASTON O'NEAL.

Monday he announced that he would not seek election to a fourth term. I know that all Members of the House were deeply sorry to learn that a heart condition has developed which led him to this personal decision. I feel that Congress and the Nation will be poorer when he leaves active service in these Halls.

MASTON O'NEAL is that rare individual who is beloved by all who come in contact with him. Quiet and courtly, he gets things done without fanfare and few men have the real friends and respect that he has within the House.

For 24 years he served as a district attorney and will complete 6 years of service in the Congress at the end of this year. We share adjoining offices in the Cannon Building as well as having adjoining congressional districts in our respective States of Georgia and Florida. From that association has come a warm personal friendship as well as a genuine feeling of respect for a fine gentleman on the part of myself and my staff.

Particularly would I say a word about Mrs. O'Neal, a lady of grace and charm who has been his guide and inspiration and has been very helpful to him in his political career.

The O'Neals are the loving parents of two fine children, Mrs. Susan Charlotte Bowden and Air Force Capt. Maston Emmett O'Neal III. Without question, their greatest pride is in their grandchildren.

Captain O'Neal is an outstanding officer and pilot in the U.S. Air Force, having served in the Vietnam conflict. He carries on a military tradition established by his father who served in the Navy during World War II.

Following his election to the 89th Congress, MASTON O'NEAL so proved himself to those he has represented that they have returned him to Congress twice without opposition.

I know that I speak for all of the Members of the Congress when I say that we will be losing one of our most beloved Members when MASTON O'NEAL ends his career of public service. But I can say also that this Nation, the State of Georgia and the people of his district are richer for his having served.

## EARTH DAY

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, as a young man I was a teacher of history and civics at Harper High School in Chicago. I have often thought back on those days and reflected, as have all teachers, how much I learned from my students. They contributed much to my thinking and to my own personal development.

Today's students, Mr. Speaker, are a bit more controversial than those I taught back in the 1940's. Their activism and excesses at times have prompted harsh words in reaction in this very chamber. Many criticisms were leveled at them; yet, yesterday, April 22, we witnessed one of the most responsible and mature endeavors ever undertaken by the youth of this country.

At over 2,000 colleges and universities and 10,000 high schools throughout the country, activities were sponsored on April 22 in observance of Earth Day. This effort is unique in our history, and indeed, in the history of the world, because never before in the millions of years that man has existed on this planet has a society done what we in America have done. Never before has man so organized his endeavors to produce such wealth for the vast majority of a country's citizens. Yet, we have paid a dear price in the process, for we are fast running out of clean land, clean air, clean water.

Look at Lake Erie with its slimy shores and wasted waters, supporting ever fewer forms of higher life. Stand on a hill surmounting one of our major cities and watch the mustard-colored haze drifting into every corner—and every lung. Visit the inner cities and see the bleakness of the streets, the despair in the faces.

These are the events that were commemorated yesterday, Earth Day, and during this week, Earth Week. The young people of our land are calling to our attention what it was that we gave up to obtain that extra kitchen appliance, that air conditioner, that last hundred horsepower in our automobiles. They are pointing out the degradation the land and the people have suffered. That it was done by and large unwittingly does not make more tolerable the dirt and waste prevalent today.

Our manufacturers and industrialists are not to be blamed alone, for they merely supplied what the people asked for. There is guilt enough for all. If our garbage dumps and landfills are overburdened it is because every one of us preferred throw-away containers to returnable bottles, and bought the flashy overpackaged product instead of the simpler, utilitarian carton.

Without some incentive to do otherwise we will probably do the same tomorrow and let the earth and our descendants bear the load. The businessman's profit is measured in dollars, the housewife's in time saved and in "convenience." And whether or not we know it, all of us help pay the price. We pay for the fancy package when we buy the product, we clean up after the litterbug with increased taxes, and we amortize the cost of the belching smokestack with years off our lives.

All of us carry a great responsibility, Mr. Speaker. It is within our power to reduce these ravages on our environment and to bring to manageable terms the wastes, solid and fluid, of our daily lives. I, and others in this Chamber, have in the past supported the Water Quality Act, the Clean Air Act, the Water Pollution Control Act, the Environmental Policy Act, and other landmark legislation designed to control pollution, and yet, pollution of our environment continues. Much remains to be done, and it is truly an awesome task we face.

The demonstrations that took place on Earth Day expressed the hope that survival and improvement are still possible. I salute and congratulate all those who yesterday brought this hope to the attention of the Nation, and join my colleagues in the Congress in redoubling our efforts to solve the environmental crisis.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I would like to include an article by Colman McCarthy entitled "Hard Facts About Dirty Facts" which appeared in the Washington Post on April 22. The article, which is a cogent analysis of the environmental problems that confront us, follows:

HARD FACTS ABOUT DIRTY FACTS

(By Colman McCarthy)

After tons of adjectives and the legwork of a thousand advance men, today sees the arrival of Earth Day—so named because a few earth people are beginning to worry. The basic dread is simple: the dirt and waste is everywhere, we are running low on—if not out of—clean land, air and water, and nobody gets a transfer when the planet stalls in mid-air. Naturalists, lecturers and the inevitable me-too politicians speaking at hundreds of colleges and high schools will tell the young what most of them know and have heard a hundred times already.

The purpose of Earth Day is to prod each group to work out a strategy for earth-improvement—or what is now called, strenuously, ecotactics. Many will organize to change local pro-pollution laws, or perhaps unite behind an earth-minded politician, or boycott the one-way cans and bottles, or—hardest of all—begin taking personal responsibility for conserving things like water, fossil fuels and life itself.

Trying to end the evil of pollution may meet many of the frustrations found earlier in the civil rights and antiwar movements: first, like racism and war, pollution has been going on unquestioned so long that suddenly putting on the brakes is more an act of alarm than actual stopping—the way a speeding car needs over 400 feet of braking before forward motion is killed. Second, ending pollution means that somebody will get hurt: profits must be cut, comforts reduced, sacrifices endured. As in all human struggles, the powerful and monied will fight the hardest to be hurt the least.

Few politicians, and certainly not a Republican President with re-election already on his mind, are talking up these hard facts about the dirty facts. Instead, anti-pollution is often presented as a warm puppy issue, assuring happiness to anyone opposing a befouled environment. If we pass enough laws, says the delusion, spend some money and have a good heart, well, it will soon be America the Beautiful again.

Just how fast the pollution wheels have been speeding along, and how many decades if not centuries will be needed before they may stop, is shown by the almost countless laws on the books forbidding pollution: the Water Quality Act, the Clean Air Act, the Water Pollution Control Act, the Environmental Policy Act, to name a few. Yet, the air, land and water continue to blacken. The "laws" have been ignored by large corporations and small companies, many of them cheered on, if not whipped on, by the stockholders. But the industries were only committing the kind of ecological murder the federal and state agencies let them get away with. It is almost as if the Interior Department, Agriculture, the FTC, the FDA and the many state and local conservation bureaus were listening to Ford Motor Company president Arjay Miller, who warned in 1967 of the "threat of over-regulation by government" regarding pollution. That remark was made when pollution was still a quiet issue.

A second reason why destruction of the earth will not stop instantly is that the needs of the public will not instantly slacken. The opposite seems true. American homes are now so filled to the roof with appliances, machines, devices and gizmos that the demand for electricity to run them all is insatiable.

The electric companies, far from being profit-mongers, argue that nuclear power plants must be built to supply the public. But each plant needs millions of gallons of water to cool the machinery. The used water is then flushed into a lake or river at an increased temperature that kills the fish and unbalances the ecology.

What does the public want? More contraptions in its homes or clean lakes and rivers outdoors?

The choice is everywhere. Phosphates in detergents—such as Axion, Bold, Cheer, Fab, Oxydol, Tide, Trend—have been ruining our lakes and rivers, according to the House Committee on Government Operations and anyone able to see or smell. But the heavy duty soaps clean clothes fresher and brighter, and everyone, except some of our younger people, wants that. Moreover, according to the Soap and Detergent Association, eliminating phosphates "would be equivalent to setting back health, cleanliness and sanitation standards many years."

Despite the industry's talk about impending disease and pestilence, a choice is present: weaker soaps or cleaner lakes and rivers. But is there a choice? The industry swears that no replacement for phosphates is now possible; since the Interior Department is hesitant to force the manufacturers to change (Interior has funded only one study, for only $99,000, on the idea of removing phosphates from the detergents), the public has the choice made for it: rivers and lakes that are dirty today and dirtier tomorrow.

The question—who gets hurt the most in cleaning up?—easily wins the Rhetorical Question of the Century contest. The consumer, who else? Fortune magazine recently asked business leaders for ideas on solving the ecology mess. Over half—57 per cent—said the government should offer industry tax relief for combat duty in fighting pollution. "This would mean," writes Michael Harrington in the current Commonweal, "that the biggest polluters, with the greatest problems, would get the largest subsidies. It would, in effect, reward those who have befouled the atmosphere. And it would, like all other tax expenditures for the private sector, take money away from social uses."

In case tax money is not about to be forked over, a few industries are telling the public outright that the latter must pay. Prices will be raised $100, for example, on new GM cars for anti-smoke devices. At this point, the temptation is to condemn the captains of industry and their corporals at the local outlet. But this is simple-minded. Naturally, industry is going to make the public pay. American business has worked hard and long to supply the public with the services, goods and technology it seemed to want. The individual consumer never asked for products that didn't pollute; instead, as in the case of cars, he said, "Make them flashy, fast and powerful." Detroit did. Now, the public suddenly wants its cars clean as well. "That's fine with us," says Detroit, but be prepared to pay for this latest whim the way you wanted and paid for the old whims.

At the base of the environmental crisis, two general theories of man are whirling. The first, from philosopher Alfred North Whitehead and popularized by Teilhard, holds that the creation of the world is still ongoing. The current mire in population should not discourage—it is only a venial lapse caused by the giddiness of progress. We'll snap to soon, and be swept up in what Teilhard calls "an irresistible tide of liberated energies."

The second theory is from Freud who claimed that man has an "innate inclination toward evil, toward aggression, destruction, and . . . toward cruelty."

The question raised by an earth suddenly turned cesspool, after millions of years of grace and purity, is forcing a definition of man: is he a co-creator or a violent destroyer? The hope of Earth Day is that we are the former, that survival, even self-improvement, is still possible. But even here the evidence is mixed. The very signs, posters, buttons and pictures used to dramatize April 22 will become tomorrow just more piles of junk and garbage to be hauled off to the burning ground—as much a pollutant to the air and earth as any Detroit smokewagon guaranteed to be damned more than once today.

---

## IMPORTANT ANTIPOLLUTION PACKAGE

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

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the major causes of air pollution is the automobile. Because of my great concern for this problem, which is rapidly increasing in almost uncontrollable proportions, I am joining with several other of my concerned colleagues in sponsoring an important air pollution package.

This is an antipollution package of quality and substance—a concrete and realistic appraisal of the problem with viable and workable solutions. I commend my colleagues for their foresight in comprehending the problem of automotive air pollution, for the timeliness of their presentation, for their awareness of the hazards of this situation, and for their thoroughness in attacking and attempting to resolve this problem. I am happy to associate myself with this effort.

The time has come when we must begin to realistically face the problem of air pollution. The simple fact is that our environment is in grave danger. The air we breathe is impure—and this is unhealthy, a threat to life. If allowed to go unchecked, this situation is going to cause enormous and hazardous consequences for the future. There is evidence today of the seriousness of this situation. In my own State of California, the problem of air pollution resulting from automobile emissions is critical. In the city of Los Angeles, there have been instances where schoolchildren have been prohibited from outdoor recess because smog levels were so high. The policy now in Los Angeles school districts is that during high frequency smog levels, children are permitted outside only 1 hour every 3 days. Incidences of lung cancer and emphysema have increased and are reportedly attributed to air pollution, and people have died with lung conditions aggravated by impure air.

This is somewhat absurd and incredible, but these are the facts. The situation in California is paralleled in New York, where extensive congressional hearings were held which resulted in this action we are taking today. All metropolitan centers in this country are fast falling victim to the dangers of automotive air pollution. This package we are considering today recognizes these facts and provides for a program to deal with all aspects of the problem.

The package attacks the problem by establishing strict Federal auto emission standards based on the cleanest feasible propulsion system; it calls for the elimination of the internal combustion engine in automobiles by 1975 and for the

installation of emission control devices on all used cars by 1972; the time limits are a positive insurance of action and action now. The package also provides for federally conducted assembly line and follow-up inspections to assure that standards are being met and kept.

The enforcement aspects of this program are sound and viable—Federal inspections will guarantee adherence to standards; and owners and purchasers of high horsepower cars, which cause greater pollution levels, will be assessed a higher auto excise tax.

The package goes further than regulating type of engine and emission control devices by banning leaded gasoline and calling for the regulation of rubber and asbestos emission. Current Federal law and research efforts consider only three of the six major automotive pollutants—carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, oxides of nitrogen; lead, rubber and asbestos are equally as dangerous and causative of pollution in the air. A report prepared for the National Air Pollution Control Administration at HEW noted that asbestos—emitted from clutch and brake lining—is an "air pollutant which carries with it the potential for a national epidemic of lung cancer." The auto industry's research into this area is practically negligible.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to give careful and thoughtful consideration to this matter. It is a problem with complex and frightening consequences for the entire human race. We all have what we might consider more important issues to contend with, but I ask with all sincerity what could be more important than an existing condition which threatens the existence of life itself?

## STRATEGY MYTH BELIED

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

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, sometimes, amid the loud cries from President Nixon's critics in the press and elsewhere, it is difficult to hear the facts about the progress this administration has made and is continuing to make in the perplexing problems facing our Nation.

Fortunately, there are voices of reason which sometimes rise above the clamor, to put the issues in their true perspective. One such voice was recently heard in an editorial from the Portland Oregonian, discussing the President's recent speech on desegregation and the followup to that speech seen in Secretary Finch's press conference and Federal court decisions regarding integration.

Perhaps the most significant thing about this editorial, however, Mr. Speaker, is the citing of specific statistics which indicate clearly that the Nixon administration has made great strides in bringing about integration of southern schools. These facts demonstrate the promise offered by Secretary Finch's statement that by next year, 80 percent of the South's Negro children will be in desegregated schools. I ask to insert this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Portland Oregonian, Apr. 8, 1970]

STRATEGY MYTH BELIED

HEW Secretary Robert H. Finch's press conference statements Tuesday should dispel any lingering doubt that the Nixon Administration is dragging its feet on racial desegregation in the schools. Secretary Finch echoed President Nixon's commitment to the elimination—through both court suits and administrative action—of law-imposed segregation. His appearance coincided with a federal court order's prevalance over the opposition of Gov. Claude Kirk to a plan for federally-imposed integration in a Florida county's schools.

Mr. Finch put it on the line. He set a goal for next fall of doubling the number of black students in desegregated schools in the South. In the first year of the Nixon Administration, that number has doubled from 600,000 to 1.2 million. The Finch projection would put the total at 2.4 million in the next year, or about 80 per cent of the South's Negro children.

That is the sort of progress unmatched by any previous administration. It reflects the success of major desegregation accomplishments already this year over the racist rhetorical opposition of southern governors and other public officials. Here is a part of this year's score:

In Louisiana, an estimated 225,000 more black pupils put in desegregated schools since the beginning of the year, doubling the number placed in integrated classrooms in Louisiana in the entire 15-year period after the initial Supreme Court school integration decision.

In Atlanta, Ga., school faculty desegregated, involving transfers of 40 per cent of Atlanta teachers, despite opposition of Gov. Lester Maddox and little community support.

In Jackson, Miss., successful integration of some 20,000 children despite the vigorous opposition of Gov. John Bell Williams.

Congress, too, has caught the spirit of accelerated desegregation, having rejected crippling amendments to legislation introduced by southern congressmen and supported by some congressmen of other regions.

Similar extensive progress in the elimination of de facto segregation established by housing patterns will be complicated. But it will surely follow, with each community taking its own tack, as in the case of the decentralization of Portland's school system.

However, events of the last few months have clearly belied the contentions of some critics of the Nixon Administration that it was following a "southern strategy" in soft-pedalling desegregation. The pedals have never before been operated with such effect.

## GILBERT ENDORSES EARTH DAY

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

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was, of course, Earth Day. Conceived by our youth, sponsored for the most part by young people, Earth Day has suddenly come to symbolize all that is wrong with our world.

We need not look far beyond this chamber to see the ills that so concern youth today. Only blocks away we have ghetto areas; less than a mile away the polluted and rank Potomac River flows.

At rush hour Constitution Avenue going by the Capitol will be bumper to bumper with automobiles emitting noxious fumes. No one does not have to go far to find out what bothers our young people today.

The wonder is then, Mr. Speaker, why the Congress in its wisdom has not also become so concerned. We do pass laws but we extract the muscle from them at the same time. We sign resolutions but resign ourselves to pollution. Cannot the Congress learn a few wisdoms from these youngsters who preach neither hate nor love but simple survival?

We must not be afraid to lead occasionally. If we are so subtly attuned to political nuances as our critics claim, does it not seem significant that Earth Day itself, unknown just a year ago, has become so imbedded in the mind of the public at large today? I think that should tell us something of what the people of this Nation are demanding.

They want their air fit to breathe, their water pure enough to drink. They want an end to murky waters and fish unfit to eat. They want the noise levels tolerable, the byways unlittered, the ghettos eradicated.

I salute the young men and women who have made this day possible. And I pray that all of us in Congress do not end this year without some affirmative response to this call from our Nation.

We possess no convenient excuse for not responding. In fact, we as a body owe the Nation a deep apology for allowing matters to degenerate to where they stand today.

I would ask today that those committee chairmen who have environmental projects before them immediately convene hearings to determine how to improve those areas under their jurisdiction. We cannot longer accept a project because it will cause only minimal destruction. We must, from this day forward, concern ourselves with how to improve what we have allowed to be damaged.

We all recognize that the pressures that come from groups which are more concerned with profit than with purity. Appealing to man's better nature has never been successful by itself. It is time, however, to realize that profit cannot come if the Nation's very existence is in jeopardy. If we make it profitable to care about environment and expensive to abuse it, the Congress will have gone a long way toward redeeming itself in the eyes of the American people.

## McCULLOCH MOVES TO SAVE THE "QUEEN"

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

Mr. MCCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation supported by Senator SAXBE and cosponsored by Congressmen ROBERT A. TAFT, JR., of Cincinnati, WILLIAM H. HARSHA, of Portsmouth, and CLARENCE E. MILLER, of Lancaster, that would preserve the last page of America's 160-year-old riverboat history. My reference, Mr. Speaker, is to the only overnight passenger steamer in America—the *Delta Queen*. She is the

last paddle wheel steamboat authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission to carry overnight passengers, certificated and regularly inspected by the U.S. Coast Guard.

This vessel has a steel hull and a superstructure largely of mahogany, ironwood, and walnut. Because of this wood construction, the *Delta Queen* cannot meet modern steel ship building requirements and was therefore to be retired from service in 1968. However, by act of Congress—Public Law 90-435—the *Delta Queen* was permitted to operate until November 2, 1970. Unless this Congress acts, another of our great American traditions will have passed from the scene.

The law that would retire the *Delta Queen* was enacted in 1966 to rid the seas of unsafe ships and to insure the financial responsibility of the carriers calling at U.S. ports. Inadvertently, it seems, that this legislation was made broad enough to encompass passenger vessels carrying overnight passengers operating on our inland rivers. For the purpose of safety standards, the *Queen* was placed in the same category as deep-draft vessels traveling on the high seas. Unless this Congress intervenes 160 years of paddle wheel history will end November 2, 1970.

Originally designed and built in 1926, the *Delta Queen* is the most luxurious paddle wheel passenger boat ever built and also the safest. Every compartment and public room is equipped with automatic sprinklers and other safety devices such as fire extinguishers, fire hydrants, fire alarms, and emergency tools that are strategically located throughout the vessel. Unlike ocean vessels, most of the *Queen's* staterooms open directly onto the outside deck. There are no enclosed corridors where passengers or crew could be trapped.

I believe that the Congress has the duty, indeed the responsibility to look into this type of small business which has become all but extinct. It hardly need be said that the riverboat business is not what it was 50 years ago when hundreds of vessels, similar to the *Delta Queen*, plied the same trade routes. However, many Americans have discovered that riding on a riverboat can be a most satisfactory experience. Mark Twain said it this way:

> One cannot see too many summer sunrises on the Mississippi. They are enchanting. First there is the eloquence of silence; for a deep hush broods everywhere. Next there is the haunting sense of loneliness, isolation, remoteness from the worry and hustle of the world. . . . And all this stretch of river is a mirror, and you have the shadowy reflections of the leafage and the curving shores and the receding capes pictured in it. Well, that is all beautiful; soft and rich and beautiful; and . . . you grant that you have seen something that is worth remembering.

The legislation that has doomed the *Queen* was passed in 1966. Since that time, the owners of the vessel sought successfully two extensions of time in order to permit them to design and construct a duplicate of the *Delta Queen*. To their dismay and to the dismay of many, the owners and operators of the *Queen* learned that with the rise in the cost of construction, material, and labor under competitive bidding, a new vessel to replace the original *Queen* would cost in excess of $10,000,000 instead of the estimated $4,000,000 to $6,000,000. This new dollar figure is believed by all to be prohibitive for such a small business as Greene Line Steamers, Inc.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, enactment of my bill would have an important positive effect on the long-range economies of our river system. Mr. Speaker, I predict that passage of this legislation will encourage and make possible the expansion of scenic river travel in the United States.

Presently, by act of Congress, the *Delta Queen* is categorized with ocean-going vessels. I think she and others like her should be distinguished from that class and should be exempted. The *Queen*, for example, only travels the rivers: the beautiful Ohio, the scenic and historic Mississippi and Tennessee. For 9 months of the year she travels our western river system—from St. Paul in the North to New Orleans in the South, from Pittsburgh in the East and to the Gate of the West—St. Louis, touching ports in 16 States.

The *Delta Queen* is never more than a few yards from any shore and should an emergency arise, all the captain need do would be to hit the rudder and she could be run aground probably before the lifeboats hit the water.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the *Delta Queen* presently meets certain Coast Guard safety standards and I think it should be noted that the waters in which she travels is no deeper, at its deepest point, than her middle deck. For these reasons I believe this type of watercraft is very much distinguishable from those ocean going vessels which the 1966 legislation sought to regulate for greater safety of life on the high seas.

I am sure that many of my constituents along with people from around the State of Ohio, as well as citizens from other river States across the Nation, do not want to see the cessation of this great tradition by legislation that is primarily intended to rid the high seas of unsafe ocean-going ships.

---

## WILLIAM T. EVJUE, 1882–1970, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER OF THE CAPITAL TIMES DAILY NEWSPAPER, MADISON, WIS.

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the Members of the House the death of William T. Evjue, editor and publisher of the Capital Times daily newspaper in Madison, Wis. I am certain that all of my colleagues who knew him or knew of him will join me in this tribute to a crusading newspaperman and humanitarian.

In the development of a community, a State, and a great Nation, a voice of conscience is needed to protect the less powerful from abuse and misuse. A voice of sensitivity, a voice of courage, and a voice of commitment to the ideal that no man's rights as a citizen of this country can be blotted out by those who temporarily grasp the levers of political and economic power.

Wisconsin and the entire Nation have been the benefactors of such a voice for the last 53 years. Although death has now silenced that voice, William T. Evjue has established a record of humanitarianism and journalistic excellence that will serve as a benchmark for all who follow.

When he published the first edition of the Capital Times on December 12, 1917, he protested the suppression of dissent from a war to make the world safe for democracy. The words of that early protest and the publisher who had the courage to print them are even more relevant today. For today, we are again waging a battle for the right to dissent and for the cause of a peaceful world.

During Mr. Evjue's 53 years as editor and publisher of the Capital Times, he possessed an unchanging commitment to the principle of human dignity. The controversies which he engendered gave him the will to meet other controveries, and to emerge from each conflict with renewed strength. Unlike some newspaper editors, he did not tie his publication to the pursuit of blandness—he did not allow his voice to grow old and dull.

What made Mr. Evjue's newspaper unique was his refusal to withdraw quietly from the rough and tumble arena of public events—to print only that news which pleased his news sources, his advertisers and his readers. While every reader may not have always agreed with what Mr. Evjue printed, no amount of pressure compromised his views of the public good.

It was this unswerving loyalty to a principle that led him to support Republicans, Democrats, Progressives and Socialists. It is the test he used when he launched his campaign against secrecy in government, special privilege, corruption, gambling and bigotry. He supported Al Smith, the Democrat and Catholic, for the same reason he supported Robert LaFollette, the Republican and Protestant. He fought the Ku Klux Klan for the same reason he fought McCarthyism. He fought the Communists for the same reason he fought Fascists—because they opposed free men.

From his earliest campaigns against those who profiteered from war to his most recent opposition to the bottomless pit of the Vietnam conflict, Mr. Evjue supported the pursuit of peace. However, he was not a pacifist. He supported the war against fascism in World War II. He supported the war against aggression in Korea. But he opposed the war in Vietnam, because he believed it serves the cause of our antagonists and is sustained by policies inspired by the "industrial-military" complex of this country.

After his early years as a crusader in the Nation's and Wisconsin's capitals, he had ample laurels to rest upon if he so chose. Yet, to the last days, Mr. Evjue

maintained his belief in equality and his determination to ferret out corruption. He was well aware that the voice of special interest is often louder and heard more distinctly than that of the average citizen. Mr. Evjue's voice was heard whenever the public's rights were abrogated. It is easy to look back over the past half century and pause to recall the battles he has fought, and the frustration of those who thought they could silence him.

A little more than a year after he founded the Capital Times, Mr. Evjue wrote:

> We have tried to stand for interests of the common man. We have tried to tell the truth about things. We have fought privilege. We have fought exploitation at the hands of interests that prey on the public.

The most remarkable thing about his statement is that for 53 years he lived that philosophy and kept his pledge to his readers. The unique role which he played in American journalism will be recorded by history. The lessons which his life has taught will be emulated by other newspapermen who follow.

Although death has removed Mr. Evjue from the American journalism scene, his ideals still live.

---

## NATIONAL OBSERVANCE EACH YEAR OF THIRD WEDNESDAY OF APRIL AS EARTH DAY

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in the name of progress, we have wrought tragic wrongs on this planet we inhabit. Man's race toward self-destruction in his quest for the necessities of life must halt.

On Earth Day we were all talking about "the same old garbage." It is everywhere we look. Our advanced technology has moved forward helter-skelter with little thought of its total effect on the environment.

The full extent of the damage we are doing to our environment and our course of seeming self-destruction have been forcefully brought to our attention. The impact of this realization has brought about a recognition of the factors which we have come to accept as "every day" but which are extremely detrimental to all aspects of our ecology. Our continued advances in technology can no longer be accepted without a forethought to the consequences to do so may very well be our undoing.

The overwhelming response of the entire Nation to Earth Day, 1970, indicates to me the keen awareness of the American people for the need to improve the quality of our environment. More importantly, it indicates a national commitment to do something about it. But Earth Day will have been meaningless, if, having been celebrated on April 22, it is then promptly forgotten. We must make Earth Day an everyday occurrence.

One of the most interesting observations I have read in the recent proliferation of material about the decay of our environment was made by Jerry Yudelson of the Cal Tech Environmental Action Council and quoted in an article by Connie Flateboe in the March issue of the Sierra Club Bulletin. Mr. Yudelson observed:

> Ecology is as much an attitude toward life as a science. Changing personal attitudes about the environment is as important in the long run as passing laws or developing new technologies for environmental control.

Stated in another way, the individual is the key to resolving the environmental crisis. If he is not willing to pay the price—and it is a price not measured in dollars alone—then the fight for a clean environment is foredoomed to failure.

In my judgment, an annual observance of Earth Day would serve to renew each individual American's commitment to the antipollution effort and allow us to review what progress has taken place and determine what efforts remain to be taken during the following year.

I am today, therefore, introducing a resolution to authorize the President to designate the third Wednesday of April of each year as Earth Day. The text of my resolution follows:

H.J. RES. 1185

A joint resolution designating the third Wednesday of April of each year as Earth Day

Whereas, the overwhelming response of the entire nation to Earth Day, 1970, indicates the keen awareness of the American people for the need to improve the quality of the environment, and

Whereas, this need has national and international import; and

Whereas, this need is a continuing one and should be constantly reviewed to determine what progress has taken place and what efforts remain to be taken during the following year; and

Whereas, such an annual day of observance would serve to renew each individual American's commitment to the anti-pollution effort: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the third Wednesday of April of each year is designated as "Earth Day," a day to renew each individual American's commitment to the anti-pollution effort. The President is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate activities.

An annual reappraisal of our course, our efforts, and our progress would be extremely beneficial, and I urge favorable consideration of my proposal at an early date.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the counties in my district in south Florida planned a very active part in yesterday's observance. The following news articles from the South Dade News Leader and the Key West Citizen outline the programs organized in Dade and Monroe Counties:

[From the South Dade (Fla.) News Leader, April 15, 1970]

DADE COUNTY SCHOOLS, COLLEGES TO OBSERVE E-DAY

Dade students will observe the nationwide Environmental Teach-In April 22 by planting seeds, visiting sewer treatment plants and holding neighborhood clean-up drives.

E-Day, a nationwide movement, is designed to make us all aware of the threat to our ecology, and to encourage individual responsibility in keeping our environment habitable.

Most Dade schools have ongoing programs in ecology. These will be supplemented by classroom discussions and reports, poster displays, field trips and school-wide assemblies.

Activities will vary with each school, according to Mrs. Harriet Ehrhard, science consultant.

Sixth grade pupils at Broadmoor Elementary will talk to first and second grade classes about pollution: its dangers and prevention, and about keeping our surroundings clean.

A group of youthful student reporters at Kinloch Park Junior High will discuss the question, "Why is the American Rush for Progress Permitted to Destroy the Nation?" and offer both individual and group solutions to the problem. They'll also write letters to-the-editors of local newspapers discussing how they feel about pollution and what they as individuals can do about it.

A fifth grade group at Miami Shore's Elementary has written and produced a skit which has been shown to the community groups and will be televised on Channel 2 at 1 p.m., April 25.

Miami Beach Senior High will move the E-Day observance up to April 20 and is planning to hold a rock band performance of songs relating to pollution during lunch period. The school paper already has devoted one issue to environmental problems and will do so again on the 20th.

Mrs. Ehrhard said the study of ecology and the environment has been part of biology and science courses in Dade for many years.

"We are stressing it more now," she said, "but we always have made our students aware that they must take care of and be cautious about what they do with the things that surround them. We always have taught the importance of clean air and clean water and that we must preserve our natural resources."

Miami-Dade Junior College students and faculty will join hundreds of colleges across the country in observance of Earth Day.

For the National Environmental Teach-In, a series of programs, films and special guest speakers has been planned on both North and South Campuses.

The event, sponsored at M-DJC South by the Division of Natural Sciences, will feature three guest speakers. Ralph Renick will present WTVJ's award-winning documentary, "A Dirty Shame," at 9 a.m. Dr. Milton Kolipinsky of the U.S. Geological Survey will discuss environmental problems in South Florida at 11 a.m., and Paul Leach of the Dade County Pollution Control Board will speak on governmental protection of the environment at 3:25 p.m. All lectures are scheduled for Room 2108 of the Trammell Learning Resource's Center and are open to the public.

The public is also invited to attend any of the classroom lectures that will be devoted to environmental problems during the week. On April 20 and 24, Dr. Wallace Orgell will lecture on "Resources, Wastes and Survival" at 2:25 p.m. On April 24, T. A. Toney will speak on "Use and Abuse of Subsurface Water" at 3:25 p.m. On April 21 and 23, Dr. John Zaharis will speak on "Population Pollution" at 7 a.m., Dr. Roy Jervis on Pollution in the Gene Pool" at 9:50 a.m., and Dr. Robert Brown on "Rape, Ruin, Retchedness" at 11:15 a.m.

Observances at M-DJC North are being sponsored by the Community College Studies Department. Speakers on April 22 include nationally known author Philip Wylie, Dade Thornton of the Florida Audubon Society and Robert Evans of the Dade Pollution Control Board. Wylie and Thornton will lead a discussion with students and the public at 9:15 a.m. in the McArthur Science and Technology Building patio. Bill Anderson, former Disney photographer and naturalist, will con-

duct slide and film lectures at 11 a.m. and 2 p.m. in Room 2151 of the Science and Technology Building.

Other activities at North Campus include participation of a student group named "Environment!" which has compiled a bibliography of articles and books dealing with environmental problems and possible solutions. The group has also gathered a list of films available to students and to the general public.

The students have also formed a speakers bureau and are urging every academic department at the campus to devote April 22 classes to environment and the way that environmental problems relate to the subject matter of the course.

Another group of students enrolled in a South Campus Continuing Education course, "Man and His Environment," has devoted the final three weeks of classes to contacting civic groups urging them to use their April meetings to discuss environmental problems.

---

[From the Key West (Fla.) Citizen, Apr. 19, 1970]

LOCAL SCHOOLS TO TAKE PART IN ENVIRONMENTAL TEACH-IN

Monroe County schools—both teachers and pupils—will become totally involved in a nationwide Environmental Teach-In on Wednesday, April 22.

Superintendent of Schools, Armando J. Henriquez, in announcing the participation said it was in accordance with the request of State Commissioner for Education Floyd T. Christian that all schools throughout the state join in the nationwide effort.

Superintendent Henriquez requested and received from the principals of the Monroe County schools the plan of each for participation in the "E-Day" observance. These plans include a varied number of activities from the reading of newspaper articles on Environment to, in one case, a "Litterbug Convention."

School children will view film strips on the environmental crisis, take part in clean up campaigns and make field trips to waterfront areas to observe at first hand the harm being done in the area of water pollution by the dumping of waste materials into the waters of our oceans and bays. Other children will draw posters depicting before and after scenes of pollution.

Science classes will conduct tests on conservation, take them home and discuss them with their parents. Senior high biology and chemistry students will conduct extensive studies of ecology and related terms.

Panel discussions on the growing pollution problem in the United States will occupy some junior high school students with areas of concern being garbage disposal, the yacht basin, sewage disposal, canal and stream pollution and oil slicks in surrounding waters.

Also to be featured in the Environmental Teach-In will be talks before assemblies by members of the Florida State Conservation Department.

"I am pleased," said Henriquez, "with the response of the schools to the participation in 'E-Day'. The detailed reports of planned participation indicate a real interest on the part of our students and our teachers in the environmental crisis which faces our nation.

"It is a matter which should concern every citizen—especially future citizens, now in school, who will have to face up to the perils of pollution if some nationwide corrective action is not taken by responsible leaders in business and in government."

While we have allowed technology—in the name of progress—to pollute our natural resources, we have been most fortunate to have many farsighted individuals whose actions have preserved many areas in south Florida. In the 12th District of Florida alone we have three parks under the National Park System—the Everglades National Park, the Biscayne National Monument, and Fort Jefferson National Park—three national wildlife refuges—the Key Deer Refuge, the Great White Heron Refuge, and the Key West National Wildlife Refuge—and Florida's John Pennekamp Coral Reef State Park in the Florida Keys. The Pennekamp Park is the first underseas park within the continental United States.

But what was emphasized yesterday was that this is not enough. If our air and our water are polluted our efforts to protect the endangered species or to preserve the beauty of the Florida Everglades or the Biscayne Bay will quickly be nullified.

The solution to our environmental crisis will come from many sources. Our efforts in the Congress to formulate programs to purify our air and water must continue and expand. Efforts in industry must be doubled. But the most important factor, in my judgment, is individual commitment. Ecology is as much an attitude as a science.

---

## H.R. 17140—RESTORE CONFIDENCE TO OUR MONEY THROUGH CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the American people are bombarded with fearful reports on war, poverty, pollution, inflation, strikes, and violence, yet the foremost concern to every citizen is his money and its buying power.

Because of this I have introduced H.R. 17140, a bill to vest in the Government of the United States the absolute, complete, and unconditional control over our money through Government ownership and control of the 12 Federal Reserve banks.

I have taken this action because of an ever-increasing lack of public confidence in the private monopoly which presently is in charge of our money. Confidence and stability in our fiscal affairs could be restored by the Federal Reserve Board and private bankers but they refuse to discipline themselves voluntarily to meet the crisis they have precipitated.

Since the Federal Reserve bankers lack the responsibility to perform their duty, then Congress must concede that the Federal Reserve Act of 1913 has, by experience, proven itself a failure.

When the Federal Reserve Act was signed into law in 1913 the U.S. public debt was $1 billion. As of January 1970 our national debt was $382 billion. The combined national debt—Federal, State, county, municipal, corporate, and private—is fast approaching $2 trillion. The non-Federal debt is estimated at $1,347 billion. Farm debt at the end of 1969 has reached nearly $60 billion—up from $25 billion or almost doubled in the last 10 years.

We but owe it to ourselves, is the response of the liberals to the figures. We owe it to someone but not to ourselves because we do not own our own money.

Consider that according to the Treasury report of January 1970 the total coinage in circulation was $5,965,000,000 and the total currency in circulation was $47,026,000,000. Yet of this evidence of wealth totaling $52,991,000,000 if $46,431,000,000 is Federal Reserve notes which belong to the Federal Reserve then only $595,000,000 in currency belongs to our people or the Government. And this $46 billion of the Federal Reserve is lent into circulation by commercial banks for which credit on credit our people as borrowers pay interest.

Considering that the estimated interest on the national debt this year will exceed $18 billion it must be apparent that this kind of credit lending has been a profitable institution, but not for our people or our country.

Inflation and recession are destroying both the poor and the entrepreneur. Interest rates, already exceeding usury, give no sign of lowering and under the expected economic law of supply and demand can be expected to soar higher. Unemployment increases stealthily. Most workers and producers are falsely led to believe the answer lies only in wage increases or price increases. The consumer seeks relief through price controls.

And behind the scenes our academic economists fumble to "think tank" sophisticated solutions to a problem they are unable to understand because its beneath their comprehension. And any of the many proposals of the controlled intellectuals in the service of the cabal can but be temporal and could only worsen the problem by entending the time of any solution.

The Federal Reserve exclusive franchise was a mistake. Congress in 1913 erred tragically when it imprudently delegated full control over our money to the Federal Reserve moneychangers—a private banking cartel. The act may carry de facto legality but no informed individual can deny its unconstitutionality and unjust powers over the money of our people.

Yet fear pervades our land and those who know the truth and could act or relegated to silence because someone's political future may be threatened or a friend embarrassed. My only comment is that unless we corral this monster in our midst the very Republic which includes not only the wealth but the intellect, will be demolished. We walk by faith and not by sight. Should confidence fail or falter the mightiest will fall first.

My bill H.R. 17140 provides the only viable and effective solution to the breakdown in confidence of our money and financial system. It is very simple. That we return the banks of the Federal Reserve System and full control over our money to the Congress. I claim no pride in authorship because this is as was intended by the Founding Fathers when they provided in the U.S. Constitution—the law of the land:

The Congress shall have the power—

5. To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures (Article 1, Section 8, clause 5).

Who should the people trust more than their Congress—if they disapprove

we can be eliminated at the polls. Unelected bureaucrats and monopolistic bankers, never.

We of this House are the sole representatives of the American people. Our system is not a democracy because we are the only elected officials in the federal system. The Founding Fathers intended that the power to issue and control money was only to be entrusted to the hands of those elected officials who are constantly accountable to the voters.

This H.R. 17140 will do.

I insert the text of H.R. 17140 at this point:

H.R. 17140

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States is hereby authorized and directed forthwith to purchase the capital stock of the twelve Federal Reserve banks and branches, and agencies thereof, and to pay to the owners thereof the par value of such stock at the date of purchase.

(b) All member banks of the Federal Reserve System are hereby required and directed to deliver forthwith to the Treasurer of the United States, by the execution and delivery of such documents as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, all the stock of said Federal Reserve banks owned or controlled by them, together with all claims of any kind or nature in and to the capital assets of the said Federal Reserve banks, it being the intention of this Act to vest in the Government of the United States the absolute, complete, and unconditional ownership of the said Federal Reserve banks.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

---

## AWARD OF CONTRACT BY NASA TO GENERAL ELECTRIC CORPORATION FOR PHASE D OF APPLICATIONS TECHNOLOGY SATELLITE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BEALL), is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BEALL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the award of a contract recently by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to the General Electric Corp. for phase D of the applications technology satellite—F and G—program. On the basis of information I have received I feel that it is in the best interest of the Government of the United States to further examine events leading up to the announcement of this contract before any official award is made by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to General Electric Corp.

I would like to relate to you a brief history of this project and some of the incidents that have come to my attention which would indicate that perhaps one contractor was clearly favored over another.

After extensive preliminary procedures early in 1969 NASA selected the Fairchild-Hiller Corp. and the General Electric Corp. as competitors in phase D of the applications technology satellite program in May of 1969. Both of these competitors received procurement packages and resubmitted the proposals to NASA for examination in September 1969. Conversations were held and new proposals were submitted at the end of December. Following further examination by NASA, a resubmission of the cost estimate was requested and the contractors were given an estimated award date of April 1970.

It appears that during the period of September to the final announcement in April, certain things happened that worked to the benefit of the General Electric Corp. and to the detriment of the other bidder, the Fairchild Hiller Corp.

In competitive bidding of this type, where cost-plus plays an important part, one of the prime considerations differentiating between the competitors should be the technical excellence of the design. During the evaluation process in this particular competition, however, there is evidence that technical innovations developed by Fairchild eventually became a part of the competitor's proposal. These changes, therefore, had the effect of diminishing the technical superiority Fairchild-Hiller had displayed.

Further, I have learned that NASA distributed Fairchild's proposal to its technical evaluators prior to the time that General Electric even submitted its proposal. This, therefore, provided General Electric the opportunity to learn Fairchild's price even before they submitted their bid. Apparently, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration allowed General Electric to submit its final revised proposal 1 week beyond the previously determined date for submission.

There is further evidence that General Electric was permitted to submit technical changes in its final revised proposal which is contrary to NASA's own instruction.

There is also evidence that the final price reduction made by the General Electric Corp. resulted from a change in accounting procedures rather than any real savings occasioned by substantive provisions.

An analysis of the procedures used in this particular competition can only lead one to the conclusion that the decision to make the award was based on something other than objective examination. It would appear that the competitors size, the number of previous space programs, and other factors might have been used. It is further evident that the competitive nature of the program was diluted because of events that transpired between the period September of 1969 and April of 1970. Through this period the submission and resubmission of proposals has given one contractor the opportunity to take advantage of technical innovations introduced by the other; in this case, the Fairchild-Hiller Corp.; in its original proposal. That result, therefore, is to eventually eliminate the technical advantage Fairchild had in September.

While the result would appear to be reprehensible in this case, this practice carried to its extreme would be catastrophic to the competitive bidding process. Eventually, the larger companies would be able to take advantage of any technological superiority in a smaller organization and the eventual result would be that the smaller companies would be forced out of the market. This then, would place the Government at the mercy of a monopolistic industry.

Upon learning about this contract and the items that I just mentioned, I requested that the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Dr. Thomas P. Paine, provide a review of this whole bidding process and I, of course, asked the General Accounting Office to do likewise. Dr. Paine acknowledged this request and has indicated his willingness to submit to such an examination. In the meantime, however, NASA has notified the Fairchild-Hiller Corp. that it is eliminating certain funding the contractors have been receiving.

Both Fairchild Hiller and General Electric have been receiving a certain amount per month in order to cover their costs since the submission of the original proposals. The decision to eliminate Fairchild's funds has the effect of rendering inconsequential the results of any investigation that might be made into the propriety of the bidding procedure and the validity of the announced intention to make the award. The capacity to produce a contract of this nature obviously depends to a great degree on the ability of the technical team that is assembled by the contractors. The elimination of funds in Fairchild's case would make it virtually impossible to retain the scientific personnel that comprise this team and, therefore, would be imposing an additional injustice on this bidder. In a telegram last Friday, I requested Dr. Paine to continue the funding of both contractors until the General Accounting Office has had the opportunity to determine the validity of his decision.

In view of the scope of the contract and the nature of the information that has been developed, it seems that the only logical course to follow, in the best interests of all concerned, particularly the Government of the United States, is to reexamine the decision to award this contract in an atmosphere that will be free of any potential conflicts.

Because Dr. Thomas Paine was employed by the General Electric Corp. in a high executive capacity for a period of years prior to becoming the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the charge might be made that he favored one of these two competitors at the expense of the other.

In order to protect Dr. Paine and the highly respected Space Agency from such allegations and in order to ascertain that this contract was awarded strictly on the basis of merit, I would again request that any official award be delayed until such time as a complete examination has been made by the General Accounting Office.

In the meantime, in order to maintain the integrity of the bidding process, it is essential that funding be continued for both contractors.

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

Mr. BEALL of Maryland. I yield to my colleague from Maryland.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, it bothers me—and I have reviewed the formal allegations made in the protest of which the gentleman from Maryland speaks—that one company in this competition apparently started way ahead, but was, by the end of the competition, equalized. What is the point of competition if NASA procurement procedures first encourage equalization and second do not give credit to the competitor who makes the major innovation?

Particularly, what is the chance of the small- or moderate-size competitor in a competition such as this—where this transfusion and equalization process has occurred—as opposed to the industrial grant. NASA may always justify selection of the giant, and say, "Well, they are bigger, and have had more experience, so now—now, not then, but now that they are technically equal we will give it to the bigger, more experienced company." I think there is a serious philosophical question to be explored here, with ramifications that reach beyond the Fairchild-GE competition for the ATS F. & G. It is the question of how NASA procurements are to be conducted—and how protection for technical innovation can be credited to the smaller company struggling against a giant in such a way as to give the smaller company's technical innovation any meaning in the outcome.

I also hope the General Accounting Office, which is an arm of this Congress, will very seriously probe the implications of the late submission of General Electric's revised cost proposal, which I understand included a prohibited technical revision as well, and the effect the late GE submission had on Fairchild-Hiller's posture in the ultimate analysis. It seems that what is good for the goose is good for the gander. If Fairchild-Hiller was denied an extension in which to submit its bid, and GE was likewise denied, why was GE's late submission then accepted? If Fairchild-Hiller's final technical proposal had been disseminated, including reference to hours of production, it seems clear to me that it is entirely possible that General Electric could have known Fairchild-Hiller's price before General Electric even submitted theirs.

Mr. BEALL of Maryland. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I agree this is a matter that needs very serious study because the integrity of the entire bidding system is at stake.

---

## LEGISLATION TO ELIMINATE AUTO AIR POLLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced on behalf of myself and 27 other Members of the House H.R. 17199, H.R. 17201, and H.R. 17203, a comprehensive 11-part package of automotive air pollution legislation.

One provision is an updated version of H.R. 13225, legislation I introduced in July 1969, to ban the internal combustion engine. This provision would outlaw the sale of engines which did not meet the pollution levels of the "cleanest feasible propulsion system." Last summer I also introduced H.R. 13281 and H.R. 13320, the first bills ever introduced in Congress to regulate or ban lead in gasoline.

If enacted, this legislation would eliminate auto air pollution by the mid-1970's and achieve, almost immediately, a radical reduction in air pollution.

The legislation includes provisions—

Phasing out large horsepower, high-pollution engines;

Establishing an air pollution trust fund to finance research and development on pollution-free engines and government purchases;

Revising the tax structure to encourage low-pollution engines;

Establishing, on a national basis, the California standards for auto pollution for the 1971, 1972, and 1974 model years;

Establishing pollution standards for used cars and commercial fleets;

Banning lead in gasoline by 1972; and

Revising Government test procedures to include inspection of auto pollution control devices on the assembly line and after they have been in operation.

The recent public statements of the auto industry, claiming major technological advances to alleviate the harmful environmental impact of the automobile appear to me to be sheer hypocrisy. It seems to be more than a coincidence that in the face of mounting public concern the industry is suddenly claiming all kinds of air pollution breakthroughs. Past experience would suggest that there is usually little to such claims. One major auto producer, for example, advertised an air pollution device as being almost immediately available as far back as 1939. The device has yet to make it beyond the design state. Worse, however, if the claims are true, it suggests that the industry has been holding back on development of low pollution engines.

The auto is responsible for up to 92 percent of air pollution in urban areas. This legislation is the result of ad hoc hearings we held in December in New York at which Ralph Nader, the vice presidents of the two major automobile manufacturers, and experts on health and low pollution technology testified on auto air pollution. The report issued as a result of these hearings appears in the February 17, 1970, RECORD on page 3639. The full transcript of the December hearings appears in the February 5, 1970, RECORD on page 2601.

There is a great deal of engineering evidence to suggest that the internal combustion engine cannot be cleaned up sufficiently to bring air pollution down to acceptable levels.

The only way this is going to be achieved is to turn to cleaner alternative propulsion systems like steam or gas turbines. Steam produces one-eightieth the level of carbon monoxide, one fifty-fifth the level of hydrocarbons and one-fourteenth the level of oxides of nitrogen of an unregulated internal combustion engine.

Except for Detroit, which has a vested interest in maintaining the internal combustion engine, almost every expert believes clean alternatives are feasible right now which are cheaper to manufacture and operate and easier for the driver.

Dr. Robert U. Ayres, a noted expert on automotive engineering technology, told our ad hoc hearings in December that when compared to the IC engine under actual testing conditions, steam engines were found to be:

First, mechanically simpler (no clutch, transmission, starter, distributor, carburetor, fuel induction system, muffler, and so forth;

Second, longer lived and more reliable;

Third, more powerful for the size and weight;

Fourth, cheaper to operate;

Fifth, virtually pollution free;

Sixth, quiet;

Seventh, safe and quick to start up; and

Eighth, as efficient under normal driving conditions.

If the American auto industry can build the world's largest auto plant in the Soviet Union, it can produce a pollution free engine in the United States. The industry has the technological capability; all it needs is the economic incentive.

Mr. Speaker, this legislative package will bring about that incentive.

A list of the House sponsors of the legislation, a summary of its provisions, and the text of the three bills follow:

LIST OF THE SPONSORS OF THE LEGISLATION

Leonard Farbstein, Democrat, of New York.
Joseph Addabbo, Democrat, of New York.
William A. Barrett, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
Mario Biaggi, Democrat, of New York.
Frank J. Brasco, Democrat, of New York.
George E. Brown, Jr., Democrat, of California.
Jeffrey Cohelan, Democrat, of California.
Dominick V. Daniels, Democrat, of New Jersey.
Don Edwards, Democrat of California.
Jacob Gilbert, Democrat of New York.
Seymour Halpern, Republican of New York.
Lee Hamilton, Democrat of Indiana.
Michael Harrington, Democrat of Massachusetts.
Edward I. Koch, Democrat of New York.
Allard K. Lowenstein, Democrat of New York.
Abner J. Mikva, Democrat of Illinois.
Joseph G. Minish, Democrat of New Jersey.
Arnold Olsen, Democrat of Montana.
Richard Ottinger, Democrat of New Jersey.
Edward J. Patten, Democrat of New Jersey.
Bertrum L. Podell, Democrat of New York.
Adam C. Powell, Democrat of New York.
Peter Rodino, Jr., Democrat of New Jersey.
Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Democrat of New York.
William F. Ryan, Democrat of New York.
William St. Onge, Democrat of Connecticut.
John V. Tunney, Democrat of California.
Lionel Van Deerlin, Democrat of California.

---

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF LEGISLATION

1. Sets auto emission standards on the basis of the cleanest feasible propulsion system.

There is agreement among many recent studies conducted for government that at least two inherently cleaner alternative propulsion systems, steam and gas turbine, are technologically and economically feasible and possibly cheaper to produce and operate.

Current auto emission standards are based on what the inherently pollution IC engine can achieve. Standards should be set on the basis of the cleanest feasible propulsion system and responsibility to carry out the standards left to the auto industry.

2. Large engines which cannot meet the standards would be phased out in 1975.

It must be recognized that conversion to a new propulsion system cannot be completed in one year, but must be done on a gradual basis, beginning with a limited number of lines. Large horsepower IC engines which *cannot* meet the standards should be phased out first based on the following time-table:

Based on sales of 1969 American cars, the phasing out would have the following effect:

(a) 375 horsepower in 1975—Less than 5 percent of new car sales.

(b) 275 horsepower in 1976—35 percent of new car sales.

(c) 175 horsepower in 1977—All but 10 percent of new car sales.

(d) All internal combustion engines in 1978.

Phasing out large horsepower engines first has the advantage of eliminating the highest pollutant first. Large engines burn more fuel and thus produce higher levels of pollution. It also has the following additional advantages:

(a) It is easier to develop a new propulsion system in a large engine.

(b) Fewer people buy automobiles with large engines for personal use, therefore, any recalls that might be necessary to perfect a system would affect fewer people. The industry follows a practice now of putting experimental systems, which may need recalling to perfect them, on "odd-ball lines" that attract fewer customers and inconveniences fewer customers. This would follow that practice.

3. A large scale Federal prototype development program for pollution-free vehicles would be undertaken.

Currently, the Federal Government is developing one prototype rankine (steam) propulsion system. A more extensive program is needed. Such a program would not need to test all forms of propulsion, since steam and gas turbines are generally conceded to be the most feasible and the most developed. Nor would such a program have to undertake initial development. While the spokesmen for the major auto companies were telling a Senate committee that steam autos were not feasible, members of the committee were driving a modern steam car in the Senate basement. Similarly, at least one small company is now producing inexpensive gas turbine engines. What remains to be developed is the mass production capability and not the engine itself. Such a program would also provide a source of technological and cost information independent of the auto industry.

4. Part of the Federal automobile excise tax would be utilized to provide the necessary financing for the air pollution program.

A Federal commitment to eliminating automotive air pollution will require a guaranteed source of funding for the next 4 to 5 years. The mechanism of the automotive excise tax offers a logical source of such funding.

The tax should be recalculated on the basis of the amount of engine horsepower and the amount of pollution produced. This would be in line with the philosophy that the polluter should pay for cleaning up his pollution. It would also reflect a recognition that in addition to producing more pollution, large engines—and this generally means large cars—occupy more parking and road space in our crowded central cities, a privilege for which they should pay.

The revenue collected in excess of the current 7 percent tax level should then be set aside to finance the prototype development and Federal purchase of pollution free automobiles.

5. The Federal Government would be authorized to purchase pollution free vehicles even if they were more costly.

To create a significant market for low pollution vehicles now and thus stimulate earlier production, the Federal Government should purchase entirely pollution free vehicles even if they are more costly than currently available high polluting vehicles.

6. The states would be encouraged to purchase pollution free vehicles by authorizing the use of the highway trust fund to compensate for any added cost.

The states and local governments, like the Federal Government, are major purchasers of new cars, trucks and buses. To stimulate them to purchase pollution-free vehicles, highway trust fund money should be authorized to be used for added cost involved in purchasing them.

B. A radical reduction in automotive air pollution can be achieved almost immediately. What is needed is (7) an increase in interim auto emission standards to those already established for California; (8) the establishment by 1972 to auto emission standards for used cars; (9) the establishment by 1972 of rigorous emission standards for fleet owned vehicles; (10) ban leaded gasoline and regulate the composition of fuel; and (11) regulate rubber and asbestos emissions.

7. Interim auto emission standards would be increased to those already established for California and strengthened enforcement procedures would be established.

According to Federal law, California is the only state that can set its own auto emission standards. It can set standards so long as they are more rigorous than Federal standards and are approved by the Federal Government as "technologically feasible." Standards for 1971, 1972 and 1974 have been approved, which began to regulate oxides of nitrogen in 1971.

We applaud the Administration's announced auto emission standards for 1975, but believe standards more stringent than those for 1970 models are necessary in the interim. We also are pleased that oxides of nitrogen will be regulated, but do not believe we should wait to 1973 to do so. As an interim step, the California standards, which have been approved by the Federal Government as "technologically feasible," should be required of all new cars. There is no reason standards demonstrated to be feasible should be applied just in California.

However, such standards are meaningless if large numbers of devices are found to be defective. The Federal Government should be empowered to conduct assembly line inspections of air pollution devices in place of its present testing of prototype devices, which may or may not be the same as those mass produced. It should also be given the power to inspect devices after 6,000 miles of operation and require recalling of lines found to have defective devices with the auto company picking up the cost of correction.

8. Auto emission standards would be established for used cars by 1972.

To achieve clean air now, air pollution standards should be established for all used cars to go into effect after January 1, 1972. Such standards should apply to all cars sold or licensed after that date.

Even if a pollution free auto could be marketed today, it must be remembered that over 90 percent of the cars on the road are more than one year old, and these cars account for far more than 90 percent of the pollution that comes from the auto. Approximately 10 million new cars are sold annually, and these have an average life of ten years. It would be almost a decade before today's high polluting used cars would be retired.

One of the major auto manufacturers recently announced development of an air pollution device for used cars. An independent firm has also developed and tested such a device. We believe they are now technologically feasible and should be required.

According to evidence presented in connection with the recent Federal suit against the auto industry, United States v. Automotive Manufacturers Association, et al., the auto industry has been conspiring since 1953 to prevent the development or manufacture of anti-pollution devices. If they had not acted in this way, pollution devices might well have been on cars 15 years ago. As the polluter, we do not believe the auto manufacturer should make a profit in selling pollution control devices to owners of autos without devices that they manufactured. It would seem to us that the industry has the obligation to sell and install these devices at cost.

9. Rigorous emission stands would be established by 1972 for fleet owned vehicles.

Fleet owned trucks, buses and taxis make up only 10 percent of vehicular traffic in urban areas, yet account for over 30 percent of the air pollution that comes from vehicles. Fuels, like compressed natural gas, which can operate in current internal combustion engines, can dramatically reduce these pollution levels, and are readily accessible to a fleet operation. The Florida telephone company, for example, has been operating its trucks on one form of natural gas for the past ten years. Rigorous emissions standards for fleet operations should, therefore, be established by 1972. Such standards should be similar to those tentatively established by the State of California for 1975.

10. Leaded gasoline would be banned by mid-1972 and governmental authority established to regulate the composition of fuel.

Leaded gasoline should be banned and the Federal Government empowered to regulate the composition of fuel. Current engines need no modification to use unleaded gasoline. One oil company has been marketing a premium brand non-leaded gasoline for many years.

There is currently a "gentlemen's agreement" in the oil industry limiting to 4 grams per gallon the lead content of gasoline. This should be phased out in accordance with the following time table:

(a) 3 grams per gallon after January 1, 1971.

(b) 2 grams per gallon after June 30, 1971.

(c) 1 gram per gallon after January 1, 1972.

(d) 0 gram per gallon after June 30, 1972.

Gasoline is the largest unregulated source of lead in the atmosphere—98 percent—and can be directly correlated with the level of lead in the air. Forty-five percent by volume of lead in gasoline ends up in the air. We do not believe this uncontrolled experiment can be permitted to go on any longer. Leaded gas must be totally banned by mid-1972.

Elimination of lead from gasoline would not only remove the major source of unregulated lead in the atmosphere, but would reduce emission from hydrocarbons and carbon monoxides as well which are increased as a result of the presence of lead. Except for the oil and lead industries, there was unanimous support in recent California legislative hearings on the banning of lead. The auto industry, we believe, is supporting a ban because it sees the result of pollution reduction as one way of taking the pressure off the move to ban the IC engine, and to buy time until approximately 1980.

Many of the additives and other components of fuel also contribute hazardous emission to the atmosphere. The Federal Government should have the power to regu-

late the composition of fuel to reduce this hazard.

11. Federal auto emission standards would be established for rubber and asbestos.

Federal auto emission standards should be established for rubber and asbestos as well as for carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons and oxides of nitrogen. Testimony at our hearing revealed the health hazards of these previously little noticed pollutants. Rubber emission comes primarily from auto tires and can be reduced. Asbestos in the air comes primarily from automotive brake systems and can also be reduced.

TABLE 1.—POLLUTION CHARACTERISTICS OF VARIOUS PROPULSION SYSTEMS

[In grams per mile]

| | Internal combustion engine (unregulated) | Internal combustion engine on natural gas | Gas turbine [1] | Steam engines [2] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hydrocaronbs | 11 | [3]1.5 | 0.32 | 0.2 |
| Carbon monoxide | 80 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 1.0 |
| Oxides of nitrogen | 4 | 1.5 | 1.9 | .4 |

[1] Based on the Chrysler Corp. experimental gas turbine car.
[2] Based on Williams steamcar tested by Mobil Oil Corp. in December 1966.
[3] Mostly nonreactive hydrocarbons.

TABLE 2.—COMPARISON OF EMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

[In grams per mile]

| | Current 1970 model | California | | | Nixon | | This legislation, 1975–78 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1971 | 1972 | 1974 | 1973 | 1975 | |
| Hydrocarbons | 2.2 | 2.2 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 2.2 | 0.5 | 0.2 |
| Carbon monoxide | 23.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 | 11.0 | 1.0 |
| Oxides of nitrogen | | [1]4.0 | 3.0 | 1.3 | 3.0 | .75 | .4 |

[1] The regulation of hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide has increased the emission of oxides of nitrogen beyond the level of the unregulated internal combustion engine. The chemical conditions relied upon in antipollution devices to date have increased the emission of oxides of nitrogen.

H.R. 17199

*A bill to amend the National Emission Standards Act to provide for the elimination of automotive air pollution*

*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 "National Emission Standards Act Amendments of 1970."

SEC. 2. Section 202 of the National Emission Standards Act is amended by striking out in subsection (b) thereof "prescribed under this section," and inserting in lieu thereof "prescribed under subsection (a) of this section" and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c)(1) In addition to standards prescribed under subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall by regulation, giving appropriate consideration to technological feasibility and economic costs, prescribe as soon as practicable, but not later than June 30, 1971, standards applicable to the emission of any kind of substance, from any class or classes of new motor vehicles propelled by any system other than one using an internal combustion engine, and new motor vehicle engines other than internal combustion engines, which in his judgment cause or contribute to, or are likely to cause or to contribute to, air pollution which endangers the health or welfare of any persons, and such standard shall apply to such vehicles or engines whether they are designed as complete systems or incorporate other devices to prevent or control such pollution.

"(2) The regulations initially prescribed under this subsection shall be applicable (A) on and after January 1, 1975, to all new motor vehicles propelled by engines having 375 horsepower or more and to all new motor vehicle engines having 375 horsepower or more (B) on and after January 1, 1976, to all such new vehicles and engines having 275 horsepower or more (C) on and after January 1, 1977, to all such new vehicles and engines having 175 horsepower or more, and (D) on and after January 1, 1978, to all new motor vehicles and new motor vehicle engines. Amendments to any regulations prescribed under this subsection shall become effective on the effective date specified in the order promulgating such regulations which date shall be determined by the Secretary after consideration of the period reasonably necessary for industry compliance.

"(d)(1) In addition to standards prescribed under subsections (a) and (c), the Secretary shall by regulation, giving appropriate consideration to technological feasibility and economic costs, prescribe, as soon as practicable, standards applicable to the emission of any kind of substance, from any class or classes of motor vehicle or motor vehicle engines sold, or offered for sale in commerce, other than a new motor vehicle or new motor vehicle engine sold or offered for sale to an ultimate consumer, which in his judgment cause or contribute to, or are likely to cause or contribute to, air pollution which endangers the health or welfare of any persons, and such standards shall apply to such vehicles or engines whether they are designed as complete systems or incorporate other devices to prevent or control such pollution. Standards prescribed under this subsection may be amended by the Secretary by regulation in the same manner as in the case of prescribing the initial standards. Standards initially prescribed under this subsection shall establish maximum levels of emission for at least the following: reactive hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, and oxides of nitrogen. Standards first prescribed under this subsection shall become effective as of January 1, 1972, and subsequent standards or amendments to then existing standards shall become effective on the date specified in the order promulgating such regulations, which date shall be determined by the Secretary after consideration of the period reasonably necessary for compliance.

"(2) Whoever sells or offers for sale in commerce or introduces or delivers for introduction into commerce any motor vehicle or motor vehicle engine which is not in conformity with standards issued under paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be subject to a fine of not more than $500 if he is not engaged in the business of selling motor vehicles or motor vehicle engines and of not more than $1,000 if he is so engaged in such business."

SEC. 3. The National Emission Standards Act is amended by renumbering section 212 as section 217 and by inserting immediately after section 211 the following:

"RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

"SEC. 212. The Secretary shall conduct and accelerate research and development of propulsion systems for use in motor vehicles, other than those using internal combustion engines, which systems are technologically and economically feasible including, but not limited to, mass production methods and techniques. Such research and development shall include cost analysis of mass production of such feasible propulsion systems, and such cost analysis shall be independent of those produced by manufacturers. Any knowledge and information resulting from research or development, including cost analysis, carried on under this section shall be public information.

"FEDERAL LOW-EMISSION VEHICLE PROCUREMENT

"SEC. 213. (a) For the purpose of this section—

"(1) 'Board' means the Low-Emission Vehicle Certification Board;

"(2) 'Federal Government' includes the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government of the United States, and the government of the District of Columbia;

"(3) 'motor vehicle' means any vehicle, self-propelled or drawn by mechanical or electrical power, designed for use on the highways principally for the transportation of passengers except any vehicle designed or used for military field training, combat, or tactical purposes;

"(4) 'low-emission vehicle' means any motor vehicle which meets the regulations prescribed under section 202(c) of this title.

"(b) There is established a Low-Emission Vehicle Certification Board to be composed of the Secretary of Transportation or his designee, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or his designee, the Director of the National Highway Safety Bureau in the Department of Transportation, the Administrator of the General Services Administration, and one member appointed by the President. The Secretary of Transportation or his designee shall be the Chairman of the Board.

"(c) Any member of the Board not employed by the United States may receive compensation at the rate of $125 for each day such member is engaged upon work of the Board. Each member of the Board shall be reimbursed for travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(d) (1) The Chairman, with the concurrence of the members of the Board, may employ and fix the compensation of such additional personnel as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Board, but no individual so appointed shall receive compensation in excess of the rate authorized for GS–18 by section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

"(2) The Chairman may fix the time and place of such meetings as may be required.

"(3) The Board is granted all other powers necessary for meeting its responsibilities under this Act.

"(e) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall determine which models or classes of motor vehicles qualify as low-emission vehicles in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

"(f) The Board shall certify any class or model of motor vehicles—

"(1) for which a certification application has been filed in accordance with subsection (h) of this section;

"(2) which is a low-emission vehicle as determined by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

"(3) which it determines is suitable for use as a substitute for a class or model of vehicles presently in use by agencies of the United States.

The Board shall specify with particularity the class or model of vehicles for which the class or model of vehicles described in the application is a suitable substitute. In making the determination under this subsection the Board shall consider the following criteria:

"(1) the safety of the vehicle;

"(2) its performance characteristics;

"(3) its reliability potential;

"(4) its serviceability; and

"(5) its fuel availability.

"(g) Certification under this section shall be effective for a period of two years from the date of issuance.

"(h)( (1) Any party seeking to have a class or model of vehicles certified under this Act shall file a certification application in accordance with rules established by the Board and published in the Federal Register.

"(2) The Board shall publish a notice of each application received in the Federal Register.

"(3) The Board shall determine whether or not the vehicle for which application has been properly made is a low-emission vehicle in accordance with procedures established by it and published in the Federal Register.

"(4) The Board shall conduct whatever investigation necessary, including actual inspection of the vehicle at a place designated by the Board in the certification application rules established under this section.

"(5) The Board shall receive and evaluate written comments and documents from interested parties in support of, or in opposition to, certification of the class or model of vehicle under consideration.

"(6) Within ninety days after the receipt of a properly filed certification application, the Board shall reach a decision by majority vote as to whether such class or model of vehicle is a suitable substitute for any class or classes of vehicles presently being purchased by the Federal Government for use by its agencies.

"(7) The Board shall publish in the Federal Register, within ninety days after the receipt of a properly filed certification application, a report of its decision on such application which sets forth with particularity the reasons for granting or denying certification, together with dissenting views.

"(i) As soon as possible, but no later than January 1, 1973, only certified low-emission vehicles shall be acquired by purchase by the Federal Government for use by the Federal Government.

"(j) For the purposes of this section any statutory price limitations shall be waived, and the procuring agency shall be required to purchase available certified low-emission vehicles which are eligible for purchase before purchasing any other vehicles for which the low-emission vehicle is a certified substitute.

"(k) This section shall take effect upon its enactment and the Board shall promulgate the procedures required to implement this section within ninety days thereafter.

"STATUTORY STANDARDS

"SEC. 214. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the maximum level of emission from any new motor vehicle or new motor vehicle engine, expressed in grams per mile, with respect to reactive hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, and oxides of nitrogen shall be as follows: Reactive hydrocarbons—2.2 for 1971, 1.5 for 1972, 1973, and 1974; carbon monoxide—23.0 for 1971 through 1974; oxides of nitrogen—4.0 for 1971, 3.0 for 1972 and 1973, and 1.3 for 1974. For the years after 1974, such levels shall be determined by the Secretary in accordance with this title but such levels shall not exceed those established herein for 1974.

"(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the Secretary from establishing for any year with respect to reactive hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, and oxides of nitrogen emission standards establishing lower levels of emission than those provided in this section.

"(c) The Secretary shall conduct such inspections and investigations as may be necessary to enforce standards established under this title, including, but not limited to, (1) the inspection (continuously or periodically) of new motor vehicles and new motor vehicle engines and items of equipment necessary to conform such vehicles and engines to such standards, at the time and place of manufacture (including the assembly of parts of such vehicles, engines, or items of equipment), and (2) the inspection of new motor vehicles and new motor vehicle engines after such engines have been operated at least 6,000 miles but not more than 50,000 miles. Any inspection of a new motor vehicle or new motor vehicle engine, after its sale to the ultimate purchaser, shall be made only if the owner of such vehicle or engine volunteers to permit such inspection to be made. If, as a result of any such inspection or investigation, the Secretary determines that any new motor vehicle or new motor vehicle engine is no longer in conformity with regulations prescribed under this title because of any defect in such vehicle or engine, the manufacturer of such vehicle or engine shall furnish notification of such defect to the owner of such vehicle or engine within a reasonable time after such manufacturer has been notified of such defect by the Secretary. Such notification to the owner shall contain a clear description of the defect, a statement of measures to be taken to repair such defect, and a commitment of the manufacturer to cause such defect to be remedied without charge.

"FLEET OPERATIONS

"SEC. 215. After January 1, 1972, if a person is engaged in any business, commercial, industrial, or other activity which results in any year in such persons' operating, directly or indirectly, ten or more motor vehicles, each such motor vehicle without regard to age or condition, must produce a level of exhaust emissions of not more than .5 grams per mile of reactive hydrocarbon, 11 grams per mile of carbon monoxide, and .75 grams per mile of oxides of nitrogen. Violations of this section shall be subject to injunction and the penalties provided in section 204 and 205 of this Act in the same manner and to the same extent as is provided therein for violations of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 203(a) of this Act.

"RUBBER AND ASBESTOS STANDARDS

"SEC. 216. No later than January 1, 1972, the Secretary shall, acting under and in accordance with the authority given him by this title, prescribe maximum levels of emission of rubber and asbestos from motor vehicles and motor vehicle engines."

SEC. 4. (a) Subsection (a) of section 210 of the National Emission Standards Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary may by regulation designate any fuel (which, for purposes of this section, means only fuel intended for use in the transportation of any person or thing) or fuel additive, and after such date or dates as may be prescribed by him, no manufacturer or processor of any such fuel or fuel additive may sell or deliver it unless the manufacturer of such fuel or fuel additive has provided the Secretary with the information required under subsection (c) of this section and unless such fuel or fuel additive has been registered with the Secretary in accordance with subsection (c) of this section."

(b) Section 210 of such Act is amended by redesignating subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f), respectively, and by adding after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) The Secretary may, on the basis of information obtained under subsection (c) of this section or any other information available to him, establish standards respecting the composition or the chemical or physical properties of any fuel or fuel additive to assure that such fuel or fuel additive will not cause or contribute to emissions which would endanger the public health or welfare, or impair the performance of any emission control device or system which is in general use or likely to be in general use (on any motor vehicle or motor vehicle engine subject to this title) for the purpose of preventing or controlling motor vehicle emissions from such vehicle or engine. For the purpose of carrying out such standards the Secretary may prescribe regulations—

"(A) prohibiting the manufacture for sale, the sale, the offering for sale, or the delivery of any fuel or fuel additive; or

"(B) limiting the composition or chemical or physical properties, or imposing any conditions applicable to the use of, such fuel or fuel additive (including the maximum quantity of any fuel component or fuel additive that may be used or the manner of such use)."

(c) The subsection of section 210 herein redesignated as subsection (c) is amended by striking out "For purposes of this section, the Secretary shall" and inserting in lieu thereof "For the purpose of establishing standards under subsection (b), the Secretary may require the manufacturer of any fuel or fuel additive to furnish such information as is reasonable and necessary to determine the emissions resulting from the use of the fuel or fuel additive or the effect of such use on the performance of any emisison control device or system which is in general use or likely to be in general use (on any motor vehicle or motor vehicle engine subject to this Act) for the purpose of preventing or controlling motor vehicle emissions from such vehicle or engine. If the information so submitted establishes that toxic emissions or emissions of unknown or uncertain toxicity result from the use of the fuel or fuel additive, the Secretary may require the submission within a reasonable time of such scientific data as the Secretary may reasonably prescribe to enable him to determine the extent to which such emissions will adversely affect the public health or welfare. To the extent reasonably consistent with the purpose of this section, such requirements for submission of information with respect to any fuel additive shall not be imposed on the manufacturer of any such additive intended solely for use in a fuel only by the manufacturer thereof. Among other types of information, the Secretary shall"; by inserting in clause (2) "the description of any analytical technique that can be used to detect and measure such additive in fuel," after "above,"; by striking out in such clause "to the extent such information is available or becomes available,"; by striking out "clauses (1) and (2)" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "the provisions of this subsection"; and by striking out "such fuel additive" in such sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "such fuel or fuel additive."

(d) The subsection of section 210 herein redesignated as subsection (d) is amended by inserting between the first and second sentences the following new sentences: "The Secretary may disseminate any information obtained from reports or otherwise, which is not covered by section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code and which will contribute to scientific or public understanding of the relationship between the chemical or physical properties of fuels or fuel additives

and their contribution to the problem of air pollution." The first sentence of such subsection is amended by striking out "subsection (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (c)."

(e) The subsection of section 210 herein redesignated as subsection (e) is amended (1) by adding "or subsection (b)" after "subsection (a)"; and (2) by striking out "$1,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,000".

(f) The amendment made by subsection (e)(2) of this section shall be effective with respect to any fuel or fuel additive to which a regulation issued under subsection (a) of section 210 of such Act or a standard established under subsection (b) of such section, as amended by this Act, applies

(g) Notwithstanding any of the amendments made by this section, after January 1, 1971, no person shall process, blend or produce in any way any gasoline containing any component of lead in excess of 3 grams per gallon, nor may any such gasoline be imported into the United States. After June 30, 1971, no person shall process, blend or produce in any way any gasoline containing any component of lead in excess of 2 grams, nor may any such gasoline be imported into the United States. After June 30, 1972, no person shall process, blend or produce in any way any gasoline containing any component of lead in excess of 0 grams per gallon, nor many any such gasoline be imported into the United States. Whoever violates this subsection shall forfeit and pay to the United States a civil penalty of $1,000 for each gallon of gasoline processed, blended, produced, or imported in violation of this subsection. Such penalty may be recovered in a civil suit in the name of the United States brought in the district where such person has his principal office or in any district in which he does business. The Secretary may, upon application, remit or mitigate any such forfeiture.

---

H.R. 17201

A bill to impose an excise tax on automobiles based on their horsepower and emission of pollutants, for the purpose of financing programs for research in, and Federal procurement of, low emission vehicles

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a)(1) section 4061(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to motor vehicle excise tax) is amended—

(1) by striking out "the specified percent of the price for which so sold" in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "a percent of the price for which so sold equal to the specified percent determined under paragraph (1) or (2), plus (in the case of an article taxable under paragraph (2)) the percent determined under paragraph (3)", and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3)(A)(i) An article taxable under paragraph (2) which when sold is a motor vehicle is taxable under this paragraph at a percent determined by adding the percent determined under subparagraph (B) to the percent determined under subparagraph (C).

"(ii) An article taxable under paragraph (2) which when sold is not a motor vehicle is taxable under this paragraph at 4.5 percent.

"(B) Each motor vehicle referred to in subparagraph (A)(i) is taxable at a percent, based on the brake horsepower of the engine of such vehicle, determined under the following table:

| "If the brake horsepower is— | Then the percent is— |
|---|---|
| Not over 175 | .0 |
| Over 175, but not over 275 | 0.5 |
| Over 275, but not over 375 | .1 |
| Over 375 | 1.5 |

"(C) Each motor vehicle referred to in subparagraph (A)(i) is taxable at a percent, based on the grams of carbon monoxide it emits per mile, determined under the following table:

"If the grams of carbon monoxide emitted per mile is—

| | Then the present is— |
|---|---|
| Not over 11 | 0 |
| Over 11 | ¼ of 1 percent for each gram in excess of 11 |

"(D) For purposes of subparagraph (C), carbon monoxide emissions of a motor vehicle shall be determined (in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) on the basis of the standard tests conducted by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on vehicles of the same kind for purposes of determining whether such vehicles meet the omission standards prescribed under section 202 of the National Emission Standards Act.

(2) The amendments made by paragraph (1) of this subsection shall apply with respect to articles sold on or after the day after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) Amounts received in the Treasury by reason of the tax imposed by section 4061(a)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall be paid into a separate account in the Treasury and shall be available for appropriation only to carry out section 212 of the National Emission Standards Act (as amended by section 2 of this Act) and to pay the amount by which the price of certified low-emission vehicles purchased by the United States in accordance with section 213(i) of such Act (as so amended) exceeds the price of similar automobiles which are not certified low-emission vehicles.

SEC. 2. The National Emission Standards Act is amended by renumbering section 212 as section 214 and by inserting immediately after section 211 the following:

"RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

"SEC. 212. The Secretary shall conduct and accelerate research and development of propulsion systems for use in motor vehicles, other than those using internal combustion engines, which systems are technologically and economically feasible including, but not limited to, mass production methods and techniques. Such research and development shall include cost analysis of mass production of such feasible propulsion systems, and such cost analysis shall be independent of those produced by manufacturers. Any knowledge and information resulting from research or development, including cost analysis, carried on under this section shall be public information.

"FEDERAL LOW-EMISSION VEHICLE PROCUREMENT

"SEC. 213. (a) For the purpose of this section—

"(1) 'Board' means the Low-Emission Vehicle Certification Board;

"(2) 'Federal Government' includes the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government of the United States, and the government of the District of Columbia;

"(3) 'motor vehicle' means any vehicle, self-propelled or drawn by mechanical or electrical power, designed for use on the highways principally for the transportation of passengers except any vehicle designed or used for military field training, combat, or tactical purposes;

"(4) 'low-emission vehicle' means any motor vehicle which meets the regulations prescribed under section 202(c) of this title.

"(b) There is established a Low-Emission Vehicle Certification Board to be composed of the Secretary of Transportation or his designee, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or his designee, the Director of the National Highway Safety Bureau in the Department of Transportation, the Administrator of the General Services Administration, and one member appointed by the President. The Secretary of Transportation or his designee shall be the Chairman of the Board.

"(c) Any member of the Board not employed by the United States may receive compensation at the rate of $125 for each day such member is engaged upon work of the Board. Each member of the Board shall be reimbursed for travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(d)(1) The Chairman, with the concurrence of the members of the Board, may employ and fix the compensation of such additional personnel as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Board, but no individual so appointed shall receive compensation in excess of the rate authorized for GS–18 by section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

"(2) The Chairman may fix the time and place of such meetings as may be required.

"(3) The Board is granted all other powers necessary for meeting its responsibilities under this Act.

"(e) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall determine which models or classes of motor vehicles qualify as low-emission vehicles in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

"(f) The Board shall certify any class or model of motor vehicles—

"(1) for which a certification application has been filed in accordance with subsection (h) of this section;

"(2) which is a low-emission vehicle as determined by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

"(3) which it determines is suitable for use as a substitute for a class or model of vehicles presently in use by agencies of the United States.

The Board shall specify with particularity the class or model of vehicles for which the class or model of vehicles described in the application is a suitable substitute. In making the determination under this subsection the Board shall consider the following criteria:

"(1) the safety of the vehicle;

"(2) its performance characteristics;

"(3) its reliability potential;

"(4) its serviceability; and

"(5) its fuel availability.

"(g) Certification under this section shall be effective for a period of two years from the date of issuance.

"(h)(1) Any party seeking to have a class or model of vehicles certified under this Act shall file a certification application in accordance with rules established by the Board and published in the Federal Register.

"(2) The Board shall publish a notice of each application received in the Federal Register.

"(3) The Board shall determine whether or not the vehicle for which application has been properly made is a low-emission vehicle in accordance with procedures established by it and published in the Federal Register.

"(4) The Board shall conduct whatever investigation necessary, including actual inspection of the vehicle at a place designated by the Board in the certification application rules established under this section.

"(5) The Board shall receive and evaluate written comments and documents from interested parties in support of, or in opposition to, certification of the class or model of vehicle under consideration.

"(6) Within ninety days after the receipt of a properly filed certification application, the Board shall reach a decision by majority vote as to whether such class or model of vehicle is a suitable substitute for any class

or classes of vehicles presently being purchased by the Federal Government for use by its agencies.

"(7) The Board shall publish in the Federal Register, within ninety days after the receipt of a properly filed certification application, a report of its decision on such application which sets forth with particularity the reasons for granting or denying certification, together with dissenting views.

"(i) As soon as possible, but no later than January 1, 1973, only certified low-emission vehicles shall be acquired by purchase by the Federal Government for use by the Federal Government.

"(j) For the purposes of this section any statutory price limitations shall be waived, and the procuring agency shall be required to purchase available certified low-emission vehicles which are eligible for purchase before purchasing any other vehicles for which the low-emission vehicle is a certified substitute.

"(k) This section shall take effect upon its enactment and the Board shall promulgate the procedures required to implement this section within ninety days thereafter."

---

H.R. 17203

A bill to permit the Governor of a State to elect to use funds from the State's Federal-aid highway system apportionment for purposes of paying additional costs incurred by such State in purchasing low-emission vehicles

*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 "State Low-Emission Vehicle Procurement Act".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "Federal-aid highway system apportionment" means an apportionment for a fiscal year to a State under one of the five paragraphs of section 104(b) of title 23, United States Code;

(2) the term "Governor" means the chief executive officer of a State;

(3) the term "State" means a State, the District of Columbia, or Puerto Rico.

GRANTS

SEC. 3. The Governor of a State may elect to use all or part of one or more of any Federal-aid highway system apportionment for such State for a fiscal year for the purpose of reimbursing such State and its political subdivisions for the additional cost to such State and its political subdivisions (determined under regulations of the Secretary of Transportation) of purchasing low-emission vehicles (meeting standards prescribed by the Secretary) for their own use. The election authorized herein shall be made in such manner as the Secretary of Transportation shall by regulation prescribe, within sixty days after the Secretary of Transportation certifies to the Governor, pursuant to title 23, United States Code, the sums apportioned to that State for a fiscal year.

AMENDMENT TO TITLE 23, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 4. (a) Section 104(e) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "State highway department" the following: "and the Governor or chief executive officer of each State."

(b) Section 104(b)(5) of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Rules, regulations, and standards adopted by the Secretary for estimating the cost of completion of the Interstate System and taking into account all previous apportionments shall prescribe a consistent and equitable procedure for taking into account amounts of apportionments which the Governor of a State has elected to use to carry out section 3 of the State Low-Emission Vehicle Procurement Act."

(c) Section 104 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) No amount which the Governor has elected to use to carry out section 3 of the State Low-Emission Vehicle Procurement Act in a fiscal year shall be available for expenditure for Federal-aid highways under this title."

(d) Section 118(a) of such title is amended by striking out "On and after" and inserting in lieu thereof "Sixty days after."

AMENDMENTS TO HIGHWAY REVENUE ACT

SEC. 5. (a) Section 209(f)(1) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 is amended by inserting "(A)" before "making expenditures" and by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and (B) for the purposes of section 3 of the State Low-Emission Vehicle Procurement Act."

(b) Section 209(g) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "An election by the Governor of a State under section 3 of the State Low-Emission Vehicle Procurement Act to use funds to carry out such section 3 shall not be taken into account in making any adjustment under this section."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 6. This Act shall take effect upon the first certification of Federal-aid highway system apportionments under section 104(e) of title 23, United States Code, following the date of enactment of this Act.

---

## GIVE 'EM HELL HARRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday evening, May 7, at 8:15 p.m., the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Kansas City, Mo., will sponsor the presentation of a two-act documentary drama entitled "Give 'Em Hell Harry."

The play, written by Carl E. Bolte, Jr., will honor our former Chief Executive, the Honorable Harry S. Truman of Missouri. It will dramatize the event-filled years that the former President spent in the White House at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

The date of May 7 was selected for the performance as it is the eve of Mr. Truman's 86th birthday.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to accept the request that I serve as one of the honorary chairmen of the event, along with many distinguished Missourians. I pledge to all who plan to attend a most rewarding and nostalgic evening.

Although I have admittedly often been poles apart politically and philosophically from our 33d President, we have always maintained a good friendship and mutual respect that has stood the test of time as well as partisan politics. I can well remember the occasions when the man from Independence visited our part of the State of Missouri, and would designate this Member of Congress to be the "White House physician" for his stay. This of course, due to our service in the executive branch during the Truman administration, and bringing my friend and fellow physician back from World War II in the European theater to become the White House physician.

The script of "Give 'em Hell Harry" has been made available to me and its reading has evoked many memories of the sometimes tumultuous days of the "Fair Deal."

It chronicles the death of President Roosevelt which thrust the former captain, farmer, haberdasher, U.S. Senator, Vice President, into the Nation's highest office during some of the most trying days in the history of the United States.

It recreates the day when Mr. Truman, angry about an unfavorable review of his daughter Margaret's vocal recital, dictated the now famous letter to the Post reviewer offering to "punch him in the nose," should they per chance happen to meet.

The play returns dramatically to the conflicts that led to the decision to drop the first atom bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan. The debate before that decision with Generals Marshall and Arnold, Admiral Leahy, Dr. Conant, Secretary of State Byrnes, and others is all enacted with the final determination made by the oft quoted phrase, "The buck stops here."

We are taken back to May 1946, when Mr. Truman, attempting to solve a crippling railroad strike, took the precarious political step, of drafting the railroad workers into the armed services in order to keep them on the job.

Other scenes in the play depict the creation of the Hoover Commission on the Reorganization of the Congress; the beginning of the Marshall plan; the ill-famed attack on the President and the House of Representatives of enraged Puerto Ricans; the Berlin blockade; the 1948 "whistle-stop" campaign; the "police action" in Korea; and the eventual recalling of General MacArthur; and on into the scandals of the deep freezes and mink coats.

All the history of the Truman years in the White House is portrayed by an excellent cast, tasteful settings, and a dramatic script.

The Junior Chamber of Commerce of Kansas City, Mo., has assumed the responsibility of the ticket sales for this one-night-only performance. It will be held in the Kansas City Music Hall which seats more than 2,500. The Jaycees have pledged the funds from the sale of tickets to be used by the Kansas City Philharmonic Orchestra.

I am sure that many Members of the Congress who know and love this great American would like to attend this production. It is my pleasure to extend an invitation to them to do so. My office will be happy to supply any further information that might be desired.

Those who recall the man who is famous for the phrase, "If you can't stand the heat, stay out of the kitchen," and "the buck stops here," will be delighted with "Give 'em Hell Harry."

---

## THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this special order to advise the Members of the House that I am, today, introducing the first of a series of

bills pertaining to our Federal-aid, highway system and program.

As a member of the Roads Subcommittee from California, I feel the time has come for a new look at our entire highway program. We need to completely evaluate the history of road development in the United States and decide whether or not we have been heading in the right direction, what mistakes have been made and, most importantly, where do we go from here?

This, of course, is the purpose of the hearings now being held by our Public Works Committee.

In previous legislation we took the initiative and called for a "functional classification and needs study" to be conducted by the Federal Highway Administration, in concert with the American Association of State Highway Officials, and the recommendations presented to our committee in 1970—this year.

While I will be participating directly in the framing of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970, during the course of the hearings, I want to relate to my colleagues, at the outset, just a few thoughts and ideas that I believe are pertinent and, hopefully, timely.

The Interstate Highway and Defense System and the Federal-aid highway program developed in 1956 have been lauded and generally considered to the the most important public works project ever undertaken by any country in the world. It has contributed more to economic growth in the United States than any other single Government program. It permitted the movement of people, goods, and services to accelerate tremendously. It helped large and small businesses alike to "get a piece of the action." Our gross national product has more than doubled since the enactment of this act in 1956. Our standard of living increased immensely.

As we move into the decade of the 1970's, I believe we stand, literally, "at the crossroads" in our decisionmaking process. What we do this year, with regard to highway legislation, and in the next 10 years, in my judgment, will determine the direction and success story of America for the next 100 years.

We will, by our decisions, determine whether our already over-crowded, overcongested, unmanageable, heavily polluted, and decaying metropolitan areas are going to add more people and more problems or whether we check, and hopefully, reverse the present population migration trend and move toward a more balanced population pattern and a better environment for future living.

The revenue allocations formulas we adopt for highways and all modes of transportation will "pretty well determine" the final outcome.

For many years, I have strongly advocated the establishing of three transportation trust funds:

First. Improve and revise the existing highway trust fund in concert with the States.

Second. Enact an airport-airways system trust fund.

Third. Establish an urban area transportation system trust fund.

I believe this basic concept is now underway due to the very able leadership of our Secretary of Transportation, John Volpe. Further, I developed in-depth testimony and presented it to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee during the consideration of the airport-airways legislation.

Today, I will touch briefly on what I think needs a great deal of consideration and emphasis—that of revenue allocation revisions of our established formulas and apportionment factors for all Federal-aid highways, but in particular, the primary and secondary roads systems.

The legislation I am introducing today would change the percentage of matching funds for primary and secondary roads from 50–50 to 75–25.

The areas that really need the highways and improved roads are the sparsely populated areas, which in fact, are the least able to finance the then badly needed highways. The major road deficiencies in highway construction are in rural America. Conversely, the greatest opportunity for improving the quality of life can be found in "Countryside, USA."

The most important ingredient for revitalizing and diversifying rural America is a coordinated, integrated, and balanced transportation system.

The most important contributor toward that objective, in my judgment, will be an accelerated construction timetable of the Federal aid to primary—FAP—and Federal aid to secondary—FAS—road system, coordinated with our Interstate Highway System completion and the contemplated airport-airway system now pending before the Congress.

It is for this reason that I introduce the "75–25" highway matching formula legislation today, in the hope that it will focus increased attention on this very important segment of our total transportation system.

If I were to offer some constructive criticism of our existing highway allocation formulas, I would suggest that there has been too much emphasis on allocating funds to where the population is and not enough attention given to allocating funds on a basis of where the population can be.

We need to devise a new method of financing the urban area transportation system to improve the traffic flow and develop more efficient and effective "people-moving" systems, consistent with improved urban living objectives.

However, there is one commonly accepted fact of life that cannot be underestimated. And, that is desire on the part of the individual to maintain his independence and flexibility, particularly as it relates to transportation.

The overwhelming majority of Americans will insist on personal transportation from their home, select the direction they want to travel—with the option to change their mind—and on their own time schedule.

With this in mind, the automobile is a long way from becoming extinct and will serve as the prime vehicle for most Americans during our lifetime.

The public is demanding pollution-free engines and properly so. This will come into being and ultimately add to the demand for more automobiles.

So, now is the time to lay the legislative groundwork for "redirecting the traffic"—instead of pouring more traffic into the cities, let us develop a system that will help some people get out of the cities. The relief of population pressures can make more cities livable and manageable and open up new opportunities for people now "mired down in megalopolis."

Time and again, I have heard people say, I would like to "go back from whence I came"—"if only I could make a living there." Mr. Speaker, I submit, a change in the revenue allocation formula of our highway system and a redirection of other tax revenues could go a long way toward accomplishing this and, at the same time, provide major improvements in the quality of future living conditions for all Americans.

In 1968, the Congress accepted an amendment I introduced in our Roads Subcommittee to increase the funds available for primary and secondary roads by $225 million. I hope you will take a good look at this proposal to change the matching fund formula to 75–25, looking constantly to the tremendous advantages that can accrue to the benefit of all people—living in both urban and rural America.

The environmental, inflationary, crime, and other major socioeconomic problems of America are primarily concentrated in metropolitan areas.

I hope some of you can see the opportunities available to provide relief from these mounting and nagging problems.

America desperately needs a more balanced population pattern—this can be accomplished through creation of a more balanced transportation system—this can be realized through a more balanced method of financing our transportation systems.

I want to start balancing our highway system—that is what "75–25" is all about.

The timing on this formula change will have to be considered and decided upon by those most familiar with current highway financing and our committees of the Congress, working with the States—keeping constantly in mind the fact, that the fuel tax was "invented" at the State level and we do not want to preempt their ability to raise adequate funds to meet their own transportation requirements as well as their own share of the matching funds.

The year, 1970, could be the year of decision. It could also determine the direction America and her people will take for the balance of our lifetime. I hope it will lead to building a better—"open-space" America.

---

## EARTH DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McDONALD) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for more than 200 years this country has met, explored, and conquered frontiers. It has been a way of life for us. We had the audacity, the fortitude, and the courage to enter often

hostile territory, and in so doing we have established a world reputation of hardiness and ingenuity.

It was not too long ago that St. Louis was the last vestige of westward civilization. The Mississippi River was the frontier, but the land beyond beckoned. Our pioneers accepted—and met—the challenge.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, was Earth Day. All over this Nation people met on college campuses, in town halls, in public parks, and at garbage dumps in an effort to focus attention on our environmental problems. Those problems represent in a sense a human frontier—a barrier to human development, which we must penetrate to have a better way of life.

There is much to be done in the exploration of this human frontier. Individuals can address themselves to a host of projects, all of which will contribute to the massive cleanup necessary to bring about clean air and clean water.

There are projects designed to clean up our beaches. There are projects to clean up our roadways. There are projects to clean up, fix up, and straighten up all the physical disorder in our country.

Many Congressmen and Senators returned to their home States to sweep debris from the side of the road and contribute to the volumes of environmental rhetoric.

The legislation correcting many of our environmental problems is pending here in Congress. It is here that the ultimate decision will be made when—and how—to clean our environment. I would hope that my colleagues' efforts include a commitment to return to Congress and take positive action on the bills and resolutions pending on this issue. To return without such a commitment is to negate the efforts of thousands of Americans on Earth Day.

It is not my intention to demean the work being done by the thousands of citizens taking part in active campaigns. That work is valuable toward solving the problem at hand.

But the residue of garbage, litter, bad air, and dirty water which lowers the quality of life in this country is the end result of our environment problem. I see my responsibility as a Member of Congress as developing an action program to attack the root of the problem. There are solutions to our environmental crisis. And they are now before this body in bill form. This is where I must be if I am to carry out the responsibilities of my office.

Earth Day was a day to assess the mass reaction and response to a challenge. Hundreds of thousands of Americans took part in a day of dedication to preserve and improve our quality of life. That sort of activity is supportative to the action now needed by Congress. There is something for everyone to do. That something—for a Congressman—can only be done in this Chamber.

The topic of environment has brought together the young and the old. It serves as a glue which brings together and holds the many factions that exist in our Nation. I would hope that Earth Day, Mr. Speaker, is remembered as a benchmark for positive action toward creating a clean and healthy environment for today and tomorrow. The day we began to do something about the world we are in. The day we penetrated the human frontier.

## CITIZEN SUITS NEEDED AGAINST AIR POLLUTERS

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

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, although pollution is considered a public nuisance, there is little a private citizen can do to stop emissions. To remedy this fundamental wrong, I am today introducing a bold, new approach to pollution: giving citizens the right of legal action against anyone polluting the air.

This bill does not mean that anyone can get relief from an alleged polluter merely by filing a suit. Each decision would be based on consideration of whether or not a defendant is polluting, whether or not he can stop, and whether or not the plaintiff is damaged. But the decision will be based on these relevant issues and no longer on legal technicalities.

The requirement that a polluter abate his pollution unless the cost is prohibitive has already been adopted by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court and by the U.S. district court in Oregon. It makes sense that a polluter should not be allowed to poison the air merely because cleaning up would subject him to a nonprohibitive expense.

The citizen bill against polluters would also allow class actions, treble damages for willful violations of regulations, minimum damages, and recovery of costs for successful plaintiffs.

Today pollution is generally considered a public nuisance, which only public authorities have the right to abate.

This situation of citizen powerlessness should be ended. The average citizen is injured by pollution and should have a right to stop it. Also, the possibility of private action would insure much more widespread control of pollution than is possible when the power to act is limited to a few agencies, often understaffed.

The major element of the bill suggests that a polluter must abate its pollution whenever it can do so and still stay in business. By definition this provision will not force a company to operate at a loss. It will end the excess profits earned by free use of the public's air.

Both justice and reason demand that when a business can abate its pollution, it should be required to do so.

In some cases a polluter will not be able to stay in business unless it is allowed to continue to pollute. In these cases a decision must be made as to whether or not the social benefits of the polluter's enterprise outweigh the damage done by the pollution. Unfortunately, in the past the courts have tended to balance the benefit to the public against the damage to the individual plaintiff. This bill adopts the more sensible approach of balancing public benefit against public, not merely private, harm. It establishes the citizen's right to clean air.

## NO PRIVACY FOR 1040

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the senior Senator from Delaware, the Honorable JOHN WILLIAMS performed a service for the entire country by exposing a shabby political trick for what it was.

Several days before that, three former Democratic officials, acting on orders of the Democratic National Chairman Lawrence O'Brien, charged that Presidential Aide Clark Mollenhoff was illegally examining income tax returns.

They waxed indignation about this invasion of privacy and shortly thereafter some of their Democrat cohorts in the Congress joined them in pointing with alarm at this practice.

But lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the Senator from Delaware disclosed that one of those making the complaints, Mr. Mortimer Caplin, had, while Director of the Internal Revenue Service, given carte blanche to a White House aide, Mr. Carmine Bellino, to examine income tax returns without written permission.

This, of course, was during the administration of President Kennedy. In contrast to the open access given Mr. Bellino, files have been made available to Mr. Mollenhoff only on written request.

Mr. Speaker, the charges made by Mr. Caplin, Mr. O'Brien, and others were a dishonest bit of political trickery, worthy of none of them. We can all hope they will not stoop so low again.

## ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP—PART I

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, now that Earth Day has come and gone, now that the orgy of environmental demonstrations has been flashed across the television screens, now that the burnings, buryings, and picketing are finished for the moment, it is time we settled down to the serious business of cleaning up the Nation's natural and human environment. Additionally, now that it is generally agreed that the population has been properly and substantially warned about the threat of pollution—for the nth time during the past nth number of years—we should recognize that the cause of conservation and pollution abatement has been "catching on" throughout the country.

As one who has been concerned with the conservation of natural resources for more years than I like to count, you will forgive me for cocking a jaundiced eye at the plethora of activities which accompanied Earth Day. My concern is, and has been, sustained activity on behalf of improving the environment. If that is the result of the youthful massification regarding the environment, then a great deal has been accomplished. Only time will tell.

Meanwhile, back in the real world,

dollars and cents, not demonstrations and confrontations, determine the real thrust of our commitment to environmental cleanup, it is possible to find some signposts of hope about the problems of pollution we face.

In the series I am beginning today, I hope to show that our much-maligned free-enterprise system is beginning to respond to the challenges of environmental pollution. Following today's report, I will submit for our colleagues' consideration the status of industrial pollution abatement programs which are showing promise in the never-ending struggle to produce without polluting.

Perhaps it need not be said, but I will say it anyway, the Federal Government cannot by itself force the cleanup of the environment in spite of the speeches and posturing by some well-known Federal officials. If the environment is to be improved it will be on a cooperative basis; that is, individuals, groups, businesses, politicians, government at all levels, will have to work in harness to effect significant environmental improvements.

Before I bring to your attention various industry programs and individual statements on pollution abatement, it is proper to have the scene set. Edwin L. Dale, Jr., the distinguished economics columnist for the New York Times, has done just that in an article entitled "The Economics of Pollution," which appeared in last Sunday's New York Times Magazine. Without further ado, I will set the realists' scene for effective pollution abatement by referring you and our colleagues to the Dale article:

[From the New York Times Magazine
Apr. 19, 1970]

THE ECONOMICS OF POLLUTION

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

Now that environment has become a national concern, it might be well to clean up some of the economic rubbish associated with the subject. There are, alas, a few "iron laws" that cannot be escaped in the effort to reduce the pollution of our air and water, in disposing of solid waste and the like. The laws do not necessarily prevent a clean environment, but there is no hope of obtaining one unless they are understood.

We have all become vaguely aware that there will be a cost—perhaps higher monthly electric bills, perhaps higher taxes, perhaps a few cents or a few dollars more on anything made from steel—if there is a successful and massive effort to have a better environment. But that is only a beginning. There are other problems.

This article will describe the three iron laws that matter. There is no point in hiding that all three are very depressing. The only purpose in adding more depressing information to a world already surfeited with it is a small one: to avoid useless effort based on false premises. A classic example has already arisen in wistful Congressional inquiries into whether we might think of a future with somewhat less electric power, or at least less growth in electric power.

In shorthand, the three laws are:

(1) The law of economic growth.

(2) The law of compound interest.

(3) The law of the mix between public and private spending.

THE LAW OF ECONOMIC GROWTH

Whether we like it or not, and assuming no unusual increase in mass murders or epidemics, the American labor force for the next 20 years is already born and intends to work. It is hard for any of us—myself included—to imagine a deliberate policy to keep a large portion of it unemployed. But that simple fact has enormous consequences.

For more than a century the average output of each worker for each hour worked has risen between 2 and 3 per cent a year, thanks mainly to new machines, but also to better managerial methods and a more skilled labor force. This increase in what is called productivity is by far the most important cause of our gradually rising standard of living—which pollution aside, nearly all of us have wanted. In simplest terms, each worker can be paid more because he produces more and he consumes more because he earns more. Inflation only increases the numbers and does not change the facts. Machines increase the productivity of an auto worker more than a barber, but both rightly share, through the general rise in real income, in the expansion of productivity in the economy as a whole.

It is difficult to conceive of our society or any other wanting to halt the rise in productivity, or efficiency, which has made real incomes higher for all of us. But even if "we" wanted to, in our kind of society and economy "we" couldn't. The profit motive will almost always propel individual daily devisions in the direction of higher productivity. A business will always buy a new machine if it will cut costs and increase efficiency—and thank goodness! That is what has made our standard of living—and we do enjoy it—rise.

It is not a matter of enjoying it, however. By any fair test, we are not really affluent; half of our households earn less than $8,500 a year. Apart from redistributing income, which has very real limits, the only way the society can continue to improve the well-being of those who are not affluent—really the majority—is through a continued increase in productivity. Anyone who wants us to go back to the ax, the wooden plow, the horse carriage and the water wheel is not only living a wholly impossible dream, he is asking for a return to a society in which nearly everybody was poor. We are not talking here about philosophical ideas of happiness, but of what people have proved they want in the way of material things. This society is not about to give up productivity growth. But every increase in productivity adds to output. Now consider the next step:

We can count on the output of the average worker to continue to rise in the years ahead, as it has in the past. Nearly all current forecasts put this rise in productivity much closer to 3 per cent than to 2, and 3 per cent has been about our average in the years since World War II. So without any change in the labor force at all, our national output will go on rising by some 3 per cent a year.

What does output mean?

It means electric power produced—and smoke produced.

It means cans and bottles produced.

It means steel produced—and, unless something is done about it, water and air polluted.

It means paper produced—with the same result as for steel.

And so on and on.

But that is not the end, for there will not be a static labor force. As noted, the force for the next 20 years is already born and it is going to grow year by wear (with a caveat, to be described below).

Obviously, we want to offer these people employment opportunity. So, in addition to a 3 per cent productivity growth, there will be an added growth of at least 1 per cent a year in the number of workers. The result is that we are almost "condemned" to a rise in our total output of 4 per cent a year. The only escape, it seems, would be a national decision either to have high unemployment or to try to be less efficient. Both are absurd on their face.

The law of economic growth says, then, that we already know that the national output in 1980 will be, and almost must be, some 50 percent higher than it is now. President Nixon has said so publicly, and he is right. That is the result of an annual rate of real growth of about 4 percent, compounded. It is terrifying. If an economy of $900-billion in 1969 produces the pollution and clutter we are all familiar with, what will an economy half again as large produce?

Is there no escape from this law? The answer, essentially, is no. But there is one possible way to mitigate the awesome results. We might reduce the labor input (but, we hope, not the productivity input), without creating mass unemployment.

Each working person has a workday, workweek, workyear and worklife. Any one of them could be reduced by law or otherwise. We could reduce the legal workweek from the present 40 hours. We could add more holidays or lengthen vacations to reduce the workyear. We are already shortening the worklife, without planning it that way: increased participation in higher education has meant later entry into the labor force for many, and retirement plans, including Social Security, have brought about earlier retirement than in the past for others.

If, by chance or by law, the annual man-hours of employment are reduced in the years ahead, our output will grow a little less rapidly. This is the only way to cut our economic growth, short of deliberate unemployment or deliberate inefficiency.

There is a cost. It is most easily seen in a union-bargained settlement providing for longer vacations without any cut in annual wages, or a legal reduction in the workweek from 40 to 35 hours, with compulsory overtime payments after that. In each case, more workers must be hired to produce the same output, and if the employer—because of market demand—goes on producing at the same level, wage costs for each unit of output are higher than they otherwise would have been. Prices will therefore be higher. This is widely recognized. Maybe we would be willing to pay them.

But we cannot guarantee less output. Only if employers produce less—because of the extra cost—would that happen. And in that larger sense, the cost of a reduction of our annual labor input is simply less production per capita because the labor force is idle more of the time.

But less production was the objective of the exercise—the antipollution exercise. If we start with the proposition that the growth of production is the underlying cause of pollution, which has merit as a starting point, the only way we can get less growth in production, if we want it, is to have more of our labor force idle more of the time. In that case, we will have more leisure without mass unemployment, as we usually think of the term. Our national output, and our standard of living, will rise less rapidly.

That last idea we may learn to take, if we can cope with the leisure. But under any foreseeable circumstances, our output will still go on rising. With the most optimistic assumptions about a gradual reduction of the workday, workweek, workyear and worklife, we shall undoubtedly have a much higher output in 1980 than we have in 1970. To a man concerned about the environment, it might seem a blessing if our economic growth in the next 10 years could be 2 per cent a year instead of 4 per cent; he cannot hope for zero growth.

The law of economic growth, then, tells us a simple truth: "we" cannot choose to reduce production simply because we have found it to be the cause of a fouled environment. And if we want to reduce the rate of growth of production, the place to look is in our man-hours of work.

THE LAW OF COMPOUND INTEREST

It is a fair question to ask: Why weren't we bothered about pollution 12 or 15 years

ago? In October, 1957, to pick a date, the Soviet Union sent the first earth satellite into orbit. The American economy had just begun a recession that was to send unemployment to 7 per cent of the labor force. The late George Magoffin Humphrey, who had just resigned as Secretary of the Treasury, was warning of what he saw as vast Government spending, at that time $77-billion, and saying it would bring "a depression that would curl your hair." There were plenty of things to think about.

But nobody was worried about pollution. Conservation groups were properly bothered about parts of the wilderness (the Hell's Canyon Dam in Idaho, for example), but that was an entirely different thing. That was an issue of esthetics, not health. Nobody seemed to mention air pollution or waste that might overwhelm the space in which to put it. In a peculiarly sad irony, the late Adlai E. Stevenson had fought and lost an election against Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1956 partially on a "pollution" issue—radiation in the atmosphere from the explosion of atomic weapons.

The question, to repeat: Why didn't we worry about pollution then? The answer is that, relatively speaking, there was no pollution. Yes, there were electric power plants then, too. Yes, there were paper mills polluting streams. Yes, there were tin cans and paper and bottles. Some snowflakes, though we didn't know it, were already a bit black, and Pittsburgh got national attention because it tried to do some cleaning up.

But here we come to the law of compound interest. In 1957—*only 13 years ago*—our gross national product was $453-billion. In 1969, in constant dollars, it was $728-billion. That is an increase of nearly $300-billion in tin cans, electric power, automobiles, paper, chemicals and all the rest. It is an increase of 60 per cent.

So what? That was not the result of an unnaturally rapid growth rate, though a bit more rapid than in some periods of our past. The *so what* is this: in the preceding 13 years the growth had been *only $100-billion.* We were the same nation, with the same energy, in those preceding 13 years. We invested and we had a rise both in productivity and in our labor force. But in the first 13 years of this example our output rose $100-billion, and in the second 13 it rose $300-billion.

In the next 13 it will rise more than $500-billion.

That is the law of compound interest. These are not numbers; they are tin cans and smoke and auto exhaust. There is no visible escape from it. Applying the same percentage growth to a larger base every year, we have reached the point where our growth in one year is half the total output of Canada, fully adjusting for inflation. Another dizzying and rather horrifying way of putting it is that the real output of goods and services in the United States has grown as much since 1950 as it grew in the entire period from the landing of the Pilgrims in 1620 up to 1950.

Most investors know the law of compound interest. There is a magic rule, for example, known as the Rule of 72. It says, with mathematical certainty, that money invested at a 7.2 per cent rate of interest, compounded each year, doubles in 10 years. Our G.N.P. happily, does not compound at 7.2 per cent. But it compounds at between 4 and 5 per cent, and it has been compounding. The result is that the same, routine, full-employment, desirable, nationally wanted, almost unavoidable percentage increase in our national output in 1970 means precisely twice as many extra tin cans, twice as much additional electric power, and so on, as the same rate of growth in 1950. And that is only 20 years ago! We are not doing anything different, or anything awful. We are the same people. Granting approximately the same amount of human carelessness and selfishness, we are the victims solely of the law of compound interest.

### THE LAW OF THE MIX BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SPENDING

Robert S. McNamara, the eternally energetic and constructive former Secretary of Defense and now president of the World Bank, gave a speech in February about the plight of the poor countries. In the speech he understandably criticized the United States for reducing its foreign aid effort. But in supporting his point he adopted, almost inadvertently, a piece of partly fallacious conventional wisdom:

"Which is ultimately more in the nation's interest: to funnel national resources into an endlessly spiraling consumer economy—in effect, a pursuit of consumer gadgetry with all its senseless by-products of waste and pollution—or to dedicate a more reasonable share of those same resources to improving the fundamental quality of life both at home and abroad?"

Fair enough. It means tax increases, of course, though Mr. McNamara did not say so. That is what the "mix" between public and private spending is all about. But for our purposes the point is different. Let us look more closely at the phrase: ". . . a pursuit of consumer gadgetry with all its senseless by-products of waste and pollution . . ."

As it stands, it is true. Private consumption does create side effects like waste and pollution. But now, assume a Brave New World in which we are all happy to pay higher taxes and reduce our private consumption so that the Government may have more money with which to solve our problems—ranging from poor education to poverty, from crime to inadequate health services. We shall not examine here the issue of whether more Government money solves problems. It is obviously more effective in some areas than in others. But anyway, in our assumption, we are all willing to give the Government more money to solve problems, including pollution.

Now let us see what happens.

The Government spends the money to reduce pollution. Sewage plants are built. They need steel. They need electric power. They need paperwork. They need workers. The workers get paid, and they consume.

The Government spends the money on education. New schools are built, which need steel, lumber and electric power. Teachers are hired. They get paid, and they consume. They throw away tin cans.

The Government spends the money on a better welfare system that treats all poor people alike, whether they work or not. Incomes among the poor rise by some amount between $4-billion and $20-billion, and these people consume. Electric power production rises and appliance and steel production rises, and so on and on.

The point is obvious by now. A shifting in our national income or production between "public goods" and "private goods" hardly changes the environment problem at all because it does not reduce total spending, or output, in the economy.

Lest a careful economist raise a valid objection, a slightly technical point must be conceded here. Government spending is done in three categories:

Purchase of goods (tanks, typewriters, sanitation trucks and school buildings).

Transfer payments to people outside government (Social Security, veterans' benefits, welfare).

Purchase of services, meaning the services of the people it employs (teachers, policemen, park rangers, tax collectors).

To the extent that a shift to more public spending, through higher taxes and a resulting reduction of private consumption, involves the first two of these categories, the point stands as made: there will be just as much production of steel, tin cans, electric power and toasters as before. To the extent that the higher public spending goes to the third category, employment of more teachers, policemen and the like, there will be slightly less production of goods, even though these people spend their paychecks like everyone else. Essentially what happens in this case is that the society has chosen, through higher taxes, to have more services and fewer goods. If we assume that goods production brings pollution, a society with fewer auto- or steelworkers and more cops will crank out less pollution.

But this remains a relatively minor matter. Hardly anyone who proposes a solution to our problems thinks in terms of vast armies of Government workers. Reforming welfare through the President's new family-assistance plan is the perfect example; this will be a simple expansion of transfer payments. And, for that matter, building more sewage plants will be a purchase of goods. The overriding fact is that we can spend 30 per cent of our G.N.P. for public purposes, as we do now, or 50 per cent, and the G.N.P. will still be there. The law of compound interest will apply, forcing the G.N.P. upward. To the extent that the environment problem is caused by ever-expanding output, the third law says that it will not be essentially changed by altering the mix between private and public spending.

### CONCLUSION

Three nice, depressing laws. They give us a starting point for any rational discussion of the environment problem. Our output is going to go on growing and growing under any conceivable set of choices we make.

But the starting point does not mean despair. It simply means that trying to solve the problem by reducing output, or the growth of output, is waste of time and energy. It won't and can't work.

How is the problem solved then? The purpose here is not, and has not been, to solve any problems. It has been to try to head off useless solutions. But a few things can be said:

There is, first, technology itself. The very energy and inventiveness that gave us this rising output—and got us to the moon—can do things about pollution. A fascinating case is the sulphur dioxide put into the air by coal-burning electric power plants. A very strong argument can be made that under any foreseeable circumstances we will have to burn more and more coal to produce the needed growth of electric power. And the ground does not yield much low-sulphur coal. Thus, somebody is going to have to have the incentive to develop a way to get the sulphur out before it leaves the smokestack; and if this costs the utilities money, the regulatory commissions are going to have to allow that cost to be passed along in electric bills.

Next, there is the related idea—being increasingly explored by economists, regulators and some legislators—of making antipollution part of the price-profit-incentive system. In simplest terms, this would involve charging a fee for every unit of pollutant discharged, with meters used to determine the amount. There would be an economic incentive to stop or reduce pollution, possibly backed up with the threat to close down the plant if the meter readings go above a specified level. The company—say a paper company—would be faced with both a carrot and a stick.

There is also that simple use of the police power, as with poisonous drugs or, lately, D.D.T. It is the "thou shalt not" power: automobiles can emit no more than such-and-such an amount of this or that chemical through the exhaust pipe. Once again, if the engineers cannot find a way out, the car simply cannot legally be sold. There will be, and should be, all sorts of debate "at the margin"—whether the higher cost

of the different or improved engine is worth the extra reduction of pollution. The argument exists now over D.D.T.; there are clearly costs, as well as benefits, in stopping its use. But the "thou shalt not" power exists.

Finally, there are many possibilities for using a part of our public spending for environmental purposes. Sewage plants are the obvious case. President Nixon has proposed a big expansion of the current level of spending for these plants, though not as much as many interested in clean water—including Senator Edmund Muskie—would like to see.

In this case, and only in this case, a greater effort at curing pollution must be at the expense of some other Government program unless we pay higher taxes. It is proper to point out here the subtle dimensions of the issue. There are all sorts of possible gimmicks, like tax rebates for antipollution devices for industry and federally guaranteed state and local bonds. One way or another, spending more for pollution abatement will mean spending that much less for something else, and the something else could mean housing or medical services. Every local sewage plant bond sold means that much less investment money available for mortgages, for example.

A final reflection is perhaps in order, thought it is almost banal. Our rising G.N.P. gives us the "resources" to do the antipollution job. These resources include rising Government receipts. Our technology, which has given us the rising G.N.P., might find the way out of one pollution problem after another—and they are all different.

But, in the end, we cannot be sure that the job will be done. Growth of total output and output per capita will continue. The long-term relief is perfectly obvious: *fewer "capita."* That sort of "solution" might help, in our country, by about 1990. If we survive until then, the law of compound interest will be much less horrifying if the population is 220 million instead of 250 million.

## EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. McKNEALLY), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to bring to the attention of this House an article appearing in the Sunday, April 19 edition of Potomac magazine of the Washington Post. This article, entitled, "We Haven't Learned How To Use Our Teaching Machines To Teach" was written by Leo S. Tonkin, a good friend and constituent of mine from the 27th Congressional District of New York.

I heartily commend Mr. Tonkin's thought provoking article to every American citizen. At a time when taxpayers everywhere are hard pressed to meet the spiraling costs of our educational system, Mr. Tonkin's comments deserve our attention. I am particularly gratified to see mention made of President Nixon's sensible call for greater research into the basic dynamics of the learning process of students. Certainly, we should have known much more of this basic process before investing billions of dollars into the complicated and expensive field of teaching machines and their components.

Incidentally, in bringing this article to the attention of the House, I am happy to note that Mr. Tonkin is chairman of the board of trustees at an excellent college in my district, St. Thomas Aquinas College, in Sparkill, N.Y. When Leo Tonkin was elected board chairman there some 3 years ago, he was the youngest college chairman in the country, and it was testimony to the progressive and effective leadership that is guiding St. Thomas Aquinas College into the years ahead.

Aside from Mr. Tonkin's role as president of Tonkin Associates, a Washington, D.C., based college and school system development consulting firm, he has authored other numerous articles, and has spent some years as a congressional assistant to Senator CHARLES MATHIAS, Congressman CARL ELLIOTT, and Congresswoman EDITH GREEN. His background and professional activities thus recommend the Potomac magazine article to all our attention and I am happy to insert it in the RECORD at this time:

WE HAVEN'T LEARNED HOW TO USE TEACHING MACHINES TO TEACH

(By Leo S. Tonkin)

The word "technology" is not new to the vocabulary of education. For years we have been hearing about teaching machines, slide and film projectors, dial access, programmed instruction. In fact, in the last 10 years, the federal government has provided grants totaling $5 billion or more to help schools buy the latest machines on the market. Familiar corporate names, like Eastman Kodak, IBM, Xerox, Bell and Howell, have been manufacturing such devices for years. Their armies of salesmen have been doing a noteworthy job, too.

So, after all this prodigious spending, what has it got us?

The answer—shockingly—is very little. We simply have not learned yet how to use the machines made for teaching.

The many pages of a report just issued by the federal Advisory Commission on Instruction Technology say loudly that education technology in American schools today is not making it. My own meetings with high school and college personnel around the country would convince anyone—as it has convinced me—that educational technology has been little used and, where used, has often failed.

Closed-circuit television systems remain idle in the schools, microfilm readers are alien to most students, programmed study consoles are dusty from nonuse. Some claim that the machines are invaluable. But in my work, as a school systems and college consultant, mostly all I hear are complaints.

The fact is, we need *some* kind of mechanized help in America's teaching business.

In seven years, the United States will be spending about $76 billion to educate some 63 million students, in both public and private schools. The cost will have risen 40 per cent in 10 years, the student population 6 million. Facing this, we must find new ways to teach more students, and teach them better, and for less money. It sounds simple—but it isn't, and every taxpayer knows it; continuing tax increases afflict every community, large and small.

With billions of dollars already spent on this expensive hardware, and very little payoff to show for it, where does the blame lie?

Much of it lies with the corporations. They rushed headlong into the teaching machine business, chalking up tremendous sales. But, in the process, they sat back and cared little about perfecting creative materials, slides and films to make the hardware usable.

A good deal of blame also lies with the federal government. In approving an astounding amount of taxpayers' money for equipment and machines, the government encouraged schools by the thousands to apply for grants (through programs like the National Defense Education Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and a score of other federal programs). The inevitable result: schools with closets stacked high with teaching machines, machines that sounded wonderful in sales brochures, looked imposing to the local P-TAs (and taxpayers) but just plain failed in helping the citizens' children to learn.

If we are going to make teaching machines work, and justify the commitment we've already made in terms of time and money, we must start immediately to understand what's gone wrong, and get to the business of correcting the problems.

It is clear that technology can bring about far more productive use of teachers' and students' time. And it is blatantly clear too, that education (as well as taxpayers) desperately needs this kind of help. So, just what is wrong? Three areas, in particular, have not kept pace with the development of the teaching machines:

1. Hardware minus software.

In 1969, public schools in the United States owned 251,000 16-millimeter projectors, and 426,000 slide and filmstrip projectors. When you add to this thousands of other teaching devices, you begin to see how well industry has been marketing its products.

But all these teaching machines take materials, and the materials are of first importance if a student is to use a machine, learn from it, and return to it on his own initiative—and he must return to it on his own, or a teacher has only so many hours in which to give personal instruction.

These materials (software is the label) have not met the need.

By the truckload, the companies have been turning out "canned boredom"—materials that have excited no one, materials that have left the machines literally useless. Oh yes, the marketing brochures rave about the relevant subject matters, and most film series and the like have imposing advisory "panels of professors" who help in strangely abstruse ways to compile and edit the material. The result: a near uniform lack of anything that will *interest* students. So, like castor oil, if you don't have to take it, it sits on the shelf.

A big problem is that even the simple fundamentals of learning have been neglected in the software that has been put out so far. The psychology of learning depends upon the response of students and their teachers. Yet these are the people who have been relegated to a back seat in preparing the materials for the machines. Surprisingly little has been done to tune the students and teachers into the production of software, and that is a decisive flaw in the growth of educational technology.

If a film is to stimulate a student, watch his response to a product, test his reaction, ask for his suggestions. Similarly, with the teacher, find out his or her feelings and suggestions. Then mold and rework the films accordingly.

2. Teacher training.

Aside from assisting in the development of interesting materials, teachers must learn how to use the machines. Advancements in classroom technology present teachers an awesome roomful of complicated machinery; they must undergo specially designed training programs before they know how best to use the machines, not only in one class, but as part of the whole school environment. For the most part, such teacher training has so far been neglected.

3. School coordination.

Sensible use of these machines in classrooms is lost when schools fail to provide an awareness and appreciation of just what a machine can do, and get this message across to everybody. Schools, or school systems, cannot merely dump a machine into a classroom. Some teachers, some bureaucrats, resent them. And that is probably quite nat-

ural—they represent a threat—until both bureaucrats and teachers learn what these machines are capable of—that human teachers will *not* be replaced by automation, that a prime importance of the machines lies in freeing teachers for more and more individualized attention to individual students. Educational technology is an expensive business, and its potential for better learning is too important to be lost in bureaucratic malaise.

When media systems are tried and found effective, an entire school—in fact the entire school district and perhaps the state at large—should help implement the proven systems, and see that this costly equipment is given the widest possible use.

What is the future for teaching machines? In the words of the Advisory Commission on Instructional Technology, ". . . technology could bring about far more productive use of the teachers' and students' time." The large corporations that make the machines know this well. After having profited immensely in the mid-1960s from selling so much equipment to schools, their business suddenly took a downward turn. Many, like General Learning Corporation, have retrenched their operations. They know now that preparing sensible and effective software must occupy the principal priority area for further advancements.

Teaching machines do have a special capacity to tailor instruction to individual students. Computer-assisted instruction offers considerable potential, in view of its encouraging students to proceed at their own pace, then receiving instant feedback on right and wrong answers. Computer-assisted instruction (now labeled CAI) is just now breaking above the water and (as with all of computer technology) the potential of these machines is without limit for storing information and returning it to a student at his own individual capacity.

Prof. Gabrel Ofiesh of Catholic University here has been a leader in this infant field, and his work is beginning to bear fruit. In New York City, a computer learning system with 200 terminals has recently gone into operation, and 16,000 students are already involved in its use.

We must remember the lesson of the 1960s, however. Students must be involved in reworking the initial programming, teachers must be trained in how to use the machines, and schools must coordinate the technology across various courses and school systems. Only then will we transform the entire learning environment, by using teachers, students and facilities in new and different ways.

In his recent education message to Congress, President Nixon requested early establishment of a National Institute of Education within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, to research and understand thoroughly the dynamics of the learning process of a student. This knowledge is desperately needed, and should have come years ago, before we spent billions upon billions of dollars on untried teaching machines, and encouraging everyone to expect great and immediate strides in education via the new technology.

Knowing what we now do about teaching machines, I would propose the following steps:

(1) Develop "media centers" in the schools. In these centers, make the computers, the dial access, the talking books, the microfilm readers and the other fine learning systems available to all students—and on a constant readiness basis.

(2) Establish a widely based teacher training program in the new technologies.

(3) Research and understand thoroughly the psychology of learning, particularly as it pertains to educational technology.

(4) Enlist the support of students in preparing and critiquing software. A good lesson could be gained from the Washington Workshops Foundation. This Foundation annually sponsors a series of highly effective seminars in American government for hundreds of high school students from across the country. In conjunction with this, the students themselves will be assisting in preparing a sensible and practical series of films and filmstrips that look at the study of government through the eyes of youth.

(5) Choose material topics and content most carefully if we are to encourage a student to reach for a machine, push buttons and experience a stimulation that will be meaningful and sensitive to the disadvantaged youngster as well as to the brightest students.

(6) Provide an interrelationship of machine to student to teacher to school in such a way that a new kind of learning environment comes into being. Antiquated and expensive class hours, sleepy lectures, physical conformity and wasted materials must give way to students' using better what is and will become available. Technology can serve as the catalyst for all of this.

(7) Follow up use of the machines with on-the-scene visits, work-study arrangements, and time-off semesters of study for individual students. Here again, the Washington Workshops could serve as an important example. Their program combines seminar attendance, preparation of film and other software, research papers, and follow-up assignments, requiring a month or more of study away from high school.

(8) Round out the most effective educational technology program by making source materials available at school via such systems as low-cost microfilm readers. In a government class, for instance, excerpts from the *Congressional Record,* Committee reports and hearings, official statements and the like should be available. Then when a teacher mentions something important, they can all go to the original source material. Educational television can be a great help here. Recent grants to Washington's noncommercial television station (WETA, Channel 26) to provide live coverage of official Washington events (like Capitiol Hill hearings) to similar non-profit channels across the country is a case in point.

The future for educational technology is by no means gloomy because of past mistakes. It could be, of course, if educators, corporation designers and others involved refused to learn from those mistakes. But the indicators now seem to say that, from the White House on down, there will be a new and coordinated approach to educational technology, and that America's inestimable ability to use machines productively in other facets of society will be harnessed to help solve the problems of the schools.

---

## PROBLEMS FACING THE NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BYRNE) is recognized for 35 minutes.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there have been many problems and crises confronting this august body during the 18 years I have had the honor to represent the Third District of Pennsylvania, but throughout that service I cannot point to a period where we have had a greater challenge facing us than today.

The problems facing the Nation are of such proportions that it is not physically possible for the Congress to solve each and every one before the conclusion of this session. But their monumental nature demands that we do everything within our capacity and ability to accomplish as much as possible in the time that remains for us in this session.

There are many "priorities" and "priority priorities" to consider and I feel that the people of this country are looking to us for action—action now because, unfortunately, the executive branch seems to be neglecting these needs and wants which are its primary responsibility.

Briefly, I would like to outline the fields in which I consider immediate movement not only necessary but vital.

### THE VIETNAM WAR—AND ASSOCIATED CONFLICTS

My feelings on these conflicts are a matter of record. I am not in favor of a land war in Southeast Asia for a number of reasons. Frankly and pragmatically, it is a historical fact that a land war in Southeast Asia cannot be won. This current war of attrition does not solve the problems which led to the war; what it does is eat up lives and resources.

I have supported the efforts of the President to deescalate this conflict, but I must state frankly I am not satisfied by what has been accomplished.

I am not satisfied with the pace of troop withdrawals. I am not satisfied that we are supporting a stable, democratic, representative government which could fill the void when and if American forces leave that area.

I am not satisfied with American efforts at the so-called Paris peace talks, which have denigrated from an honest effort toward a true and lasting peace to a cruel charade which no one—most of all the American Government—takes seriously.

I would urge that this body and the other body of the Congress use every means, make every effort to convince the President that these talks be upgraded; that he send the Secretary of State as his personal representative to these talks; so that the world and our adversaries in this conflict know absolutely that the United States wants a true, lasting and equitable peace in Southeast Asia.

But let me make absolutely clear where I stand. As long as we do have troops engaged in combat in that area of the world, I am determined that they shall have the best and sufficient equipment and material to defend and protect themselves. We will never desert or deprive these brave young men who are executing their duties as American citizens.

### THE MIDDLE EAST

Time and time again, this body, with my absolute support, has passed resolution upon resolution urging the President to pursue a more sensible course in the Middle East, but apparently these pleas have fallen on deaf ears—or nearly deaf ears.

It is a wise nation which knows its true friends; and I think it is abundantly clear the only dependable, democratic and true friend in the Middle East is the State of Israel.

How do we recognize this friendship? By denying to this small country the means to protect itself. And at the same time we engage in a monumental arms race with the Soviet Union and France as to who will supply more sophisticated weaponry to the Arabs—who inciden-

tally curse and damn us as their blood enemies.

Make no mistake. If it were not for Israel holding the line against Soviet expansion in the Middle East, I shudder to think what our military position would be in that part of the world.

PRICES—INFLATION

Anyone who does not admit that our Nation is in the midst of inflation is just not facing facts. If anyone harbors any doubts, let him ask the housewife, who finds food prices up each and every time she does her shopping.

Ask the municipalities and school boards who, if they are able to sell their bond issues, find that the allocations no longer cover the building and services for which they were intended.

Ask anyone who has been unfortunate enough as to require medical treatment or hospital care. For many, health insurance has become a down payment for medical care only. And health insurance costs are spiraling, reaching the point where it is beyond many of the people who need it the most.

I think this points very clearly to the need of either Federal control over health prices, or the institution of a national health plan to insure that this, the richest Nation in the world, can assure at least minimum health standards for its people.

UNEMPLOYMENT

An unemployment rate approaching 5 percent may be "acceptable" to certain members of the administration, but it is obvious that these individuals are not those suffering from joblessness and its handmaidens of hunger and deprivation.

I do not consider any rate of unemployment acceptable; I do not believe unemployment makes a healthy economy; I believe that nothing can substitute for the dignity and fulfillment of honest employment.

INTEREST RATES AND HOUSING

Recently I read a newspaper article by a knowledgeable real estate financier who advised those waiting for a reduction in interest before purchasing a house to stop waiting. Interest rates, he declared, are not coming down.

Unfortunately, I must agree with him. Despite a small amount of movement concerning the prime rate, interest costs do not seem to be declining. I think a good look must be taken at all the to-do about the prime rate decline. How many people can borrow money at the prime rate? Very few.

I do not think this reduction is filtering down to the small borrower—especially in the realm of mortgages.

For this reason, the homebuilding industry has ground almost to a standstill—despite housing legislation passed by this body.

Any homebuilding that continues appears to be involved with very expensive houses—houses that the average person cannot afford—even if he could get a mortgage loan.

The place where we vitally need new and rehabilitated housing is within the city—the inner city, if you will. The suburbs and semisuburbs likewise need housing, I agree, but unless we launch a massive homebuilding campaign within the city, our cities are going to die.

Again, despite the legislation of the Congress, it would not take long to count the number of housing units being worked on within the cities. The cities—my city included—need massive assistance and cooperation from its legislators.

"Build—Build—Build"—should be our watchword in the Congress. Give people decent housing which they can afford.

The cities are depending upon us; the people are depending upon us.

Unemployment in the building industries is rife—probably at the crisis stage.

These are facts we cannot ignore. They cry out for action.

TAXES

In view of the foregoing, I feel the need for tax reform is imminent—to preserve what little the people have left—if anything—after the ravages of inflation and unemployment.

I am not one of the supporters of the "filter-down" doctrine—that the large corporations should be given tax relief and the relief will filter through to the "little man." This just is not so.

And I hope no one ever sells us a bill of goods again that a tax surcharge is necessary to halt inflation. We had the surcharge and inflation was not even slowed. What we did get was a lot of squeezed little people, who had to deny themselves not luxuries but necessities of life.

Income tax being the biggest tax bite experienced by the citizenry, here is the place we should logically begin with tax reform. The proper place we should start is with a realistic exemption for dependents. Certainly not $600 a year, or even $1,200 a year are realistic figures for support of children or aged parents.

Another area crying for relief is among the middle class—that great, forgotten majority of Americans, who are carrying the brunt of the tax burden. We know the very rich evade taxes through gimmickry despite the reforms passed by the Congress. More tightening up is necessary for the rich and relief is needed for the middle class.

CRIME

I need not tell anyone residing or working in an urban area that crime stalks our streets; there is an uneasiness in the day succeeded by utter fear at nightfall. And make no mistake, this fear for life and limb transcends racial and ethnic lines. All of our citizenry is frightened on the streets and even within their own homes.

To combat this intolerable situation, I see two basic approaches. First, I do not believe we need more laws; there are enough statutes upon the books now. What we need is efficient, fearless enforcement of existing laws.

Second, we must attack the causes of crime. I am not talking about the habitual criminal; the only thing that can be done with the confirmed felon is to remove him from the public for as long a period as possible.

But where we can make real progress is among the occasional, nonprofessional criminal, who turns to violence and theft through frustration with existing society. A good job is the best deterrent to crime that I can think of. Money spent in training our citizens for a productive, dignified life is the best investment I can visualize.

Clean up the slums. Give people decent housing. Give them dignity and purpose.

Destroy the incentives of crime and the breeding ground of crime, and we have come a long way toward the solution of this immense problem.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Can we hold our heads up when we recognize that in the richest land of the world the aged who have worked hard and honorably through the autumn of their years cannot live in dignity and freedom from fear during their "golden years."

In today's world, it is impossible to subsist on social security payments without outside income or subsidation by relatives. Social security is not welfare. It is payment earned by our elderly during their productive years. They have a right to expect more than they are getting.

As soon as possible, we must work for a substantial increase in social security payments—an increase to make living for the elderly more realistic in this present day.

Other adjustments are needed in social security. With the astronomical increases in health insurance costs, I think the Medicare program must assume the deficit presently being filled by health insurance plans.

Also in the realm of Medicare, I think it only proper that the disabled people under 65 on social security be granted coverage under Medicare. They are one group which needs it the most.

FARM SUBSIDIES

In view of the cost of government and the price of food products, I believe it is incumbent upon Congress to reassess and adjust the multibillion-dollar farm subsidy program whereby farmers are getting unbelievable sums from the Government both for raising and not raising agricultural products.

It just does not make sense. Here we have many thousands in the United States and many millions throughout the world hungry and starving, and we expend our precious tax money to halt the production of food.

It must be remembered that it is not the little farmer who is the chief beneficiary of subsidies; it is the giant farmer, who gets hundreds of thousands of dollars—to do nothing.

A sensible lid on the amount of subsidies going to any single farmer—or perhaps food corporation would be a more suitable name—is required now, with an eye toward eliminating this entire practice in the foreseeable future.

DRUGS

Mention the word "youth" today and most people will respond "drugs." I do not mean to imply that all young people are on drugs; the truth is that actually only a small percentage are involved. But this does not lessen the seriousness of the situation.

Millions of our children are victims of this disease of our times and this cannot be ignored. Let us face it: anyone who would poison his or her body for momen-

tary escape from the realities of the world must be sick. They must be treated as such.

We need a massive treatment program to provide the means of escape from drugs for this "hooked" generation; and we must provide the mental care as well to remove the causes which began this syndrome.

This does not imply leniency for the "pusher" or "supplier." These are the criminals and must be treated as such. This is a cancer which must be removed from our society whether the culprit be a member of the crime associations or an independent peddler.

EDUCATION

It is impossible today to open a newspaper and not read of the plight of our schools. Some operate on a hand-to-mouth existence and others are in the danger of not even operating.

Throughout the Nation, children are crowded into aged and aging firetrap buildings with too few teachers to satisfy their educational needs.

Our colleges are bursting at their seams as tuition costs climb far beyond the abilities of the average citizen. Intelligent, capable students are denied what should be a right to higher education.

Youth lounge on the streets without employment instead of having institutions to prepare them for suitable vocational careers.

Nonpublic schools are even in greater trouble than the public schools; so overburdened with spiraling cost that they threaten to close their doors and disgorge their pupils upon an already overtaxed public school system.

There is no single answer to this vast group of problems. But our responsibility to the future generations demands we take immediate action—despite the disregard of some members of the executive.

MASS TRANSIT

To me, the jokes about the various expressways and freeways of our country are not funny. I do not think they are funny to the millions of motorists who must use them in the daily exercise of their work.

Yes; we need new roads, and better roads and safer roads; but roads alone are not the final solution to our transportation problems.

What we need—and need now, before all traffic stops—are intelligent approaches to mass transportation facilities to give the traveler a sensible, convenient alternate to driving.

We all know the attitude of the major railroads; they would just as soon go out of the passenger business and restrict their activities to the more profitable field of moving freight.

This cannot be permitted, even if existing facilities must be taken over by Government or Government authorities to improve and expand mass transit systems.

Intracity and intercity bus and streetcar service must be brought up into the 20th century.

Trains and buses must be cleaned up so riders have no hesitation about using them. Criminals who haunt public transportation facilities must be removed so that riders can use them without fear.

Are these all the problems facing our society? Certainly not; they are just a few. But a start must be made, and made now. I think these spheres are the proper places to begin our efforts to give all citizens a better country and a better life.

## LAVA BEDS SHOULD BE ADDED TO WILDERNESS SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a prevous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to designate certain lands in the Lava Beds National Monument of California as a wilderness. Involved is a total of approximately 9,000 acres, all of which are within the boundaries of the federally owned park facilities located in Modoc and Siskiyou Counties in the extreme northern portions of California.

Lava Beds National Monument is an area of comparatively recent lava flows, with lava tubes, or caves, and related volcanic features. It was the principal scene of the Modoc Indian War of 1872–73, the last important war of its kind fought in California.

The smooth cinder cones are the most conspicuous features on the landscape. These miniature volcanoes rise from 100 to nearly 500 feet over the lava beds. The largest cone is Schonchin Butte, named after a famous war chief of the Modocs. Altogether, there are about 17 cinder cones in the monument, most of them in the southern part.

Of equal interest are the spatter, or dribblet, cones on the lava flows. Some of these form large tubelike structures resembling chimneys, and others have deep holes extending down into the earth. One such hole at Fleener Chimneys, northwest of headquarters, is 3 feet in diameter and more than 100 feet in depth.

The Modoc War of 1872–73 was one of the last clashes between Indians and settlers in the Pacific West. Considering the small number of Indians involved and the hundreds of troops amassed against them, it was probably the most costly Indian campaign ever waged by the U.S. Army. The main battlefields of the Modoc War, located in the monument, are practically the same today as they were in 1873. The rock forts marking the scenes of conflict have been preserved and protected.

Two types of Indian art occur in the monument: paintings—pictographs—of red, yellow, and green mineral pigments in caves and on natural bridges; and carvings—petroglyphs—which are found mostly on the rocky bluffs in the Tule Lake peninsula where the rocks were soft enough to be pecked by stone tools. In the petroglyph section, a detached segment northeast of the main part of the monument, carvings are scattered for over a quarter of a mile along the cliffs.

The plant life of the area is unexpectedly colorful. In spring and early summer, the region at times is a veritable garden, and flowers bloom profusely wherever there is sufficient soil for plant growth. About 250 species of plants grow in the area, and their reds, yellows, and whites contrast vividly with the black lava flows and the green in scattered junipers, ponderosa pine, flowering antelope bitterbrush, mountain-mahogany and wild currant.

There are about 40 species of mammals in the monument. The checklist of birds of the lava beds area comprises about 200 species.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the rugged beauty of this area can continue to be preserved in its natural state for the enjoyment of this and future generations, and therefore, I urge its inclusion in the National Wilderness System.

Thank you.

## RESTORING THE CONTROL OF OUR MONEY TO THE PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on the 21st of this month I introduced H.R. 17140, a bill to vest ownership and control of the 12 Federal Reserve banks in our Government.

This is a positive and progressive action I feel necessary to overcome the retrogressive mistakes of the past. Money, next to freedom, is a basic human right. Protection of the peoples' money is a priority duty of government.

I am not a banker, nor am I involved in any international banking schemes or profitmaking enterprises. I only recognize that there is unrest in America—it is affecting the happiness and welfare of all of our people and it can be traced readily back to money.

From time to time I hope to grant free expression to many of our concerned citizens on the money crisis—chances to express themselves to Congress that they might otherwise never be granted. In so doing I may not necessarily agree with them in whole or in part, but I feel that somehow we must breach the bonds that bind us and live up to our responsibility by giving the American people some voice over their money.

Such information must by necessity commence with the speech of Congressman Louis T. McFadden who served this body for 22 years and was chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee. I insert his speech of January 24, 1934, and other related papers and comments:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 24, 1934]

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN LOUIS T. MCFADDEN, CHAIRMAN, BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, 22 YEARS

Mr. MCFADDEN. Mr. Chairman, a citizen of the United States has asked me to explain for his benefit and for the benefit of other United States citizens the real meaning of the Roosevelt gold bill, the bill which the House passed last Saturday by 360 votes to 40, with 32 Members not voting.

Mr. Chairman, a law against the Constitution is void. The gold bill creates a nullity. Old John Marshall said that the words of the Constitution are not to be twisted out of their plain, everyday meaning. The Constitution says Congress shall have power to coin money and to regulate the value thereof. This, Mr. Chairman, means that Congress has power to make coins of metal and to stamp the true value upon each one of them. It does not mean that Congress shall refuse

to furnish the people of the United States with an adequate coinage, and it does not mean that a theoretical amount of uncoined metal shall be called a coin. A coin is an object which may be seen and felt and even heard if one tests the ring of it.

Mr. Chairman, the gold bill attempts to cut out, delete, and destroy that part of our great written Constitution pertaining to the power of Congress to coin money and to regulate, that is, to stamp on the metal coin the value thereof. The bill is unconstitutional on its face because it seeks to nullify the Constitution. Moreover, it is a bill which is contrary to the common law and to the law of custom upon which the common law rests. It attempts to legalize robbery. It attempts by force to deprive the people of the United States of their right to the currency of the Constitution. It gives the international bankers power to send the gold belonging to the people of the United States to a place of deposit reserved to themselves in Europe. Mr. Chairman, the gold bill cannot become a valid law by any constitutional means.

Now Mr. Chairman, let us look at the bill to see if the legal hirelings of the Bank of England and their agents, the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks have been able to disguise its purpose. Let us see if they were able to clothe the grisly skeleton of their greed with echoes of glib religiosity, moral precepts, economic jargon, and shop worn tags of speech, according to the fashion set by the present administration. The first thing that meets my eye is the title. We read:

"A bill to protect the currency system of the United States to provide for a better use of the monetary gold stock of the United States and for other purposes."

It is indeed a bill to protect the present currency system of the United States, but it is a bill to protect it from the just wrath of United States citizens. It is a bill to save for the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks, and a great effort has been made to have it appear that the Federal Reserve banks their gigantic monopoly of a special paper currency which they steal from the Treasury and upon which they charge the people of the United States a heavy toll of interest. It is indeed a bill to provide for a better use of the monetary gold stock of the United States, if better use means the issuance of two sets of obligations against one peace of security. It is indeed a bill for "other purposes", and these are purposes which the proponents dare not mention.

Among the purposes of the gold bill not mentioned in the title is that of pretending to take into the Treasury the gold now held by the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks, and a great effort has been made to have it appear that the Federal Reserve banks are unwilling to surrender the gold they now hold to the United States Treasury. This effort is dishonest for two reasons. First, the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks have already made a profit of some billions of dollars out of the President's gold seizures, and those billions were stolen from the people of the United States; and second, the transfer is fictitious. The President sought to convince Members of Congress that the Federal Reserve banks were resisting his efforts to have the Treasury take possession of the gold, but one of the members of the Federal Reserve Board spoiled that argument by declaring that the Federal Reserve Board had asked the President to have the Treasury take the gold.

You see, Mr. Chairman, under this bill the United States Treasury has to pay for the gold. Although the gold belongs to the people and was taken away from their bank deposits and their cash registers and their pocketbooks in the first place and put into the Federal Reserve banks, and although the Federal Reserve banks tricked and fooled the people into giving it to them for Federal Reserve currency, which they now refuse to redeem, and although that gold does not belong to the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks, the United States Treasury has to pay the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks for it. Well, how does this bill propose to pay the Federal Reserve outfit? How does this bill provide that the Government shall take over the stolen goods? It provides that the United States Government shall give the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks new gold certificates to the full value of the loot. The gold certificates will give the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks legal title to the gold, and the United States Treasury will be nothing more than its physical custodian. The Secretary of the Treasury will give the Federal Reserve banks gold for their new gold certificates whenever they ask for it. It is a fraudulent transfer.

When the individual citizens of the United States were required to surrender their gold, they were required to surrender their gold certificates as well as their gold coin and bullion. The Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks are private corporations, but they did not obey the gold orders. They did not surrender any gold coin, gold certificates, or gold bullion. On the contrary, the gold which was commandeered from the people was given to them as a free gift; and now, after they have taken into their possession all the gold belonging to the people, they are ready to make a pretended transfer of that gold to the Government. Evidently there is law for the common man and no law for the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks. The common man must toe the mark, but the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks are the agents of the Bank of England, and the law, it seems, does not apply to them. Many of the officials of the Federal Reserve outfit have had charges of impeachment brought against them, but those charges have not been investigated.

The Federal Reserve outfit now has in its possession gold coin, gold certificates, and gold bullion. But this bill does not require them to surrender their present holdings of gold certificates. After this bill becomes law, if such a catastrophe should occur, the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks will still hold their present gold certificates. They may exchange those gold certificates for gold between the time this bill becomes law and the day the President makes his proposed devaluation proclamation. Is not this gift of over $1,000,000,000 in gold a great treasure to bestow upon the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks—the corrupt and sinister organization which has bankrupted the country? Does this not make favorites of the financial crooks who control it?

Mr. Chairman, all the gold in the possession of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks belongs to the people of the United States. During the last 20 years, under the vicious Federal Reserve Act, they have taken it from the people in exchange for Federal Reserve currency, and it has not cost them one penny. Now they come forward to make a pretended transfer of the people's gold coin and bullion to the United States Treasury. Not one penny of the gold they pretend to transfer to the United States Treasury is owned by them; every dollar of it belongs to the individual citizens of the United States. The United States Treasury is to buy it on credit and to pay for it with new gold certificates. How does this transfer title to the United States Treasury? Can the Congress lend itself to such a transaction? Last May I stated that, in my opinion, the people's gold, unjustly impounded in the Federal Reserve banks, should be placed in the people's Treasury, but I did not state that it should be placed there as the property of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks, to be withdrawn by them with gold certificates and to be made exportable from the United States Treasury to the Bank for International Settlements in Europe. What this bill proposes to do in connection with the President's message suggesting that this United States gold may be sent to Europe to be kept in the Bank for International Settlements with the loot of the central banks of other countries is one of the greatest fiscal frauds in history. It is one of the biggest swindles of all time.

Again, Mr. Chairman, as you very well know, the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks had paper currency outstanding to the extent of about $5,000,000,000 when the present administration came into power. That currency was redeemable in gold. It constituted the people's title to all the gold held by the Federal Reserve outfit. It constituted a first and paramount lien on all the assets of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks. Instead of taking over the gold and the assets of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks, including the great hoard of United States wealth which they have hidden in foreign countries, and honestly administering those assets for the benefit of the people who had been defrauded by the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks, the President of the United States unlawfully relieved the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks from their legal liability to redeem their Federal Reserve currency in gold, or in lawful money convertible into gold, and from the surrender of all their assets. Every dollar that was unlawfully taken from the people of the United States by Roosevelt's gold order was given to the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks in preparation for this great steal, this wholesale robbery of the masses for the benefit of the privileged few. And now that American citizens have lost their gold, an entirely fictitious transfer has been arranged to deceive the people. Mr. Chairman, the President may underrate the mental capacity of the American people as much as he likes, but I venture to say there is no man in the United States so dumb that he cannot understand how this bill tricks and deceives him.

The Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks have profited to the extent of $5,000,000,000 or more by being released from their obligation to redeem their outstanding $5,000,000,000 of paper Federal Reserve currency in gold. They have profited by having had over a billion dollars in gold certificates saved to them. They have profited during the last 20 years by the criminality of the Federal Reserve Board, which never charged them one penny in interest on the great mass of Federal Reserve currency they have taken from the Government. They have profited from their own wrongdoing by the unlawful creation of fictitious claims against the United States Government and the giving of those claims to foreigners, and they have profited by their control of all the public revenues. And now they come forward with a scheme to sell the gold they have taken from the American people to the Treasury for new gold certificates which will give them a legal title to that gold and permit them to do as they please with it. An era of corruption is culminating in one of the greatest crimes that have ever been perpetrated against the people. Mark my words, Mr. Chairman, there will be trouble here if this bill becomes law.

Why, Mr. Chairman, this fiscal fraud, this crime is so stupendous that the instigators and manipulators of it did not dare to have all the transactions performed by one man. Each man did his part and then got out of Washington pretending that he disagreed

with the President's money policy or pretending that he was ill. William H. Woodin, who sat beside Albert H. Wiggin on the board of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and who acquiesced in and helped to perpetrate the financial misdeeds which bankrupted the country, is now hiding in a western sanitarium. Dr. Sprague, the tool of the international bankers and an employee of the Bank of England, was, in my opinion, put into the Treasury to resign at a certain time and to create uncertainty in the minds of the people by the manner of his going and his subsequent articles pleading for sound money. Mr. Chairman, all the bickering and the resignations and the artful propaganda that have been thrown around the monetary policy of Franklin D. Roosevelt cannot disguise the fact that he was selected by the international bankers to carry on the work they started with the great depression; that is, the pauperization of the masses and the seizure of American property for their own use and benefit, and that he has lent himself to their schemes by unconstitutionally demanding and assuming the dictatorial powers which will enable him to carry them out.

Another purpose of this bill not mentioned in the title is the transference of a very large quantity of United States gold to the Bank for International Settlements. One of the chief objects of the gold policy of the present administration is the sending of gold taken by force from its lawful American owners to the Bank for International Settlements in Europe, where it will be kept with the property of the central banks of the world. According to the Hague convention, under which the Bank for International Settlements was formed, gold deposited in the vaults of the Bank for International Settlements is safe from seizure. Our gold, when it goes there, will certainly be safe from seizure by the United States. The Bank for International Settlements is dominated by the Bank of England. It is not on American soil. It is in Europe. American gold, therefore, will be kept in Europe. It will be placed where none of the wage slaves of the United States will ever be able to acquire any of it. It will be the capital and means of oppression of that international superstate, that financial superstate, which has been after Uncle Sam's gold money ever since the wealth of this country attracted the attention of greedy European bankers and brought them flocking over here to set up the suction pumps of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks.

The Bank for International Settlements is an international bankers' bank. It is a central bank of central banks. The international bankers, who brought about the depression, have been drawing gold to themselves from the common people of every land. It is their intention to use that gold for their own purposes. They propose two kinds of money. Gold—the real money—is what they intend to have for themselves, and paper money, which has no intrinsic value in itself, and which is made out of nothing and is worth nothing unless it can be redeemed by the holder in gold—that is for the common people, or, as they call us, the peasants.

George Washington said:

"I never have heard, and I hope I never shall hear, any serious mention of a paper emission in this state; yet such a thing may be in agitation. Ignorance and design are productive of much mischief. The former is the tool of the latter, and is often set at work suddenly and unexpectedly."

While he was here in Congress, Daniel Webster, in 1832, made the following statement:

"Of all the contrivances for cheating the laboring classes of mankind, none have been more effectual than that which deludes them with paper money. This is the most effectual of inventions to fertilize the rich man's field by the sweat of the poor man's brow. Ordinary tyranny, oppression, excessive taxation—these bear lightly on the happiness of the mass of the community compared with fraudulent currencies and the robberies committed by depreciated paper. Our own history has recorded for our instruction enough, and more than enough, of the demoralizing tendency, the injustice and the intolerable oppression, on the virtuous and well disposed, of a degraded paper currency, authorized by law, or in any way countenanced by government."

Franklin D. Roosevelt, the high priest of repudiation, the apostle of irredeemable paper money, and the man who intends to send United States gold out of the United States to a place where no American citizen can claim it—this Franklin D. Roosevelt characterizes all those who do not agree with his monetary policy as mules. If that is true, what an awful mule President Woodrow Wilson must have been. Concerning Andrew Jackson, Wilson said:

"He had no idea of allowing the country to undertake the fatal experiment of an irredeemable paper currency."

This is the fatal experiment Franklin D. Roosevelt has undertaken. This is a part of his policy of "bold experimentation." Not long ago he told the people at Savannah that George Washington, like himself, was an experimenter. Mr. Chairman, there are no points of resemblance between George Washington and Franklin D. Roosevelt, experimental or otherwise. George Washington did not take orders from money changers. He did not rob the people of their gold. George Washington abhorred dishonor in all its forms. He would have died before he would have violated his oath of office or tampered with the Constitution of the United States in the manner of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In 1837 the New York Herald described the crime of suspending payments in specie, that is, in gold or silver, on demand, as follows:

"The general suspension of specie payments is a terrible fraud upon the community that will end in destruction to all concerned. This fraud is heightened into crime of the deepest dye, from the fact that it is done to send gold and silver to England by the actual plunder, at the point of the bayonet, of the great mass of the people here * * *. Such an act is a phenomenon in the annals of crime, without a parallel in the history of tyranny, violence, or bad government, from the remotest ages of the world down to the present day."

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us hear the true purpose of the $2,000,000,000 fund which this bill proposes to set up. I quote from the prophecies of Henry Morgenthau, Mr. Baruch's Secretary of the United States Treasury, as shown by the following article which appeared in the Washington Times of January 16, 1934:

"TREASURY SEES U.S. NEED OF BLUE CHIPS

"When you play poker, you want just as many blue chips as the other fellow.

"That, in a man's language, was the gist of Secretary Morgenthau's summing up of the Roosevelt proposal for a $2,000,000,000 stabilization fund to protect the currency of the United States.

"In other words, the American Government is engaged in probably the greatest gamble of all time. The stake is the credit of the United States.

"TO EQUAL BRITISH

"When asked why a figure of 2,000 millions for the stabilization fund had been asked, Morgenthau said:

"'We figured we might need an amount substantially equal to the British stabilization fund.

"'If we are going to play, we must have as many chips as the other fellow.

"'We want every piece of machinery the other countries have. We want to be in a position to buy gold and to sell gold.'

"The 2,000-million stabilization fund will be derived from the Government's profit on the debasing of the value of the dollar to from 50 to 60 percent of the normal valuation.

"FUND FROM PROFITS

"If the debasement is 50 percent, the profit to the Government will be $4,000,000,000 in round numbers. A 60-cent dollar will mean about 2,666 millions in profits.

"Out of these profits will come the stabilization fund to be administered by the Secretary of the Treasury, the remainder being available for any Government expenditure. Morgenthau said:

"'It is possible that the mere existence of the fund will be sufficient to carry out the law which requires that the Secretary of the Treasury maintain all lawful money of the government on parity with gold.'

"The Secretary of the Treasury is charged with the responsibility of administration of the fund to carry out that purpose. If any particular type of currency issued—United States notes, for instance—should become depreciated in value, the Treasury would go into the market and buy a sufficient quantity of that currency to maintain its parity. Operations in the foreign markets to protect possible depreciation of the dollar would be similar."

Let this quotation from Morgenthau go down into history. Long from now some curious investigator of the present age of witchcraft and magic in the White House may unearth it and reconstruct the financial history of the new deal from it, as science from a single part reconstructs the entire animal.

Mr. Chairman, it is not the gambler's voice in Mr. Morgenthau's confession which most deserves political attention. We are becoming accustomed here to gambling terms as they are employed by the executive branch of the Government, and we can well understand that the Executive and his favorites must of necessity speak the lingo of their kind. This is a gambler's administration, and all the "big shot" gamblers are here to revel in it. Mr. Roosevelt does not deny his gambling propensities. He is a "new dealer." He is "on his way", but he "doesn't know where he is going." He is for a policy of "bold experimentation", just as Samuel Insull was for a policy of bold experimentation. He has not been Ben Smith's patron all these years for nothing. But, Mr. Chairman, there is something apart from the vice of gambling to be observed in Mr. Morgenthau's utterance, and that is its entire untruthfulness. He would have us believe that the United States is on one side of the fence and Great Britain on the other. That, of course, is not the case. The United States has been placed in a position of financial servitude to Great Britain, and Mr. Morgenthau's loud-sounding propaganda is designed to conceal that fact from the people. Great pains have been taken to conceal it. It would be very damaging to this administration if certain people in the United States should find out about the great sums of United States money which have been sent to England during the past summer. Those funds were appropriated by Congress for the people of the United States.

Mr. Chairman why should tax money paid by American citizens be sent to London? When England makes her periodical gesture of insult toward the United States by paying a small installment on the war debt she owes us, she pays us in debased coins, in token coins, to be exact. But when Mr. Roosevelt sends American money to England, he sends it in gold or its equivalent. When Mr. Morgenthau obtains his "kitty" for this, I have been told, is what he called the proposed stabilization fund at the White House a week ago last Sunday evening. American funds will be fed to Europe more expedi-

tiously and with less secrecy than such operations now require. If Congress puts the people's property into a "kitty", someone, if he cannot be the knight of the bedchamber, can at least pose before royalty as the knight of the "kitty."

Mr. Chairman, understanding that Henry Morgenthau is related by marriage to Herbert Lehman, Jewish Governor of the State of New York, and is related by marriage or otherwise to the Seligmans, of the international Jewish firm of J. & W. Seligman, who were publicly shown before a Senate committee of investigation to have offered a bribe to a foreign government; and to the Lewissohns, a firm of Jewish international bankers; and to the Warburgs, whose operations through Kuhn, Loeb & Co., the International Acceptance Bank, and the Bank of Manhattan Co. and other foreign and domestic institutions under their control, have drained billions of dollars out of the United States Treasury and the bank deposits belonging to United States citizens, and to the Strauses, proprietors of R. H. Macy & Co., of New York, which is an outlet for foreign goods dumped upon this country at the expense of the United States Government, which is compelled to issue paper money on the said foreign goods of the Strauses; and that Mr. Morgenthau is likewise related or otherwise connected with various other members of the Jewish banking community of New York and London, Amsterdam, and other foreign financial centers, and that he has as his assistant, presiding over public funds, Earle Bailie, a member of the firm of J. & W. Seligman, bribe givers as aforesaid. It seems to me that Henry Morgenthau's presence in the United States Treasury and the request that Congress now give him a $2,000,000,000 "kitty" of the people's money for gambling purposes is a striking confirmation of the statement made by me on the floor of the House on May 29, 1933, which statement was as follows:

"Mr. Chairman, the Constitution of the United States has served us well. I am in favor of defending it against all comers. In the Constitution of the United States it is written that the United States shall guarantee a republican form of Government to every State in the Union. This guaranty has been broken by Franklin D. Roosevelt in his unlawful assumption of dictatorial powers. It is also written that no State shall make anything but gold or silver coin a tender in payment of debts. This repudiation bill and its predecessors nullify this provision of the Constitution. It is also written in an amendment to the Constitution. "The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned." Mr. Chairman, this repudiation bill questions the validity of the public debt and repudiates it. It repudiates the Liberty bonds; it repudiates the veterans' adjusted-service certificates; it cancels the war debts due to the United States from foreign governments. "Now, Mr. Chairman, we have come to the place where we must decide whether we shall serve God or Mammon. Shall we nullify the Constitution at the behest of the money changers who have unlawfully taken all our gold and lawful money into their own possession or shall we take a stand here in defense of the faith of our fathers? Mr. Chairman, my mind is made up. I will stand by the Constitution. If I should fail to do so, I should expect to be met at the train when I go home to my district by a delegation of honest Pennsylvania citizens with 50 or 100 feet of rope. I should expect to be escorted to the nearest tree to be taught what it means to vote for a nullification of the Constitution in the House of Representatives.

"Mr. Chairman, the provisions of this repudiation bill were foretold by a writer in the Dearborn Independent some years ago. There is, therefore, nothing novel or original about them. The writer of the article in the Dearborn Independent made the following quotation prophesying some of the measures which have been introduced here by the President of the United States:

"'(2) Confiscation of money in order to regulate its circulation.

"'(3) We must introduce a unit of exchange based on the value of labor units, regardless of whether paper or wood is used as the medium. We will issue money to meet the normal demands of every subject, adding a total sum for every birth and decreasing the total amount for every death.

"'(4) Commercial paper will be bought by the Government, which * * * will grant loans on a business basis. A measure of this character will prevent the stagnation of money, parasitism, and laziness, qualities which were useful to us as long as the Gentiles maintained their independence, but which are not desirable to us when our kingdom comes.

"'(5) We will replace stock exchanges by great Government credit institutions, whose functions will be to tax trade paper according to Government regulations. These institutions will be in such a position that they may market or buy as many as half a billion industrial shares a day. Thus all industrial undertakings will become dependent on us. You may well imagine what power that will give us.

"'Remember that when next you hear the Jewish plan that "Gentiles" shall do business with their own bits of paper, while Jews keep the *gold reserve* safely in their own hands. If the crash comes, "*Gentiles*" have the paper and the *Jews* have the gold. Says protocol XXII: "We hold in our hands the greatest modern power—gold; in 2 days we could free it from our treasuries in any desired quantities."

"'The *Jews* are *economists*, esoteric and exoteric: They have one system to tangle up the "Gentile", another which they hope to install when "Gentile" stupidity has bankrupted the world. The Jews are economists. Note the number of them who teach economics in the State universities. Says protocol VIII:

"'"We will surround our Government with a whole world of economists. It is for this reason that the science of economics is the chief subject of instruction taught by the Jews."'

"Mr. Chairman, have not most of these predictions come to pass? Is it not true that, in the United States today, the *'Gentiles'* have the slips of paper while the *Jews* have the *gold* and lawful money? And is not this repudiation bill, a bill specifically designed and written by the *Jewish international money* changers themselves, in order to perpetuate their power? What else do you make of it, Mr. Chairman? Does it not cancel the war debts? Does it not defraud the holders of *Liberty bonds* and every other obligation calling for the payment of money? Does it not defraud the veterans of the World War and take the value out of their adjusted-compensation certificates?"

Mr. Chairman, do you not see in this "kitty" bill the identical features outlined in the Protocols of Zion? Do you not see the Protocols of Zion manifested in the appointment of Henry Morgenthau as Secretary of the Treasury? It is not by accident, is it, that a representative and a relative of the money Jews of Wall Street and foreign parts has been so elevated?

Why, Mr. Chairman, this "kitty" bill takes the hitherto obscure young Henry Morgenthau and makes of him a central bank of the United States. It makes of him a central bank, an institution which Jefferson declared is one of deadly hostility to the free institutions of the United States. It exalts him above all other men. Under the powers to be granted him, his conduct is not subject to review or control by any other officer of the United States Government, not even the President.

What this "kitty" bill really does is to slide into the hands of Henry Morgenthau the emergency powers which Congress granted to the President. Those powers will not lapse. Instead, they are being slyly and dishonestly transferred to the bankers and after the bankers, in the person of Henry Morgenthau, have exercised them long enough to get the gold of the United States into their exclusive possession and to transfer it to their den of thieves, the Bank for International Settlements, Congress may take back its constitutional power over the currency, but it will have nothing left to exercise it on. The monetary gold of the people of the United States will, like the sons of the people, be buried in a foreign field.

Mr. Chairman, if you, as one of the party in power, are thinking of remaking the world so that the old America we knew and loved is to be no more; if you are one of those who is countenancing the placing of this country under the British Crown and the pooling of all American resources with those of England and Soviet Russia; if you are one of those to whom a title of nobility appears to be more desirable than plain citizenship in the Republic founded by George Washington, I trust that you will some day descend from the Speaker's chair and let us know the reasons for your preference. If, on the other hand, you are not what these words depict, I trust that you will come down to the floor and tell us how constitutional government is to be maintained in this country if the plutocratic managers of the Democratic Party continue their efforts to destroy it. You, if anyone, should be able to give the people of the United States an answer to this question.

Under this administration the result of the American Revolution has been reversed. The United States has become an economic vassal of Great Britain. The once proud Republic of the United States with its great charter of human freedom, the Declaration of Independence, and its written Constitution, which had kept it free and independent for over 140 years, and its flag, first made by the hands of Betsy Ross in Philadelphia, and its national anthem, born within earshot of the British guns that shelled Fort McHenry—all these, like the American dollar, were brought down from their high estate.

Oh, say, can you see by the dawn's early light
What so proudly we hailed at the twilight's last gleaming?

Mr. Chairman, you know very well that you cannot see that flag there as it used to be. Others started very cautiously to pull it down. But it was Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his unlawful and unconstitutional assumption of dictatorial powers, who finally lowered it and tore it from its standard.

Mr. KELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCFADDEN. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KELLER. I should like to ask this question, if the gentleman holds that our only legal money under the Constitution is metal money?

Mr. MCFADDEN. I do; yes.

---

PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA MAN STOPS PAYING INCOME TAX—ASKS FOR 3-YEAR REFUND, INVITES STATE AND FEDERAL JURY TRIAL

At a State Convention of United Republicans of California (UROC) held in Santa Cruz, California, February 6-8, the editor of the California Mining Journal was privileged to hear, at a special meeting Dr. Robert L. Meiers, of Palo Alto, California. Dr. Meiers stopped paying income tax in June of 1969, and on October 22, 1969 invited the U.S. Government and its proper agency, and the State of California and its proper agency to

bring a civil action against him in a jury trial before a Federal Court—if they think he owes an income tax under the present U.S. and California Income Tax Statutes.

Although Dr. Meiers' correspondence with State and Federal officials is too lengthy for one issue of CMJ, it is a matter of such importance to every American taxpayer that we plan to publish all of his letters in chronological order. Part I follows.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
*June 11, 1969.*

U.S. Treasury,
*Internal Revenue Service,*
*San Francisco, Calif.*

GENTLEMEN: I have revised my income tax estimate because I recently learned that I am not earning "dollars" but Federal Reserve notes. A "dollar" is defined as "1/35 ounce of gold," but the banks will not exchange my Federal Reserve notes or checks for gold or gold coins, only copper and nickel coins; therefore, the notes cannot legally be considered to be "dollars." The income tax law says anyone earning 600 "dollars" or more must file. But, in the light of the above, I am not earning any "dollars," only Federal Reserve notes and copper or nickel coins.

---

THE GENERAL COUNSEL
OF THE TREASURY,
*Washington, D.C., July 24, 1969.*

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. GUBSER:

This is in reply to your letter to Commissioner of Internal Revenue Thrower, dated June 25, 1969, transmitting an inquiry from Robert L. Meiers, M.D., Palo Alto, California, who questions the constitutionality of Federal Reserve notes since they are not redeemable in gold or silver. Dr. Meiers' concern is apparently based on Article I, Section 10, Clause 1 of the Constitution, which provides that "No State Shall . . . make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts."

The quoted provision of the Constitution does not require that gold and silver coins be made the only lawful medium of exchange for the payment of debts. Nor is it the purpose of this clause to require the States to pass legislation making gold and silver coins the only legal tender, rather it is a restriction preventing them from making anything else legal tender. In other words, this prohibition is aimed at preventing the States from enacting legislation which would force creditors to accept property at inflated value or state bank notes in payment of the debts owed to them. While limiting the States in this respect. Article I, Section 10, Clause 1 has no effect on the power of Congress to provide for a national currency not redeemable in gold or silver and to make that currency legal tender. As the Supreme Court has stated, by virtue of the specific monetary powers granted by the Constitution "Congress is authorized to establish a national currency, either in coin or in paper, and to make that currency lawful money for all purposes, as regards the national government or private individuals." Legal Tender Case (Juilliard v. Greenman), 110 U.S. 421, 448 (1884). The Congress has made Federal Reserve notes a national currency and legal tender for all debts, public and private. These notes are lawful money, their issuance having been authorized under laws enacted by the Congress in the exercise of its monetary power under the Constitution.

I hope you will find the foregoing helpful in preparing a reply to your constituent.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL W. EGGERS.

The constitution defines money only in terms of gold and silver coins. The paper notes issued by the Government have not been redeemable in gold coins since 1934 and not redeemable in silver coins since the Coinage Act of 1965. Obviously these Acts are unconstitutional since no Constitutional amendment was made first. In view of this, I have not been earning any gold "dollars" since 1934, nor any silver "dollars" since 1965. Since I have been earning only Federal Reserve notes since 1965 and not "dollars," I demand a refund of all income tax paid in the years 1966, '67, '68 and '69, plus six per cent interest. As long as the present situation exists in which it is impossible to earn "dollars," it will not be necessary to file income tax reports.

If you have any facts relevant to this matter, I would appreciate hearing from you as I am prepared to take this to the Supreme Court for a Constitutional ruling, if necessary.

ROBERT L. MEIERS, M.D.

Ref: 1. U.S. Constitution
2. Myer's Finance Review, Nos. 67, 68 & 68–X

cc: David Kennedy, Secretary of the Treasury
Chas. Gubser, Congressman
George Murphy, Senator
Allan Cranston, Senator

---

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D.C., June 25, 1969.*

Dr. ROBERT L. MEIERS,
*Palo Alto, Calif.*

DEAR DOCTOR MEIERS: Thank you for sending me a copy of your letter of June 11 which was addressed to the Internal Revenue Service in San Francisco.

I have advised the Commissioner of IRS of my interest in your behalf.

Yours sincerely,

CHARLES S. GUBSER,
*Member of Congress.*

CSG: dc

---

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D.C., July 31, 1969.*

Dr. ROBERT L. MEIERS,
*Palo Alto, Calif.*

DEAR MR. MEIERS: Possibly you have received a response from the Internal Revenue Service in San Francisco concerning your letter of June 11. In any event, I thought you would like to have the enclosure which has been sent as a result of my expression of interest in your behalf.

Yours sincerely,

CHARLES S. GUBSER,
*Member of Congress.*

---

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
*Washington, D.C., August 1, 1969.*

Dr. R. L. MEIERS,
*Palo Alto, Calif.*

DEAR DR. MEIERS: This is in reply to your letter in which you contend that you are not subject to Federal income tax for the reason that the Federal Reserve notes you receive do not constitute lawful money of the United States and are, therefore, not income.

Mr. Jerome Daly, the defendant in the Justice of the Peace case you cite, has challenged the constitutionality of the monetary system of the United States in several court cases. However, the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, in affirming judgments of the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota, has flatly refused Daly's contentions on at least three different occasions. See Koll v. Wayzata State Bank, 397 F. 2d 124 (July 5, 1968); Daly v. United States, 393 F. 2d 873 (April 11, 1968); and Horne v. Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, 344 F. 2d 725 (April 29, 1965).

It was settled long ago by the Supreme Court of the United States that the Congress has the power to provide for a national currency not redeemable in gold or silver and to make that currency legal tender. See Legal Tender Case (Juilliard v. Greenman), 110 U.S. 421 (1884). The Congress has made Federal Reserve notes a national currency and legal tender for all debts, public and private. These notes are "lawful money," their issuance having been authorized under laws enacted by the Congress in the exercise of its monetary powers under the Constitution.

The opinion of the Justice of the Peace of Credit River Township, Scott County, Minnesota, does not alter the law as enunciated by the Supreme Court of the United States and the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

Sincerely,

K. MARTIN WORTHY,
*Chief Counsel.*

By: JAMES F. DRING,
*Director, Legislation and Regulations.*

* * *

---

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE CENTER,
WESTERN REGION,
*August 8, 1969.*

ROBERT L. & BETTY T. MEIERS,
*Palo Alto, Calif.*

[redacted]

Form: 1040
Period: 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969

Your inquiry concerning the tax account identified above is receiving special attention. As soon as we have the necessary information we will contact you by letter or telephone to let you know the action we are taking.

If you need to contact us, please attach a copy of this letter to your correspondence.

Sincerely yours,

DELBERT L. HIRSCHI,
*Chief, Technical Section.*

---

PALO ALTO, CALIF., MAN STOPS PAYING INCOME TAX—ASK FOR 3-YEAR REFUND, INVITES STATE AND FEDERAL JURY TRIAL
PART II

(Dr. Robert L. Meiers, of Palo Alto, California stopped paying income tax last June, 1969, and informed the Internal Revenue Service of his reasons for the action. On October 2, 1969 Dr. Meiers invited the U.S. Government and its proper agency, and the State of California and its proper agency to bring a civil action against him in a jury trial before a Federal Court—if they think he owes an income tax under the present United States and California Income Tax Statutes.

Last month's installment ended with a letter to Dr. Meiers from Delbert L. Hirschi, Chief, Technical Section, Department of the Treasury, Internal Revenue Service Center, Western Region.)

---

PALO ALTO, CALIF.
*August 14, 1969.*

CHARLES S. GUBSER
*Member of Congress,*
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C. 20515*

DEAR MR. GUBSER: Thank you very much for giving my recent letter to you the attention you did. I am returning a copy of the letter from the Treasury you forwarded to me as well as another copy of my letter to the I.R.S. Please read Mr. Eggers' letter carefully, because I could not have written a better letter in my behalf, although I am certain this was not Mr. Eggers' intention.

He is correct in identifying my concern based on Article 1, Section 10, Clause 1 of the Constitution which provides that "No State shall . . . make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts:" Can you imagine a more clear and precise statement than this? Apparently not for Mr. Eggers because he says "The quoted provision does not require that gold and silver coin be made

the only lawful medium of exchange for payment of debts." Well, it certainly doesn't provide for anything else. He continues, "Nor is it the purpose of this clause to require the States to pass legislation making gold and silver coins the only legal tender." (Obviously a state or the Nation does not have to pass a law reiterating a provision of the Constitution.) "rather it is a restriction preventing them from making anything else legal tender." (This is exactly my point.) "While limiting the States in this respect, Article 1, Section 10, Clause 1 has no effect on the power of Congress to provide for a National currency not redeemable in gold or silver and to make that currency legal tender." If this is true, and I doubt that it is, where could that currency circulate? Certainly not in any of the States. They are prohibited by the Constitution from allowing anything but gold and silver coins as legal tender within their borders.

Mr. Eggers cites the Supreme Court Legal Tender Case (Juilliard v. Greenman), 110 U.S. 421, 448 (1884). Unfortunately, he failed to tell you that that case referred to only U.S. Treasury Notes, not Federal Reserve Notes. It should be quite clear that these are not the same thing. There has been no ruling on the Federal Reserve notes and this is the issue. In fact, there are several issues involved here, such as:

1. Where does the Constitution give Congress the right to delegate its power to issue currency to a private organization, namely, the Federal Reserve Banks?

2. Where does the Constitution give Congress the right to give such an organization monopoly over currency with the full sanction and coercive power of the Government?

3. Where does the Constitution give Congress the right to permit a private organization to create something out of nothing (It costs less than one cent to print a Federal Reserve Note, regardless of the denomination) then force the citizens to make up the difference in taxes? Therefore, there is no lawful consideration for these notes to circulate as money.

4. Where does the Constitution give Congress the power to create something out of nothing, then loan that something at interest to other banks and the U.S. Treasury?

5. Where does the Constitution give Congress the power to create, then to permit a private organization to be free from control, public auditing, and taxes?

It is also interesting that Mr. Eggers did not deal with the issue in my letter, that Federal Reserve Notes are not dollars. At one time there was a statement on them saying that they were redeemable in lawful money. This is an open admission that they were not lawful money, only a promise to pay in lawful money. As the Federal Reserve Banks became bankrupt, this statement obviously became embarrassing and recently has been omitted. Since a note, whether issued by an individual, a bank or a government, is an acknowledgement of a debt with a promise to pay, the Federal Reserve Notes can no longer qualify even as notes. They are obviously not dollars because Congress has defined a dollar as 25.8 grains of gold, .900 fine, or 412.5 grains of silver. If they are not notes and they are not dollars, what are they? The only conclusion I can make is that they are only pieces of paper with some printing on them, signifying nothing. In addition to this all being unconstitutional, it is so fraudulent and immoral, that no thinking person could knowingly and willingly support such a crime.

One of the main purposes of establishing our Government under our Constitution was to protect and defend its citizens from fraud. Now, when the Government becomes a party to fraud against the citizens, where do those citizens turn to for protection and defense? Obviously, the citizens must reclaim the powers and responsibilities they originally delegated to the Government through the Constitution.

Since Federal Reserve Notes are not money, debts cannot be paid—only shifted from one to another. It's like the card game "Old Maid"—the last one who gets stuck with it, loses. In every known instance in history, when a government has committed the fraud of irredeemable currency (fiat money) it has had a destructive effective on the moral and economic character of that nation. Under such circumstances, paying the tax is aiding and abetting the destruction of our Nation. States and self. Therefore, paying the tax is treason.

Incidentally, there are many other Constitutional reasons for refusing to pay income taxes, such as:

1. As long as any income to an individual or private organization is exempt from taxation, it represents discrimination and confiscation of private property * * * which requires just compensation and due process of law.

2. All taxes must be for a public purpose. Any time taxes are used for fostering any private individual business or enterprise, the Government is using its coercive power as a highwayman forcibly taking property from A and giving it to B. At this point it ceases to be a tax and becomes robbery.

The principle involved in the above issues of discrimination in collection and/or disbursement of income taxes is one that affects the foundation and continued existence of every free government, namely, equality of all men before the law. If an income tax is laid at the same rate on all incomes and used only for public purposes, there would be no question as to its uniformity and compliance with the Constitution. It is obvious that the income tax as it is presently administered, does not meet these requirements.

3. When the Government is using the taxes for unconstitutional purposes in addition to those previously stated, the responsible citizen finds that the only patriotic action is to refuse to support these actions: of the many—only two will be mentioned. A. Engaged in an unconstitutional "war" in that it has not been legally declared and even if it were, it would not be to "repel invasion," Article 1, Section 8. B. Aiding and abetting the enemy by fostering trade with the enemy (Communist countries) which for an individual, civilian or military, would be treason.

All of these problems raise very basic questions, such as, is our Government guided by and limited by the Constitution, or is it guided by the whim of whoever is in power or has the original relationship of employer to employee changed completely between the citizens and their Government employees? Has the Government become master and the citizens slaves? Has the Government gained a special privilege to commit crimes without punishment? Have the citizens lost their ability or power to effectively limit the power and control of the Government through legal means? Is revolution the only means left to obtain a constructive change?

These are not pleasant ideas to contemplate, but each concerned citizen must face them and follow the dictates of his own conscience in terms of what is in his own best interest and the interest of his Country. In this matter, there should be no conflict of interest.

Thank you again for giving my thoughts your attention.

ROBERT L. MEIERS, M.D.

---

SOLVING MONETARY DILEMMA

More and more often we hear or read about inflation, recession and even inflation within recession or recession within inflation. Take your choice. It does show what "fine-tuning" has done to the economy.

There is increasing evidence that so-called economists and money managers are becoming increasingly frantic; and properly so, because they got themselves and us into this mess.

Interest rates have not yet been lowered. In fact, they may not even have reached their full heights. Unemployment has increased and may increase some more. Just what is wrong?

Our monetary and economic system have been complicated by men with academic degrees, who no doubt are looking for complicated solutions.

Here is a simple solution by a man without an academic degree in economics for the common man likewise without such a degree.

In our present system before production can begin someone has to borrow at interest usually from commercial banks all or most of the money required. Now, in order for full production and employment to be maintained the products must be used up—otherwise surpluses build up. But, in order for the consumers to buy up all the products all the money involved in production must reach the consumers. That can't happen now because a part of the originally borrowed money has to be paid as interest. Most of that money can't be used to buy production. Right there is the *bottleneck* in our present system.

Since the producers can't recover from the consumers the full cost of production, if they want to maintain full production, they will have to borrow more money.

On the other hand, the consumers—if they are expected to buy up and utilize all the production—will have to borrow additional money simply because they didn't get all the money involved in production. Hence, someone has to keep borrowing ever more money at interest to keep the system going. It is a VICIOUS system. If people refuse or can't afford to borrow any more, then the Government does the borrowing for us. It should not and need not be so.

THE REMEDY

Congress must admit that it made a tragic mistake when it delegated to the Federal Reserve and the commercial banks the power to issue money (mostly credit) at interest. The present system is legal because it is based on a law—the Fed. Res. Act, 1913—but it is unconstitutional and gravely unjust. Congress must assert its constitutional right and assume full responsibility for the issue of all coin, currency and credit without interest at the source. The source must be only the Congress as the Constitution provides. The Founding Fathers wanted the power to issue and control money in the hands only of elected officers accountable to the voters.

This does not mean that banks could not loan money which they really have and charge for it an interest rate controlled by Congress. But the banks could no longer issue money by creating credit. There must be a separation: Congress must issue money but not compete with bankers by loaning it, whereas bankers should loan and safeguard money but not issue any of it.

REV. DISMAS TREDER, O.F.M.

*Pulaski, Wis.*

---

CONFIDENCE, BASIC (?) COMPONENT OF MONEY SYSTEM?

William McChesney Martin, who after 14 years was replaced Feb. 1, 1970 by Arthur F. Burns as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, at a Hearing before a Senate Finance Committee on Aug. 14, 1947 stated: "I personally like the definition that money is a medium of exchange and a standard of value, and that ITS BASIC COMPONENT IS CONFIDENCE." (1, p. 1304)

By the way, both Martin and Burns are members of the Council on Foreign Relations. (2, p. E1139 and E1140)

Confidence in the present monetary system does seem to be one of its very impor-

tant ingredients; but just like the gold behind our dollars, there is very little left. Again, please let me quote THE authority: "Confidence in the stability of the dollar and fixed-income securities . . . has been gradually ERODED to the point that we have this great pressure for new plant equipment expenditures." (Wm. M. Martin himself in U.S. News and World Report, Sept. 22, 1969, p. 104).

If confidence is so essential—and I agree that it is, although I am also convinced that there ought to be something much more basic—why doesn't Congress make the monetary system worthy of our confidence? Furthermore, if the Fed. Res. Board—and bankers in general—are at all concerned about confidence, they would be the first to do their utmost to restore confidence.

The method is extremely simple, but if the bankers won't adopt it voluntarily, a law will have to be enacted to COMPEL them.

It may seem too far to go back to 1934 in order to recall some sound thinking on this topic; but if the best advice had been followed then, neither the people, the bankers, Fed. Res. Board, Congress, nor Pres. Nixon would be in the mess all of us are in right now.

What was the advice?

"If we can devise a plan that will make banking *safe* and build no more debts than we have money, we will have solved the problem . . . The Gov't. can make up its deficits with new money and this will be placed in (not lent out at interest but paid into) circulation, and of course will soon find its way to the banks as a (real) deposit of money and can be lent once, not 7 to 13 times as now . . . The nation will then be on a Cash basis for doing business, and not on a Debt basis . . .

"All banks must be required to keep a reserve of 100% against ALL deposits. No loan shall be counted as a deposit (as is now done with demand deposits), but when a loan is made it must appear on the books of the bank as a charge against the (actual money) deposits in the bank . . . When a loan is made the account will stand charged with the amount of the loan and when the loans equal the amount of the deposits, no more loans can be made. The only exception to this would be that it (a bank) could loan its capital and surplus.

"The real danger (in the present System) is the large amount of loans in this country without any money . . . The danger from inflation is the fact that the banks can and *will* use (the small amount of actual) money as reserves, and under the System as now operated, they can *create* such large mountains of debts that there is 10 times the danger from the present System than the System of 100% bank reserves for deposits. The banks can (and must be restricted to) lend their money ONCE, their customers' money ONCE . . . So under this plan when the banker calls your loan you (will) know that there is a dollar somewhere for each dollar you owe, and under the present System you owe $100 but there are but $10 in existence with which to pay your debts."

Note: Keep in mind that at present you can transact enormous business with the *credit* lent you at interest by the banks with only a *fractional* reserve, but you can't pay your debts with it.

Now back to the extremely important quotation:

"All savings accounts would be in (actual) money, so there would be no runs on the banks. It is because depositors are afraid (lost confidence) that they withdraw their money; and when the System is so set up that the fear of loss is removed, bank runs will be a thing of the past." (3, p. 45–47)

The big bankers well knew what they were after and knew well how to achieve it when they induced Congress to pass the Fed. Res. Act in 1913. The first words of that Act are:

"An Act to provide for the establishment of Federal Reserve banks, to furnish an ELASTIC currency . . . and for *other* purposes." (4, p. 1)

I hope your guess is as good as mine about the OTHER purposes.

The currency is *elastic* alright. Have you noticed the alternate expansion and contraction of credit? About that George Knupffer writes:

"They have to allow periods of expansion, so as to fatten the victim before the slaughter". (7, p. 60)

Have you noticed the alternate inflation and deflation, booms and bursts? Some try to make us believe those are inevitable, natural, economic, business cycles.

Did you ever try to figure out why ever more people are becoming poorer, while ever fewer people are becoming super rich? If you think seriously enough about it, you might eventually conclude that those who manage our *elastic* currency might have something to do with it.

In early 1965 I was seeking an *official* reply to the question whether money printed by the Gov't and spent into circulation would have a greater inflationary impact than the same amount of money borrowed at interest by the Gov't. In part the reply on "Office of the Secretary of the Treasury" stationery, dated Feb. 26, 1965, and signed by Joseph M. Bowman, reads:

"The reason the Government does not finance itself by issuing currency rather than borrowing when necessary is that such a course of action would have a tremendous inflationary impact on economy."

"The direct use of printing press money would have far reaching psychological repercussions. It could easily undermine the *confidence* of our people."

This was not the end of my quest. I couldn't bring myself to believe the reply from the U.S. Treasury Dep't. Further search for truth brought on "Fed. Res. Bank of Richmond" stationery the following reply dated Mar. 26, 1965:

"You have asked if a million dollars printed by the Government and spent into circulation would cause any more inflation, than a million dollars borrowed from a Fed. Res. bank and spent into circulation. The answer is *NO* (emphasis added); the two actions would have essentially the same effect."

If you can't decide which of the two replies is the correct one, you definitely need more study.

I will not reveal the name of the one who signed the reply from Richmond unless someone with sufficient authority demands it.

When the Fed. Res. Act was passed in 1913 the U.S. public debt was $1 billion. Now it is $382 billion (5, p. 22). No doubt, an *elastic* currency could have been involved in that too. The *total* Federal, State, County, municipal, corporate and private debt is fast approaching the $2 trillion mark. "The 1969 . . . *non*-Federal debt . . . estimate based on *mid*year statistics . . . is $1,347 billion. (Congr. Record, Jan. 30, 1970, p. E565). Consider just the farm debts: "At the end of 1969, farm debt was nearly $60 billion—up from $25 billion in 1960". . . (6, p. 12) It more than doubled in 10 years.

That to which we ordinarily limit our idea of money is:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Total coin | $5,965,000,000 |
| 2. total currency | 47,026,000,000 |
| Total | [1] 52,991,000,000 |

[1] (5, of p. 21.)

Of the total currency $46,431,000,000 is Fed. Res. notes, which belong to the Fed. Res. and which have been *lent* into circulation by the commercial banks, and on which the borrowers have to pay interest. That leaves only $595,000,000 of currency which belong completely to the Gov't. and the people.

Now that the amount of *insured* deposits has been raised from $15,000 to $20,000, the readers are entitled to a guideline for their *confidence* in this kind of insurance.

On p. 24 of the U.S. Treasury Bulletin, Jan., 1970, there is listed under Special Public Debt Issues the item: Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. This particular debt issue for F.D.I.C. amounts to $138,000,000.

From p. 151 of the same issue of Treas. Bulletin we learn that $284,000,000 was the net income into the F.D.I.C. fund between June 30, 1968 and June 30, 1969. The balance on hand as of June 30, 1968 was $3,613,063,000. Hence, the F.D.I.C. fund on June 30, 1969 amounted to $3,897,199,000. (5, p. 151). That is the amount of money available for all deposits up to $20,000. *All* deposits includes savings, time and demand deposits. If the reader is really concerned, he will exert the effort to discover for himself the approximate amount of deposits covered by the $3,897,199,000.

Many bills have been introduced in Congress to straighten out radically our jumbled monetary mess, but those bills chronically have a way of dying in committee.

Many House as well as Senate Hearings have been held, and still we're in a mess. One wonders why.

As soon as Congress enforces an honest, dependable 100% reserve money system, neither the small bankers, Fed. Res. Board nor the Government will have to be concerned about the people's confidence. It will become automatic.

Now that you have read this brief dissertation on *Confidence,* may the writer ask the reader to measure the degree of *Your confidence* in our present money system at this moment? Or would it be better to wait until you find out the total of insured deposits?

I will be extremely happy if I can place *my* confidence in your determination to ready, study, think and DO something about it.

Rev. Dismas Treder, O.F.M.,
*Pulaski, Wis.*

February 9, 1970.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Investigation of the Financial Condition of the U.S. Hearings before the Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate, 1957–8.
2. Congressional Record, Dec. 29, 1969
3. Why 10,000 Banks Failed, 1934 by American Monetary Reform Association
4. Federal Reserve Act, Public—No. 43—63rd Congress, H.R. 7837, 1913
5. (U.S.) Treasury Bulletin, Jan. 1970
6. Business Conditions, A Review by the Fed. Res. Bank of Chicago, Jan., 1970
7. The Struggle For World Power The Plain-Speaker Publ. Co. 43, Bath Road, London, W.4., 1963

[*From The American Mercury, July 1956*]

The Constitution of the United States provides that Congress alone has the right to coin money and issue currency. However, in 1913 the Federal Reserve System was established. Today, the Federal Reserve Banks unconstitutionally issue our currency. Ironically, these private banks, largely owned by international bankers, only pay the United States Government $1.25 per $1,000 for the currency they issue—which is, incidentally, guaranteed by the people of the United States. This $1.25 is to cover the cost of paper, ink, and the use of the government printing plant. In 1913 these privately owned Federal Reserve Banks had a capital of 147 million dollars. Today, without producing any commodity or natural resource, they have assets of over 45 thousand million dollars!

(*See Encyclopedia Britannica for reference to events which led to the creation of this privately owned system of banks.)

U.S. CURRENCY PLATES TO RED RUSSIA

In Congress on July 8, 1946, the Hon. Jessie Sumner stated that Russia had been given a set of plates by the U.S. Government which enabled the former to *manufacture for herself all the American dollars she wanted to spend.* Congressman Daniel A. Reed said in Congress on Sept. 14, 1945 that ". . . it *was a deliberate fraud, the result of a conspiracy not yet revealed.*" High and reputable authorities placed the loss to U.S. taxpayers in the billions of dollars.

John W. Hanes, a former Under-Secretary of the Treasury, was reported in the Baltimore News Post of September 13, 1945, as exposing the fact that U.S. officials had turned over these plates to Red Russia. Gen. Lucius Clay, former U.S. Military Commander of Germany, is recorded as saying: "It wouldn't be difficult to make 1,000 mark notes out of the plates *we furnished to the Soviets.*"

An investigation was attempted in Congress on June 7, 1947. It was smothered by enemies of these United States. Senator Styles Bridges, and others, were greatly concerned with this illegal act.

(See Pages 6, 7, of U.S. Senate Report 837, dated Dec. 15, 1953)

Mercury printed that Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Harry Dexter White, and Harold Glasser gave the Russian government our money plates, complete with 3 planeloads of special ink and 4 planeloads of special paper for printing our money in East Germany. Refugees then brought many millions of this money to the U.S. to set themselves up in business.

We are told it is estimated the known movement of such money into the U.S. amounts to about *$19 billion* of which more than *$3 billion* comes from Canada, and $1,800,000,000 through *Swiss banks.*

(See book, "Major Jordan's Diary.")

(See Publisher Eugene Pulliam's statement, Para 4, Back Cover, June 1957.)

---

PROPOSITION N°. 57 SUBMITTED BY H. L. SAVAGE, VICE PRESIDENT, LONG BEACH LOCAL NO. 128, OIL WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION, CIO

Whereas it is an established and self-evident fact that in order *for a Nation of people to enjoy economic security and freedom, it is imperative that Government shall have the sole power to create and regulate the value of the Nation's money;* and

Whereas the founding fathers of this great American Republic recognized this fact and specifically provided for the Government of the United States of America to have the sol power to create money and regulate its value by making it mandatory on Congress as provided in article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America, "To coin money, to regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures," and

Whereas among other great Americans we find that the scientific-minded Benjamin Franklin, the democratic Thomas Jefferson, the noble George Washington, the martyred Abraham Lincoln were all advocates of the powers vested in Congress, by article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States of America; and

*Whereas it is a widely known fact that Congress has violated its own oath and trust to support the Constitution by delegating to private bankers its powers to create money and regulate its value thereof;* and

Whereas the *private bankers,* and in particular the *heads of the Federal Reserve banks (private banking institutions), have abused their powers to create money and by regulating its value to destroy money as well, have caused widespread unemployment, economic chaos, loss of homes, farms, business' savings, and paved the way for world warfare;* and

Whereas it is a positive matter of record that the overlords at the top of the money world deliberately planned and viciously carried out the program to cause the depression, widespread unemployment, loss of homes, farms, and savings after World War No. 1; and

Whereas the same people have the same power to do the same thing after World War No. 2 unless Congress restores to itself the powers vested in article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States of America; and

Whereas the overlords at the top of the private banking institutions can continue to exploit the American people and the resources of this Nation so long as they have the power to create our Nation's money and regulate its value thereof; and

Whereas it is a widely known fact that our Government is compelled to borrow its own money from private institutions and pay interest tribute to private banking institutions for the use of its own money; and

Whereas the national interest-bearing debt is growing larger and larger because Congress has delegated its power to create and regulate money to private banks; and

Whereas the United States Government does not own 1 cent of stock in the Federal Reserve banks; and

Whereas even when the war is ended with full and complete victory for the United States of America and her allies there can never be a secure and lasting peace so long as a few ruthless, cold-blooded, brutal private bankers have the power to bring on a condition which will cause continued economic chaos and eventually bring about either a revolution or another world war; and

Whereas our representative form of government is in the very gravest danger of being destroyed and a dictator form of government in one of its various forms being instituted, because the intent of the blueprint for representative American democracy is being grossly violated by those sworn to uphold and defend it; and

Whereas many sincere but uninformed Americans are being seduced into embracing foreign ideologies and philosophies of economics and government due in large part to the violation of article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America; and

Whereas it is becoming increasingly necessary that American trade-unions crusade for the American ideal of living; and

Whereas *American labor unions can never gain their goal* or *objectives* by simply bargaining collectively in the matter of hours, wages, and general working conditions *until* Congress restores to itself the power to regulate the value *of the buying power of the wages bargained for, any attempt* to bring about economic security for wage earners being futile while the New York Stock Exchange and the overlords at the top of the money world set the value of the buying power of the dollars earned; and

Whereas an amazing revolution has taken place in the science of production, no change, in any way commensurate, has taken place in the financial mechanism; and

Whereas it has become increasingly necessary for the United States of America to institute a scientific, non-interest-bearing, constitutional monetary system; and

Whereas, this scientific monetary system should have its supply of money so regulated as to prevent any material decline of the domestic average wholesale commodity price; and

Whereas the Government-created money interest free at source of origin used scientifically would prevent inflation, deflation, repudiation; and

Whereas an equitable and scientific Government controlled monetary system should be based on a balance being constantly attained in order that distribution, exchange, and consumption shall keep pace with production; and

Whereas the volume of money should be increased year by year to match growth of production; and

Whereas it is an established fact that an honest, scientific, constitutional monetary system must have these essential principles:

1. It must be created and controlled by Congress.

2. It must be free from interference by politicians and private bankers.

3. It must be interest free at the source of origin and be based on the total wealth of the Nation and not on the bonds or basic metals owned by private bankers; and

Whereas one of the main contributing factors to our present unsound monetary system is the practice of the so-called fractional reserve requirements; and

Whereas in order to secure a sound monetary system it will be necessary to institute a 100-percent-reserve requirement on demand deposits held by banks, or, in other words, a dollar for dollar or 100 percent reserve being mandatory; and

Whereas it is common knowledge that many and probably a majority of the Members of Congress are ready to restore to Congress the powers vested in article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States of America when they are convinced that they have the support of their constituents: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That we, the delegates of the Oil Workers International Union, in convention assembled at the city of Fort Worth, Tex., respectfully request Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, to immediately call upon Congress to restore to Congress the powers vested in article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States of America; and be it further

*Resolved,* That we go on record urging the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled to immediately enact such legislation as will be necessary to restore to Congress the sole power to issue money and to regulate its value, as provided in article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States of America; and be it further

*Resolved,* That we go on record urging the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled to immediately enact legislation to provide for non-interest-bearing, constitutional United States Government money.

---

## CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, we are in the habit of taking our constitutional rights for granted. In centuries past, we argued that such rights were "natural" and could not be taken away. More recently, we have termed our rights "inalienable" and have looked upon them as the cornerstone of democratic government. I believe, however, that we have entered a period in which these rights are being abridged. I argue further that recent actions of the Nixon administration read like a catalog of their infringement.

Such action necessarily fosters a deep distrust of the Government on the part of its citizens. They slowly begin to question the motives of the Government, and finally balk at having to provide such information at all. After all, if the Government has the authority to gather such confidential information, does it not have the moral obligation to insure the citizen

that the information will be used only for the stated purpose?

Last month, we were told that the National Park Service would require a protest group to disclose in advance of a demonstration in front of the White House the signs that would be used, whether the individuals had participated in any previous demonstrations, and whether they had advocated anything other than peaceful demonstrations. It seemed to make little difference to the Service, which has jurisdiction over the sidewalk in front of the White House, that the right to peaceful assembly is part of the first amendment to the Bill of Rights.

Then we were informed that the Postmaster General had authorized the opening of mail received from abroad. In the past, the practice has been to send it back unopened or to get permission before opening it. Now the mail is being opened without even asking such permission.

We learned that some people were seriously considering a proposal calling for the testing of 6-year-olds in order to determine whether they possessed "antisocial" tendencies. Evidently some people have more faith than I do in the ability to predict the direction of lifelong behavior at the still formative age of 6. The danger and possible consequences of even a slight range of error are formidable.

Finally, of late, the supposedly confidential individual tax forms filed with the government have been examined by individuals outside the Internal Revenue Service without the knowledge of the citizen filing the return. If such practice continues, it appears as if we are creating a data bank readily available for use at some, yet to be specified purpose.

These precedents are dangerous. They leave the individual potentially helpless against a Government that has tremendous stores of data that might be used for purposes as yet unknown. We know that too often the resources of individual to protect himself against such infringement are inequally distributed. The citizen may be helpless against governmental action. I believe that the individual must be protected by the government's willingness to check its own power. I call upon the government as now constituted will exercise such discretion.

## CPL. CLARENCE H. ST. CLAIR, JR.

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is with both a great sense of loss and humble pride that I relate to my colleagues in the Congress the circumstances of the posthumous awarding of the Navy Cross for extraordinary heroism in the Republic of Vietnam to Cpl. Clarence H. St. Clair, Jr., of Pensacola, Fla. The Navy Cross, as you know, is our Navy's highest award for gallantry in combat action.

Corporal St. Clair distinguished himself valorously as a squadron leader with Company K, Third Battalion, 7th Marines, 1st Marine Division in connection with combat operations against the enemy on August 28, 1969. At this point I would like to quote verbatim from the citation by the Secretary of the Navy:

Company K was conducting a search and destroy operation in Quang Nam Province. The lead platoon was pinned down by small arms, automatic weapons, and anti-aircraft fire from enemy soldiers concealed in well-camouflaged emplacements. Directed to assist the pinned-down element, Corporal St. Clair deployed his men to the point of heaviest contact and instantly came under intense fire. Observing two principal sources of hostile fire, he directed two of his fire teams to provide covering fire while he maneuvered his third team toward the enemy emplacements. While crawling toward their objective, the men were seriously wounded by enemy grenades.

Quick to act, Corporal St. Clair began crawling through the enemy crossfire toward the first objective and had advanced only five meters when he was severely injured by the detonation of another grenade. Recovering quickly, he pressed his advance until he was close enough to the enemy bunker to hurl a grenade through its aperture, destroying the position and its occupant. Although suffering intense pain, he valiantly continued in the direction of the second objective and, while thus engaged, was mortally wounded. By his courage, aggressive fighting spirit and unwavering devotion to duty in the face of grave personal danger, Corporal St. Clair contributed significantly to the accomplishment of his unit's mission and upheld the highest traditions of the Marine Corps and of the United States Naval Service.

These brave, selfless, exemplary deeds of Cpl. Clarence H. St. Clair, Jr., represent the finest traditions of our military services. Although our hearts go out to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Clarence H. St. Clair, Sr., of 2525 Wycliff Drive, Pensacola, Fla. They have suffered greatly and given so much to America, and our hearts go out to them. May their sacrifice and his not have been in vain. I am proud and honored to have represented in the U.S. Congress this courageous and devoted young man, and I know I can say that great branch of the service, the U.S. Marine Corps, is equally proud to have claimed Cpl. St. Clair as a U.S. Marine.

## PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

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

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I missed two rollcall votes in the House on Monday, April 20. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "aye" on both rollcalls No. 85 and No. 86.

## EARTH DAY

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

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, millions of people observed Earth Day yesterday at rallies throughout the United States—rallies called to dramatize what is turning into a popular national commitment toward cleaning up our environment. This hightened public awareness of environmental pollution is a heartening sign. For more than a century we have been fouling our rivers, littering the landscape, and tainting the very air we breathe. Yet, until recently, few people outside the scientific community showed anything but the most tepid interest in this problem. Fewer still were prepared to take action against it.

The situation has changed—and changed dramatically. The "teach-in," a spirited academic forum once limited to protests against the Vietnam war, yesterday became a new weapon in the war against pollution. Hundreds of thousands of students at campuses ranging from Harvard's in Cambridge, Mass., to UCLA's at Los Angeles, Calif., gathered to exchange ideas on what has become the most modish "cause célèbre" in the academic world. High school and elementary school students, once chided by their elders of a lack of interest in public affairs, were among Earth Day's most enthusiastic participants. Average citizens—working people, professional people, the old, the young—took part in meetings and rallies throughout the country. A striking success by virtually anyone's yardstick, Earth Day demonstrated that concern about our environment reaches far beyond the campus laboratory or the congressional hearing room.

Such public arousal makes my job easier—significantly easier. For years I and other Members of Congress have been struggling to enact major new legislation to clean up the environment. And, as a ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, I have exerted every effort to see that what antipollution programs we do have are amply funded.

Earth Day convincingly demonstrated that the American people are squarely behind such efforts.

The cleanup job will not be easy; nor will it be achieved overnight.

But it must be done.

It is one of history's cruelest ironies that the wastes of civilization threaten to destroy civilization.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the Record at this point the editorial series the Boston Herald-Traveler is running on ecology:

ECOLOGY AND EARTH DAY

"Ecology," says California Democratic leader Jesse Unruh, "has become the political substitute for the word 'mother.' "

If this is the only thing which has happened to the word, then the chance of earth surviving the next millennium may be diminished by the amount of compromise inherent to the political process.

Fortunately, however, ecology has also become the scientific substitute for the word "life." And what we will be seeing throughout the country this week is a fight for the preservation of life.

We hope the teach-ins, rallies and displays marking Earth Day on April 22 will be a positive manifestation of concern over the dying pines on the San Bernardino mountains, the fish disappearing from Lake Michigan and the blackened lungs in our bodies.

Organizers of these activities must make certain that their efforts to save the environment do not result in damage to the environment by deliberate slowdowns of traffic or destruction of property. What's needed is a sane, aggressive effort to get the message across to communities within and beyond the campuses. To this end, the petitions in favor of an environmental bill of

rights and requests to "reclaim" a street or two for special observances can be supported.

The Boston Area Ecology Action is seeking its goals through legitimate channels and is trying to insure that splinter groups will not frustrate the effort by resorting to illegal tactics.

The sponsors and Cambridge city officials acted wisely when they decided to cancel last Friday's Harvard Square Reclamation activities. A gathering of that sort so soon after the violent disturbances would have been risky at best.

The sponsors, however, can take solace in the support they have attracted from official quarters. Until Wednesday, the city was willing to go along with the request to permit only buses and bicycles to enter Harvard Square between 12 and 3 p.m. Officials did not object to a proposed music festival which the sponsors wanted to hold "in order to focus attention on what Harvard Square could become in terms of pedestrian and public transportation."

Sponsors of "reclamation day" ceremonies on Wednesday have been permitted to use certain streets in Boston, New York and other cities. And there appears to be considerable public support behind a petition effort in favor of adding an environmental bill of rights to the U.S. Constitution, proclaiming that "the right of the people to clean air, pure water, freedom from excessive and unnecessary noise and the natural, scenic, historic and esthetic qualities of their environment shall not be abridged."

A lack of adequate response to the proposals for a better environment could lead to a feeling of helplessness similar to frustrations concerning the war in Vietnam. People should not have to resort to extra-legal means to gain attention, and our institutions should make use of all the positive energy which is being expended, especially by youth, in behalf of a clean environment.

The problem, however, will not and cannot be solved by youth alone. And in view of the danger that radical elements may try to exploit the issue for their own purposes, it is all the more imperative that the larger population become actively concerned with the problem. Editorials in the next three days will discuss the roles which consumers, industry and government can play in combating what has come to be regarded as public enemy No. 1.

---

ECOLOGY AND THE CONSUMER

One problem in the current crusade for a clean environment is the tendency of many crusaders to blame everything on profit-hungry industry and lackadaisical government.

"We have learned that we cannot depend on the benevolence or even on the enlightened self-interest of industry," writes James Fogel of the Harvard Ecology Coalition. "Yet these are people who have it in their power to do something about our ecology. Indeed, only they have that power."

On a practical level, he continues, "You don't save the landscape by cleaning up your backyard; you don't stop the air from causing lung cancer by using car pools and you don't prevent destruction of all life in the ocean by not flushing your toilet."

To the extent that these individual acts are not by themselves going to solve the problem, Mr. Fogel is right. Yet, remembering World War II's victory gardens, one must not ignore their symbolic significance.

To blame everything on our big institutions and the men who run them is just as deceiving as to rely totally on cleaning our backyards. A decent environment can be attained by combining high personal resolve with legislation, interstate compacts and commitment by industry.

The common denominator in all this is man, who has always been a messy animal. The word "ecology" is traced to the Greek word oikos, meaning a house. Literally translated, ecology means the study of houses—and that includes backyards.

"If real changes are to occur," says Russell Train, the Interior Department's top conservationist, "We are talking about changing attitudes Americans have had bred into them since the Jamestown Colony and Plymouth Rock—the frontier ethic, the pioneer drive, the striving for more and better." He's talking about a serious obstacle to a better environment—our worship of growth. We no longer enjoy the luxury of moving on to another territory once we deplete the immediate environment. The frontiers have vanished but their ethics remain.

Newsweek magazine recently observed, "The villains are the consumers who demand (or at least let themselves be cajoled into desiring) now, more, faster, bigger, cheaper, playthings, without counting the cost of a dirtier, smeller world."

Viewed from such a perspective, the main problem is not only what James Fogel calls "the self interest of industry." It would be foolish to rely on technology primarily to solve this human dilemma. Technology may, for example, sanitize the exhaust fumes or develop "clean" detergents, but such advances would also result in more and more cars and washing machines. A decent environment means more than clean air and water. It means converting concrete jungles into green malls and truncated houses into tolerable homes.

To be effective and enduring, the battle has to start at the broadest level—people not only agitating for institutional response but also exercising self-restraint.

Dressed in the garb of affluence and productivity, environmental deterioration has slowly and subtly crept upon us as few other threats have. Unlike the defenses of yesterday's wars, this battle has no frontline or rear guard. The battle is wherever people are. The captains of industry and the foot-soldiers of consumption are in this as one, and the price will have to be borne by all.

"The price," says Rep. Morris Udall of Arizona, "may be cars with 60-horsepower engines, instead of 360, and fewer gadgets and high taxes. But there will be more fishing streams. We might have fewer supersonic transports, but nicer beaches and forests." It's a high price, all right. To pay it, people must be convinced that the enemy is not only "them" but "us." Organizers of the teach-ins will succeed if they convince people of this painful truth. Restricting their role to a doctrinal recitation of the evils of industry will not suffice.

---

ECOLOGY AND INDUSTRY

A respected business magazine, Fortune, recently concluded that "American business, since it organizes and channels a high proportion of the total action of this society, has been and still is deeply implicated in depredations against the environment."

The consumer, as we pointed out in yesterday's editorial, must somehow be persuaded that his present binge of expansion and accumulation is leading to a ruinous situation. The same persuation should be applied to industry. And just as it will be difficult for people to engage in self-restraint, it will be difficult for industry to practice self-restraint.

Changes are not going to be easy in a nation where, for example, the oil depletion allowance is viewed as a bulwark of free enterprise rather than a catalyst for depletion of nature's limited resources. Changes are not going to come easily when, in the world as a whole, most nations are underdeveloped, many of them already overpopulated and all of them striving for industrialization.

Because America represents the epitome of industrialization, it is incumbent on its business leaders to set a good example for others to emulate. The awesome efficiency and ingenuity of industry will amount to naught if it is paired with the catastrophic extinction of the brown pelican and the New England lobster, or if it is matched by the defacement of thousands of green acres by strip mining.

There must be a compromise between the blessings of affluence and the sanctity of nature.

The debate between some industrial spokesmen and proponents of this week's nationwide teach-in resembles the chicken 'n' egg controversy—which comes first, consumer abstinence or industrial self-restraint? If industry is viewed as the "egg" laid by consumers, then the notion that the cleanup of the environment has to start at the people level carries weight.

This does not, however, diminish the responsibility of industrial initiative toward a cleaner environment or the role it is currently playing in the deterioration of our planet. Industry, after all, uses more than 13 trillion gallons of water each year compared to the five trillion used by people for drinking, bathing and waste disposal. Industry has been the principal poisoning agent of America's 10 filthiest rivers, two of which—the Merrimack and the Andoscoggin—are in New England. The federal government estimates that food, textile, paper, chemical, coal, oil, rubber, metal- machinery and transportation industries spill a total of 25 trillion gallons of waste into the water annually. Factories and electric-power generating plants fire some 50 million tons of fly ash and 26 million tons of sulphur oxides into skies.

The grey sky under which we all live is, by necessity, beginning to affect industrial thinking. Edward Cole, president of General Motors, recently echoed the heads of Ford and Chrysler Corps. in committing his company "to eliminate the automobile as a factor in the nation's air pollution problem," even if it means using "power sources other than the internal combustion engine." He announced that starting with 1971 models, all new cars will be equipped with an exhaust device reducing hydrocarbon emission by 80 per cent.

It is true, as some critics point out, that we cannot depend totally on industry's altruism or sense of social responsibility. But we do not have to. If industry's principle incentive is monetary and expansionist, then the goal will be thwarted by continued inattention to the environment.

The World Health Organization recently reported, for example, that on-the-job noise pollution costs U.S. employers more than $4 billion annually in accidents, absenteeism, inefficiency and compensation.

If altruism is not the principal motivation, then the balance sheet should be. The managers of industry must realize that the law of diminishing returns applies to the use and abuse of the environment as well as the supply and demand of the commercial market.

---

ECOLOGY AND THE GOVERNMENT

"No central environmental machinery, no Big Brother in Washington, can remake the environment. It's impossible," says Russell Train, undersecretary of the Interior Department.

"We can lick the problem, if only we are allowed to plan the way NASA planned the moon program. We need goals and money," says Kenneth Biglane, senior pollution expert in the same department.

Contradictory as these statements may seem, they may both be correct. Mr. Train is right because our institutional setup is such that government alone cannot cope with the problem, unless it resorts to drastic usurpation of individual and corporate liberties. Mr. Biglane's assessment is sound because, as NASA proved, there is no impossi-

ble dream when government is willing to work in partnership with the private sector.

This partnership entails cooperation, inducement and, if need be, coercion. Governments at all levels are currently participating in this three-pronged attack, giving industries which buy anti-pollution equipment a tax break, awarding grants for municipal clean-ups and prosecuting violators of statutes.

As in Medicare and mass transit, government is the last sector to respond—and, most of the time, it does so when the other sectors fail. Estimates show that it may take $20 billion a year to start reversing the course of pollution. Obviously, the private sector, though it may have caused a good deal of the problem, cannot solve it alone—not unless we are willing to accept some important modifications of the tradition of free enterprise and free choice, which seems unlikely.

Government's entry on a large scale into this problem area has been predictably marked by a lot of confusion, contradiction and waste. No less than 13 Congressional committees now have a piece of the environmental action. In addition, there are 90 separate federal governmental programs, plus 26 quasi-governmental bodies and 14 interagency committees already at work on special aspects of the environment.

The red tape and waste created is dramatically exemplified by the National Park Service's successful opposition to the proposed Florida Everglades jetport while the Corps of Engineers was building canals that lowered the area's water levels and altered the balance of animal life. The recent Chevron Oil Co.'s spill off the Louisiana coast showed the government's enforcement procedures have been lax.

Yet, despite the cumbersome bureaucracy, the federal government cannot let up on its effort. And in time, Washington must reorganize the jerry-built federal ecology structure.

In doing so, it should not prevent local governments from adopting regulations tougher than their federal counterparts. The ecology activity is proceeding at a faster tempo in states and cities than in Congress. About one-quarter of the bills now before the California Assembly deal with pollution control. The Rhode Island legislature, which considered ony two anti-pollution bills in 1969, saw 21 proposals introduced by the end of February 1970. Maine recently adopted a sweeping anti-pollution program which would, according to Gov. Kenneth M. Curtis, alleviate almost half of the municipal pollution problems in the state.

The Massachusetts Public Health Council is expected to approve shortly a series of sweeping anti-pollution regulations which would include a ban of all burning and an embargo on trucks in the Boston area between 6 and 10 a.m. during the fall months. Last week, the council adopted a regulation restricting the types of fuel burned in Massachusetts, as of Oct. 1st.

Some of these measures are no doubt unrealistic. Yet there is some truth to the slogan, "Be realistic—do the impossible."

## INTRODUCING THE CLEAN AIR ENFORCEMENT AMENDMENTS OF 1970—APRIL 22, 1970

(Mr. MURPHY of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the rightfully fretful mind of the modern-day American, pollution is the Fifth Horseman of the Apocalypse.

It rides alongside war, famine, pestilence and death, and conjures up pictures of filth, stench, fumes, muck, smoke, soot, grime, and slime.

Certainly the problems of pollution are awesome. Everyone is exposed to it in one form or another.

It is a dream, devoutly wished, that this Earth Day, with thousands of observances across the land, will mark a turning point in man's vital relationship with the earth. For far too long we have attempted to assume mastery of the earth and its inhabitants instead of living in harmony with it and with them.

We have lately become aware that in our pride and myopia, we are inexorably rendering the world unfit for life. In the now immortal words of Pogo: "We have met the enemy and he is us."

Bringing quality back into our lives will be expensive and time-consuming, and it will call for our best ingenuity and cooperativeness, but it will be worth it. For nothing short of a total commitment will do.

The depth of environmental dilemma is best stated through facts. Let me very briefly give you just a few:

Despite the work of the Public Health Service, a recent study indicates that perhaps 30 percent of the Nation's public drinking water and water systems fall below Federal standards.

In the United States, all manufacturing dumps an estimated 16,400 billion gallons of waste water into our rivers, lakes, and coastal waters each year. This waste contains 27,500 million pounds of oxygen-demanding matter and some 22,500 million pounds of solid matter.

Recent disclosure of the dumping of sewage sludge off New York Harbor is disheartening testimony to our incredible insolence toward nature in the name of expediency. An estimated 48 million tons of dredgings, sludge, and other wastes are dumped into the coastal waters of the United States each year. As the President noted recently:

> In the New York area alone, the amount of annual dumping would cover all of Manhattan Island to a depth of one foot in 2 years.

Industry, powerplants, space heaters, and incinerators annually pour almost 200 million tons of pollutants into the air we try to breathe.

We have countless incidents which warn us of the dangers of air pollution: The killer fog in London in 1965 which lasted 5 days and is said to have caused an excess of 4,000 deaths above the normal; the 1948 inversion in Donora, Pa., which made 7,000 persons ill and killed 20, and the recent blanket of eye-burning and lung-searing filth right here on Staten Island that drifted over from Kearney, N.J.

The stealthy killing by air pollution is perhaps even more alarming than the episodes listed above when you consider the dramatic rise in lung cancer and emphysema over the last few years.

And air pollution is expensive as well as dangerous. Agricultural losses are put at over $500 million a year. A family of four living in New York City has about $600 a year extra added to its cost of living in washing, cleaning, repairing, and repainting bills. A major report puts the cost of air pollution to New Yorkers at well over $500 million a year.

These are just a few of the facts that give rise to the use of the term crisis in describing the condition of our polluted world. I could go on to the more subtle dangers of solid wastes, pesticides, radioactive, and noise pollution, but I suspect that for every dismaying fact I might cite, you could reply with 10 more.

Thus, let it suffice to say that the health and well being of our Nation and its inhabitants, both human and otherwise, are faced with the clear and present danger from pollution. If we are to continue to live here, let alone play a leadership role in the world community, we must commit ourselves unequivocally to the task.

Briefly, just let me state my commitment.

While more than seven departments and agencies are directly concerned with the growing menace to life and lung, they are impotent to probe, prosecute, or punish willful air polluters. The Clean Air Act, one of the chief vehicles in the fight for clean air, is failing to provide the necessary tools for Federal officials to assist their counterparts in the State and local communities in cracking down on polluters or in enforcing antipollution statutes. The reason: The well-intentioned Clean Air Act is simply without enforceable provisions and the administration's commitment to enforcement has been a Mickey Mouse one.

Did you know, for example, that officials of the Federal Air Pollution Control Administration are powerless to enter or inspect any property or plant where an air contaminate source is located or suspected of being located?

To insure that the Federal effort in the fight for clean air becomes more than that of a mere bystander, I have this April 22 introduced the Clean Air Act Enforcement Amendments of 1970.

This vitally needed measure—H.R. 16946—will not only extend the duration of the act, but will provide for inspection and enforcement procedures, establish national emission control standards, authorize classification of air contaminant sources, set stringent $10,000-a-day penalties for violators, authorize refulation of fuels and fuel additives, and provide for improved control over motor vehicle emissions.

And in response to the sickening studies that New York Harbor's Lower Bay has been turned into a "dead sea." I have recently introduced legislation prohibiting the dumping of sewage sludge, dredging spoils, and industrial wastes into waters designated by the Interior Department as sanctuaries for marine animal and plant life. More than 20 House Members, of both parties, have cosponsored both measures, which, I might add, were introduced long before the administration turned its Madison Avenue powerhouse loose on the problems of pollution.

My sanctuaries bill authorizes the Interior Secretary to designate and protect fish spawning and mating areas and directs the Coast Guard to enforce "no-dumping regulations." Civil fines up to $10,000 are authorized.

As some of you are aware, I have introduced or sponsored a score of other anti-pollution measures, but these are the two most immediate and important devices.

I believe that on this Earth Day, as you consider the impact we in the House of Representatives have on the environment, both directly and indirectly, you will see the necessity of these measures and will support them in working toward a cleaner world.

## LABOR RELATIONS CODE FOR PUBLIC EMPLOYEES

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

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, there is rising concern among officials on all levels of government with regard to the accelerated and insistent demands of public employees for more effective participation in decisions affecting their salary schedules and working conditions. Much has been said—at city hall, the State capitals, and here in Congress—about the proper relationships and responsibilities of those who accept employment in the area of public service.

The recent postal strike brought this important and sensitive matter most forcefully to the attention of the entire Nation. On other levels of government, policemen and firemen report sick in organized platoons, teachers walk out or submit resignations en masse, garbage piles up on city sidewalks creating health hazards, and strikes paralyze public transportation.

One major factor in this increasingly distressing situation is the fact that, while labor negotiations procedures are fairly well defined in the private sector, no such procedure exists in the public employment sector. In this area, there is no consistent public labor relations policy, the ranks of union members have been rising rapidly, the sense of grievance is strong among many employees and everywhere there are growing evidences of militancy. Public employees, once considered to be the most docile and dedicated of people, have engaged in slowdowns, stoppages, and strikes in areas long considered vital to public health and welfare, and hence immune to labor disputes.

The need is clear for guidelines in this entire area of public employment. But it is much less clear to government leaders on all levels what it is that should be done to meet the legitimate requests of the workers and still keep in mind another area of growing unrest—that of the taxpayer who must finance government, no matter on what level it may exist.

On Monday of last week, the Twentieth Century Fund, a private, nonpartisan research agency, released to the public the report of a comprehensive study of the entire question of labor relations codes in public employment. I believe this study deserves the thoughtful and careful consideration of us all.

I am not at this time endorsing the recommendations of this study, since the wide variety of interests involved—economic, social, and political—make it difficult to find a single formula of solution that would be acceptable to all. However, I do believe this report does provide useful guidelines to both sides, employee and employer, in resolving what have become more and more frequent labor-management clashes in the public sector.

It does no good for us in Congress to say that this problem, while a serious one, should better be left to local government officials. Nor is it wise for those in city, county, and State government to look to the Federal Government for answers. This is a problem for all of us and we must all share responsibility for seeking and implementing solutions.

The Twentieth Century Fund report, entitled "Pickets at City Hall," suggests the creation of a new agency, independent of executive control and answerable only to judicial review, to administer a code of labor relations for public employment at State and local levels. The task force which made this study included a number of well-qualified men from a cross section of our society.

These men were:

Archibald Cox, Harvard law professor and former Solicitor General of the United States.

Charles C. Killingsworth, chairman of the Department of Economics, Michigan State University.

Joseph A. Loftus, special assistant to the Secretary of Labor.

John W. Macy, Jr., president, Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

Walter E. Oberer, Cornell University, professor of law and labor relations.

William Simkin, former Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

George W. Taylor, professor, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania.

H. Edwin Young, chancellor, University of Wisconsin.

The late Saul Wallen, noted arbitrator and mediator and president of the New York Urban Coalition, was also a member of the task force until his death in August 1969.

In my own State of Utah, the legislature has already been presented bills dealing with teacher negotiations acts and legislation to permit collective bargaining by State employees.

A lot of people are concerned with this matter. Individual Congressmen and the committees of the Congress could, in my estimation, profitably study this report and other information on the subject. The entire area of public employment labor relations might well be the subject of regional conferences involving State, city, and county officials, representatives of public employee groups and interested citizens.

The fact that a private foundation found this a suitable subject for study indicates that it might also be included on the agenda of business organizations and even some labor organizations who hold meetings in efforts to achieve constructive solutions to problems we all face.

Mr. M. J. Roussant, director of the Twentieth Century Fund, has said: "It is our hope that the work of the task force will be of value to unions of public employees, the public employers, to mediators and to the public."

I feel its work may have already been of help to the Congress and to individual States in presenting ways in which one can implement constructive solutions.

## FEES FOR USE OF OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES

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

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, recently a survey was conducted by Lee Skabelund, a graduate student in the Department of Forest Science at Utah State University, on the attitudes of 590 residents of urban Weber County, Utah—age 15 and older—toward fees charged for the use of public outdoor recreation facilities. The results of the survey are as follows:

ATTITUDES OF URBAN RESIDENTS OF WEBER COUNTY, UTAH TOWARD FEES CHARGED FOR THE USE OF FEDERAL OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES

(Data totals and percents by Lee Skabelun)

600 COMPLETE SCHEDULES DESIRED—ACTUAL IS 98.33 PERCENT OF DESIRED

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Complete schedules | 590 | 81.94 |
| Schedules missing | 5 | .70 |
| Refusals | 61 | 8.47 |
| Persons not available | 64 | 8.89 |
| Total number in sample | 720 | 100.00 |
| Question 4. Are you opposed to paying fees on Federal lands for the use of public outdoor recreation facilities? | | |
| Yes | 169 | 28.64 |
| No | 400 | 67.80 |
| No opinion | 21 | 3.56 |
| Total | 90 | 100.00 |
| Question 5. (If opposed) Why? | | |
| Should be free | 36 | 21.30 |
| Taxes should pay for it | 44 | 26.04 |
| Fees are too high | 25 | 14.79 |
| It is double taxation | 11 | 6.51 |
| The way the money is used | 9 | 5.32 |
| Never charged before | 4 | 2.36 |
| The Government is getting too much in taxes already | 6 | 3.56 |
| Shouldn't charge for picnic, beach, or unimproved facility | 6 | 3.56 |
| No answer | 13 | 7.69 |
| Miscellaneous | 15 | 8.87 |
| Total | 169 | 100.00 |
| Question 6. Who do you feel should pay the costs of public recreation areas? | | |
| Only those who use them through their fees | 240 | 40.68 |
| All taxpayers through their taxes | 147 | 24.92 |
| A combination of the above | 166 | 28.14 |
| No opinion | 33 | 5.59 |
| Other | 4 | .68 |
| Total | 590 | 100.00 |
| Question 7. (If a combination) What share of this combination do you think fees should contribute? | | |
| Most | 53 | 31.93 |
| About half | 72 | 43.37 |
| A little | 30 | 18.07 |
| No opinion | 11 | 6.63 |
| Total | 166 | 100.00 |
| Question 8. Would you prefer paying fees by— | | |
| The day | 200 | 33.90 |
| The summer recreation season | 87 | 14.75 |
| The entire year | 219 | 37.12 |
| Wants choice of the above | 34 | 5.76 |
| No preference | 50 | 8.47 |
| Total | 590 | 100.00 |
| Question 9. Which would you prefer? | | |
| An annual permit allowing you to use any Federal recreation area in the United States | 348 | 59.08 |
| A lower priced annual permit allowing you to use any Federal area within Weber County | 157 | 26.66 |
| Wants choice of above | 33 | 5.60 |
| No preference | 51 | 8.66 |
| Total | 589 | 100.00 |

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Question 10. Which of the following fee payment methods do you prefer? | | |
| Paying at the recreation area | 246 | 41.84 |
| Paying a slightly reduced rate at a convenient location near your home such as a service station, grocery store, etc. | 240 | 40.82 |
| Wants choice of above | 33 | 5.61 |
| No preference | 69 | 11.73 |
| Total | 588 | 100.00 |
| Question 11. Would you be willing to pay extra to have a recreation site reserved? | | |
| Yes | 239 | 40.79 |
| No | 308 | 52.56 |
| No opinion | 39 | 6.65 |
| Total | 586 | 100.00 |
| Question 12. When fees are charged, should the price increase with quality of facility provided? | | |
| Yes | 309 | 52.37 |
| No | 231 | 39.15 |
| No opinion | 50 | 8.48 |
| Total | 590 | 100.00 |
| Question 13. Should the price increase with the length of time the facility is occupied? | | |
| Yes | 224 | 37.96 |
| No | 322 | 54.58 |
| No opinion | 44 | 7.46 |
| Total | 590 | 100.00 |
| Question 14. Should the price increase for periods of heavy use? | | |
| Yes | 452 | 76.61 |
| No | 104 | 17.63 |
| No opinion | 34 | 5.76 |
| Total | 590 | 100.00 |
| Question 15. Should the price be reduced during periods of light use? | | |
| Yes | 188 | 31.8/ |
| No | 366 | 62.03 |
| No opinion | 36 | 6.10 |
| Total | 590 | 100.00 |
| Question 16. If fees are charged for each individual should the price be reduced for— | | |
| The aged: | | |
| Yes | 416 | 70.51 |
| No | 152 | 25.76 |
| No opinion | 22 | 3.73 |
| Total | 590 | 100.00 |
| Children: | | |
| Yes | 424 | 71.86 |
| No | 143 | 24.24 |
| No opinion | 23 | 3.90 |
| Total | 590 | 100.00 |
| Organizations: | | |
| Yes | 330 | 55.93 |
| No | 231 | 39.15 |
| No opinion | 29 | 4.92 |
| Total | 590 | 100.00 |
| The handicapped: | | |
| Yes | 493 | 83.56 |
| No | 80 | 13.56 |
| No opinion | 17 | 2.88 |
| Total | 590 | 100.00 |
| Persons with low income: | | |
| Yes | 291 | 49.32 |
| No | 274 | 46.44 |
| No opinion | 25 | 4.24 |
| Total | 590 | 100.00 |
| Question 17. Do you think fees should be charged for— | | |
| Picnic facilities: | | |
| Yes | 165 | 27.97 |
| No | 411 | 69.66 |
| No op nion | 14 | 2.37 |
| Total | 590 | 100.00 |
| Camping facilities: | | |
| Yes | 384 | 65.08 |
| No | 185 | 31.36 |
| No opinion | 21 | 3.56 |
| Total | 590 | 100.00 |
| Boat launching facilities: | | |
| Yes | 369 | 62.54 |
| No | 173 | 29.32 |
| No opinion | 48 | 8.14 |
| Total | 590 | 100.00 |
| Beach facilities: | | |
| Yes | 213 | 36.10 |
| No | 358 | 60.68 |
| No opinion | 19 | 3.22 |
| Total | 590 | 100.00 |
| Question 18. Fee moneys are used to provide additional recreation areas within the United States. Are you in favor or opposed to this policy? | | |
| Favor | 473 | 80.17 |
| Opposed | 75 | 12.71 |
| No opinion | 30 | 5.09 |
| Other | 12 | 2.03 |
| Total | 590 | 100.00 |
| Question 19. Maintenance on Federal recreation areas is provided for by tax funds. Fee moneys collected on these areas are not used for maintaining them. Are you in favor of or opposed to this policy? | | |
| Favor | 301 | 51.10 |
| Opposed | 233 | 39.56 |
| No opinion | 47 | 7.98 |
| Other | 8 | 1.36 |
| Total | 589 | 100.00 |

Chi square analysis of the data shows at the .05 level of significance there are several associations. Students tended to favor while retired persons as a group opposed fees more often than expected. Those who had children less than four years of age at home tended to oppose fees. Those persons age fifteen to nineteen and fifty to sixty-four favored fees more often than expected. Lastly those persons who had moved from state to state in the last ten years and those who had lived in Weber County less than ten years tended to favor fees. Thus contingency table frequencies yielded significant chi square test for age, occupation, and transiency.

## ABBREVIATION FOR MISTRESS

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, there are an increasing number of American women who do not wish to be identified as Miss or Mrs. I sympathize with the way they feel and I suggest that they should start using the abbreviation "Ms." pronounced "Mis."

This may seem to some like a frivolous suggestion, but it is not. I know from many conversation with women, including my wife and my daughter-in-law, that they resent being asked by strangers whether they are Miss or Mrs. They point out that men are called Mr. whether or not they are married. "What business is it," they say to me, "of a sales clerk whether I am married or not?" I believed that a profound question involving the status of women is involved here.

The form "Ms." is a useful one for another purpose, and I commend it to my colleagues in the Congress for their consideration. Many of you receive letters, as I do, signed with feminine names but with no indication of the writer's marital status. Until recently, we had a problem in my office deciding how to address these women in reply. On the envelope it was possible simply to use both names, but what to do with the salutation on the letter itself? For a while, we tried using both names—for example, "Dear Jane Brown"—but this somehow seemed too intimate for a person I had never seen. Then the possibility of using the form "Ms." was brought to my attention—for example, "Dear Ms. Brown"—and this seemed convenient. I noticed that the women on my staff thought this was a good idea. Next, I came to the conclusion that this abbreviation and salutation could be widely used.

Of course, it is really up to the women of America whether the idea catches on or not. Far be it from me to presume to tell them how they should be addressed.

Whatever form of address the ladies choose, however, the U.S. Government should not contribute to the widespread practice of unnecessarily asking the impertinent question about marital status. Far too many forms to be filled out, including U.S. Government forms, require women to specify Mrs. or Miss when the question is totally irrelevant. I am today writing to the U.S. Budget Director who has responsibility for approving all forms put out by Federal agencies, urging him to see that this question is eliminated where it is not significant.

The retailers of America should also wake up to the fact that many women do not like to be asked the question "Miss or Mrs." I am writing to 10 large New York City department stores suggesting that they instruct their clerks not to ask this question unnecessarily. I will be most interested in their replies.

Moving to a single form of address for women is not a new idea. The salutation "Mistress" was formerly used to address both married and unmarried ladies. Oddly enough, as any dictionary will show, both Mrs. and Miss are abbreviations of the word Mistress.

## H.R. 16916

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this point in order to clarify the events which occured during the debate on H.R. 16916, the appropriations for the Office of Education.

I believe the events which transpired were most unfortunate and do not reflect affirmatively on the credibility of this House; so my intention in taking this special order is to clarify the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 14, 1970, as found on page 11648. The RECORD indicates the Chair sustained the point of order made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) against Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD on the grounds that the Clerk had already passed that point in the bill. Following this, my own amendment was ruled out of order on similar grounds.

It is this point that needs correction. The Clerk, indeed, had only begun to read the page 3 sections dealing with vocational, adult, and higher education when I was on my feet seeking recognition from the Chair, and the section on community education was in truth not read prior to my seeking recognition. To

further substantiate this point: after the dialog on the point of order that followed my attempted amendment and Mr. SCHEUER'S comments, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas offered an amendment to that very section on community education. He was not ruled out of order by the Chair. Certainly if the Clerk had, indeed, read the community education section at the place indicated in the RECORD, then Mr. PRYOR'S amendment also would have been out of order and the Chair would have so ruled.

While I believe it is important to correct the RECORD as a matter of historical note, I believe there is an even more fundamental issue involved here; that is the failure of the Subcommittee on Appropriations and the Chair to allow the House to work its will in a democratic manner on this important legislation.

The objections by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to my being allowed to present an amendment to be discussed and to stand or fall on its merits are most unfortunate. In his own words, he did so "to protect his bill." It is my judgment that the democratic process and the credibility of the House are in greater need of protection than any bill.

At a time when increasing numbers of citizens are questioning this body and its ability to put its own house in order, an experience such as this does little to erase their doubts.

## D FOR DECENCY WEEK MAY 17–23

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I am sure anyone who has the least sensitivity to what is happening around him must be concerned over the rising acceptability of grossly obscene and pornographic material.

The President's Commission on Pornography is currently involved in an intensive effort designed to learn the extent and causes for the increasing profusion and use of obscene materials. This certainly is an important and timely effort.

In introducing this Decency Week resolution today it is my intent to focus public concern and generate interest in this issue. With so much competing for one's attention and with increasing permissiveness evident in all the media, obscenity as a question of public concern and debate has been unfortunately relegated to the "back burner." This is a potentially dangerous mistake. What seems to me to be the most serious aspect of this entire matter is the increasing public apathy over a question that clearly challenges basic values and standards.

Let me cite what is perhaps an exaggerated example, but nevertheless reflects how absurd some people are willing to be in their exploitation of pornographic material. A recent ad in the Los Angeles Times movie section described a film in the following adjectives—sin, corruption, wantonness, raw sex, sadism—and the final absurdity at the bottom of the ad suggested the picture was "One of the best films to come along in the last 10 years."

With this kind of offensive exploitation so evident, I believe it is time some effort was made to restore a measure of sanity—and yes—although some unfortunates may consider the standard irrelevant—decency. A week in which we are asked to look about us and say "enough—our senses are inundated with obscene trash—lets stop it" is not only a good idea, but a necessary one.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to include the text of the resolution I am introducing today. This resolution has been endorsed by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.

The resolution follows:

H.J. RES. 1187

A joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the week of May 17, 1970, through May 23, 1970, as "D for Decency Week"

Whereas the amount of obscene and pornographic material being sold and otherwise distributed throughout the United States continues to increase at alarming rate; and

Whereas such material has no redeeming social value to the Nation or the American people; and

Whereas too much of such material is finding its way into the hands of the youth of the country: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That in order to focus national attention on the need to reduce and control the vast quantities of obscene and pornographic material being distributed throughout the United States the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week of May 17, 1970, through May 23, 1970, as "D for Decency Week", and calling upon the people of the United States and interested groups and organizations to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

## NATIONAL DIGESTIVE DISEASES AND NUTRITION ACT OF 1970

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, more people in the United States suffer each year from digestive tract diseases than from almost any other type of malady. Despite this, there is no agency of the Federal Government specifically charged with the important responsibility of providing the massive research and training necessary to adequately deal with digestive disorders.

In order to improve and expand our present efforts in this area, I am introducing legislation which would establish a National Institute of Digestive Diseases and Nutrition. The creation of such an Institute would accomplish two things. First, it creates a mechanism whose overwhelming concern will be directed at digestive diseases. Second, the establishment of the Institute would clearly announce this Nation's commitment to bend every effort to deal with these disorders.

There, of course, is ample precedent to create such a special Institute. The success of the Heart Institute provides us with ample evidence of what can be accomplished when a commitment is made to provide the necessary funds and organization.

While cardiovascular diseases still account for more fatalities than other types of diseases, digestive maladies actually have a greater impact on a larger segment of the population. Digestive diseases account for more hospitalizations than any other body system disease. The latest statistics available show more than 5 million Americans hospitalized each year from digestive diseases at an annual cost to our economy of more than $8 billion.

Yet our ability to treat these diseases is pitifully small. For each 100,000 Americans there is presently one physician specially trained to deal with gastroenterological disorders. And remember, these diseases hospitalize more Americans than any other body system malady.

In the last AGA survey, it was found that 24 States had less than 10 physicians specially trained in digestive diseases. Four States had none.

Only 16 percent of the Nation's medical schools have five or more full-time teachers of digestive disorders. This compares with 60 percent of the schools having more than five teachers in the field of cardiovascular disease.

The state of knowledge about these digestive diseases, while impressive in some instances, is generally uneven. For example, the American Gastroenterological Association estimates that peptic ulcers afflict more than 10 million Americans—mostly males between the ages of 20 and 60. Yet, this figure represents, the AGA believes, only about half of those afflicted. For a number of reasons, but primarily because of lack of trained manpower and facilities, more than 10 million Americans probably are walking around with untreated—even undiagnosed—peptic ulcers. In other major digestive diseases such as hepatitis, cirrhosis of the liver, gallstones, infectious diarrhea, and cancer of the colon and rectum, there is a serious need for extensive research and trained personnel.

I believe a National Institute specifically dealing with these disorders can make an immediate and important impact in dealing with the distress of millions of Americans. I am hopeful this legislation will receive the prompt attention is deserves.

At this point in the RECORD, I wish to include two tables of supportive statistical material:

TABLE 1.—COMPARISON OF DISEASES OF BODY SYSTEMS AS PRIMARY CAUSES OF HOSPITALIZATION IN THE UNITED STATES, 1964

| Condition category | Patients hospitalized | Days of hospitalization |
|---|---|---|
| All conditions | [2] 19.7 | 181.0 |
| Digestive | [2] 3.4 | 29.4 |
| Respiratory | 2.9 | 16.2 |
| Circulatory | 2.0 | 24.4 |
| Genitourinary | 2.0 | 15.7 |
| Musculoskeletal | 1.0 | 11.0 |
| Impairments | 2.2 | 24.4 |
| All other | 6.0 | 59.9 |

[1] Modified from Lawrence.
[2] Numbers are in millions.
[3] Data from a national sample of hospitals show that the first listed cause of hospitalization constitutes ⅔ of the total digestive diseases entered in the records. Thus about 1,700,000 secondary or contributory conditions should be added, making a total of approximately 5,100,000 per year.

TABLE 2.—TOTAL ECONOMIC COST[1] OF ILLNESS, BY DIAGNOSIS, IN THE UNITED STATES IN 1963[2]

[In dollars]

| Category | Total | Direct expenditures | Earnings loss from | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Morbidity | Mortality |
| Diseases of circulatory system | 20,948.4 | 2,267.3 | 2,919.7 | 15,761.4 |
| Injuries | 11,810.6 | 1,702.8 | 1,810.7 | 8,297.1 |
| Neoplasms | 10,589.9 | 1,279.0 | 850.7 | 8,460.2 |
| Diseases of digestive system, excluding neoplasms | [3]7,837.3 | 4,158.7 | 1,220.1 | 2,458.5 |
| Diseases of respiratory system | 7,412.8 | 1,581.1 | 3,166.3 | 2,665.4 |
| Mental, psychoneurotic and personality disorders | 7,276.6 | 2,401.7 | 4,624.0 | 250.9 |
| Diseases of nervous system and sense organs | 6,795.4 | 1,416.4 | 1,525.5 | 3,853.5 |
| Allergic, endocrine, metabolic, nutritional diseases | 2,623.1 | 902.9 | 539.5 | 1,180.7 |
| Diseases of genitourinary system | 2,559.9 | 1,210.2 | 497.8 | 851.9 |
| Infective and parasitic diseases | 2,135.3 | 501.9 | 858.0 | 775.4 |
| Diseases of blood and blood-forming organs | 372.6 | 155.9 | 41.3 | 175.4 |
| Miscellaneous | 13,138.3 | 4,952.1 | 2,988.7 | 5,197.5 |
| Total | 93,500.3 | 22,530.0 | 21,042.2 | 49,928.1 |

[1] Given in millions of dollars.
[2] Adapted from Rice.
[3] Note: above figure of $7,800,000,000 for digestive disease includes $2,400,000,000 for expense of dental care, but excludes expenditures for, and indirect costs of, gastrointestinal cancer, estimated at $2,700,000,000. Hence corrected estimate of cost of digestive disease, as defined in this report, is $8,100,000,000 yearly.

At this point I wish to include the purpose of the measure and the sections which establish and relate the functions of the National Institute of Digestive Diseases and Nutrition:

That this Act may be cited as the "National Digestive Diseases and Nutrition Act."

PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The purpose of this Act is to improve the health of the people of the United States through the conduct of researches, investigations, experiments, and demonstrations relating to the cause, prevention and methods of diagnosis and treatment of diseases of the digestive tract, including the liver and pancreas, and diseases of nutrition; assist and foster such researches and other activities by public and private agencies, and promote the coordination of all such researches and activities and the useful application of their results; provide training in matters relating to digestive diseases and nutrition including refresher courses for physicians; and develop and assist States and other agencies in the use of the most effective methods in the promotion and maintenance of health and of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of digestive diseases and nutrition.

RESEARCH AND TRAINING

SEC. 3. Title IV of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"PART F—NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DIGESTIVE DISEASES AND NUTRITION

"ESTABLISHMENT OF INSTITUTE

"SEC. 451. There is hereby established in the Public Health Service the National Institute of Digestive Diseases and Nutrition (hereafter in this part referred to as the 'Institute').

"DIGESTIVE AND NUTRITIONAL DISEASE RESEARCH AND TRAINING

"SEC. 452. In carrying out the purposes of section 301 with respect to digestive diseases and nutrition, the Secretary, through the Institute and in cooperation with the National Advisory Digestive Diseases and Nutrition Council (hereafter in this part referred to as the 'Council') shall—

"(a) conduct, assist, and foster researches, investigations, experiments, and demonstrations relating to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of digestive diseases and nutrition;

"(b) promote the coordination of research and control programs conducted by the Institute, and similar programs conducted by other agencies, organizations and individuals;

"(c) make available research facilities of the Service to appropriate public authorities, and to health officials and scientists engaged in special studies related to the purposes of this part;

"(d) make grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public and private agencies and institutions, and to individuals for such research projects relating to digestive diseases and nutrition as are recommended by the Council, including grants to such agencies and institutions for the construction, acquisition, leasing, equipment, and maintenance of such hospital, clinic, laboratory, and related facilities, and for the care of such patents therein, as are necessary for such research;

"(e) establish an information center on research, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of digestive diseases and nutrition, and collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, information as to, and the particular application of, research and other activities carried on pursuant to this part;

"(f) secure from time to time, and for such periods as he deems advisable, the assistance and advice of persons from the United States or abroad who are experts in the field of digestive diseases and nutrition; and

"(g) in accordance with regulations and from funds appropriated or donated for the purpose (1) establish and maintain research fellowships in the Institute and elsewhere with such stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) as he may deem necessary to train research workers and procure the assistance of the most brilliant and promising research fellows from the United States and abroad, and, in addition, provide for such fellowships through grants, upon recomendation of the Council to public and other nonprofit institutions; and (2) provide training and instruction and establish and maintain traineeships, in the Institute and elsewhere in matters relating to the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of digestive diseases with such stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) for trainees as he may deem necessary, the number of persons receiving such training and instruction, and the number of persons holding such traineeships, to be fixed by the Council, and, in addition, provide for such training, instruction, and traineeships through grants, upon recommendation of the Council, to public and other nonprofit institutions.

## NIXON ADMINISTRATION OPPOSES ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION LEGISLATION

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was Earth Day, and in communities and on college campuses across the land, Americans met to express their concern about the quality of our enviroment.

I think it significant however that on Tuesday of this week—on the eve of Earth Day and after reams of administration rhetoric about the need for environmental education, the top education official of the Federal Government appeared before a congressional subcommittee to declare the opposition of the Nixon administration to a bipartisan effort to help our schools and communities provide education on the environmental crisis.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the testimony on April 21, 1970, before the House Select Education Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, of the Honorable James E. Allen, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Health. Education and Welfare and United States Commissioner of Education.

Mr. Allen testified that H.R. 14753, the Environmental Quality Education Act, which is cosponsored by my distinguished colleagues, the gentlemen from New York (Mr. SCHEUER and Mr. REID) and the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. HANSEN) was unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, in recent speeches, President Nixon has said it is "now or never" on measures to protect the environment; Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Robert A. Finch has warned, "we mean business" on environmental education; and Commissioner Allen has called for "legislation for Federal initiatives in environmental education."

But this week the Nixon administration declared its opposition to congressional initiatives to bring environmental education to the Nation's schoolchildren and the general public.

Yesterday, administration officials were on college campuses across the country supporting Earth Day.

Mr. Speaker, the contrast between administration words and deeds on an environmental education program must be obvious.

Following my comments, I shall ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the texts of two splendid addresses urging Federal support of environmental education, delivered by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, the Honorable Robert A. Finch, February 7, 1970, and by Assistant Secretary Allen delivered on January 23, 1970.

Mr. Speaker, the words in these speeches are fine, but unfortunately the actions of the administration in opposing the Environmental Quality Education Act speak louder than the speeches.

Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration's opposition to environmental educational legislation is one more instance of its "big talk—no action" attitude on meeting the environmental crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I am also constrained to note that during the testimony on April 21, Mr. Allen and his staff admitted that the Task Force on Environment/Ecological Education in the U.S. Education Office had a staff of only three, backed by

some students, two consultants, and no specific budget.

I think it also appropriate that I here note that the August 1969 report of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality, headed by Laurence S. Rockefeller, sharply criticized as inadequate the environmental programs of the Office of Education.

Evidently, the Administration does not read the reports of its own advisers.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I think it highly significant that Russell Train, Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, declined to testify on the bill.

In addition, representatives of the Department of Interior earlier this year asked to testify on the proposal but late Tuesday canceled, without explanation, the scheduled appearance of Leslie Glasgow, Assistant Interior Secretary for Fish, Wildlife, Parks and Marine Resources.

Another indication of the forked tongue with which the administration has been speaking in the field of environmental education is a letter dated January 21, 1970, which I received from S. Fred Singer, a top Interior Department official and former dean of environmental sciences at the University of Miami, strongly endorsing the Environmental Quality Education bill and urging its passage. Following is the text of Mr. Singer's letter:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
*Washington, D.C., January 21, 1970.*

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
*House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

Dear Mr. BRADEMAS: I have noted with great interest that you have recently introduced a bill supporting environmental education. As a former Dean of Environmental Sciences at the University of Miami, I happen to believe that this is a most important bill, and I hope it will be enacted soon. I would appreciate receiving a copy of your bill and am enclosing, for your information, a recent paper of mine on the subject, presented at the December meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. I would be happy to supply any additional information or papers you may desire.

Sincerely yours,

S. FRED SINGER,
*Deputy Assistant Secretary.*

Mr. Speaker, it is abundantly clear that the White House and the Budget Bureau have once again silenced responsible administration officials who want to support congressional initiatives to help educate Americans about the clear and present danger to the Nation's environment.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I insert the text of the two addresses of Secretary Finch and Assistant Secretary Allen to which I have earlier referred:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT H. FINCH, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, BEFORE THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

As my own first item of business, let me convey to you, at his personal request, President Nixon's greetings. Even though the press of business has prevented his personal attendance, he asked me to express his concern and close attention to your endeavors.

Your convention theme, "What's Right with American Education," provides a healthy concern with the positive. I don't think by that focus that you are ignoring the problems and tensions which secondary schools are experiencing. Since you are at the eye of the storm, you obviously know that there are no rugs big enough to have some of your problems swept under.

SPIRIT OF THE POSITIVE

It is in that same spirit of the positive that our own efforts are proceeding.

* * * * *

There is one final item on my agenda which I deem intimately related to all I have said this morning. By discussing it as an educational vehicle for the channeling of student energies, I do not mean it as a cynical technique of crisis management. I refer, of course, to the compelling problems of restoring the Nation's environment. This is not, and it cannot become, a political fad or a passing bit of heavy rhetoric. We mean business. Environmental considerations—a sense of responsibility for this planet and for each other—must become a permanent component of every decision—governmental, legal, industrial, and personal—from here on out.

ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION

The burning question about the degradation and abuse of the environment is no longer the catalogue of ecological horror stories, but rather: "What are we going to do about them?" And in this battle, there is no weapon more critical than education.

The teacher we intend to send into our public schools in 1980 is today a sixth grader somewhere in America. He or she must be taught—beginning right now—along with every American boy and girl, about environmental quality, about ecology and about all of the complex and interacting elements that go to make them up.

We and they must learn together—and in the spare time we have left, we must begin to write the textbooks for this new educational enterprise. We must think about America as it will be in 1980—a Nation with some 250 million citizens with different kinds of schools and different kinds of teaching and learning programs, and we must do this right now. That future teacher will enter college in 1976 and new textbooks will have to be written and published, courses mapped out and instructors trained in these new disciplines.

When we turn these brand-new teachers loose in 1980, they must know much more than any of us do right now about the problems involved in human survival—or else the war may well be lost, although the battles may go on for a few decades longer.

Departments devoted to the environmental sciences are being started at many of our Nation's universities. Many seminars have been held. This is an excellent beginning—but we must also begin now to develop similarly oriented programs in our grade schools, in our high schools and in our junior colleges.

ADULT EDUCATION

These same basic courses must be developed and put into action at every stage of adult education. Logically, this should include not only adult education sponsored by formal school systems, but also the educational enterprises conducted by business and industry, by unions and by other organized groups. The future of society lies in its ability to respond to crisis. And we are in a situation with regard to our environmental preservation that calls for a clear and vigorous response by every sector of American life.

THE ENVIRONMENT IS RIGHT HERE

We need in our schools to counteract the idea of environment as being something "out there" that can be visited and then left behind at the end of a field trip. Our goal must be to see that every school has access to an environmental study area where youngsters of all ages can grow up with the concept of environment as being everything that makes up their world, and with an understanding of the interdependency of all its numberless elements. Whatever Marshall McLuhan meant by telling us and the media that we live in a "global village," the analogous message for environmental education is clear: "The world is the classroom."

EEE

Through the development of what Dr. Allen has called EEE—environmental/ecological education—at every level of learning, I see some very exciting things:

—Pre-schoolers will more and more be using the out-of-doors as a classroom—for it is urgent that out children early begin to understand their environment.

High school students will use civics courses to engage in work study programs with city and state officials and environmental quality professionals. They will focus on all sorts of urban problems to which solutions must be found—waste disposal, water supply, pollution and population.

Undergraduates will participate in multi-disciplinary classes under the guidance of master teaching teams to allow them to work out the great intellectual synthesis of the 1970's—the still unexplored area that lies among the humanities, the natural and social sciences, and the broad-based environmental studies that must be undertaken.

FUSION OF EFFORT

Education in this issue is not just something for kids. The entire level of mass citizen understanding and participation must be raised if we are to reverse the environmental skid. In this effort, we must rely on educational television, on community colleges, on business, on labor—in fact, on a total fusion of individual and group effort.

Action on this issue calls for both skills and passion: for disciplined scientific techniques and the emotional commitment to utilize them. If our communications do not fail us in this crisis, ALL AMERICANS WILL, TO SOME DEGREE, BECOME ECO-ACTIVISTS.

DECADE OF CHALLENGE

Let me close my remarks on the note struck by your conference theme. If there were to be one crucial thing that is right among the many things that are right—about the American educational system, it would be its historic capacity to respond creatively to challenge. This is the decade of challenge; and in your constructive introspection, the response has already begun. To that I can only echo the words I quoted last spring at a White House meeting of the best of your own students—the Presidential Scholars. The words were uttered by my predecessor, John Gardner, and they apply to education, to political leaders, and to each one of us.

"A nation is never finished. You can't build it and leave it standing as the Pharaohs did the pyramids. It has to be recreated in each generation by believing, caring men and women. It is now our turn. If we don't believe or don't care, nothing can save this nation. If we believe and care, nothing can stop us."

---

EDUCATION FOR SURVIVAL

(Address by James E. Allen, Jr., before 1970 annual meeting of the American Council of Learned Societies)

In the course of the past few weeks we have been treated to every conceivable kind of review of the 60's and prediction for the 70's that hindsight and foresight together could reduce to words.

One of the most troubling things we have learned from this inventory is that our world—which once we believed would endure for almost anyone's casual definition of "forever"—is in acute danger of becoming the subject of a premature obituary notice.

As President Nixon said in his State of the Union address yesterday, "The great question of the 70's is shall we surrender to our surroundings or shall we make our peace with nature and begin to make reparations for the damage we have done to our air, to our land, to our water."

SCOPE OF "EDUCATION"

If the tragic state of the environment seems a rather inappropriate subject for an address by the United States Commissioner of Education, let me assure you that it is not. Indeed, everything we have been alerted to about the perilous condition of our planet comes under the heading of "education."

Granted, it is an unusual form of education. Instead of learning it as a matter of course from our earliest classrooms on through the educational process, we are having it sledgehammered into our heads rudely and with little warning. It is education nonetheless, and in the light of history, it may prove to have been the most valuable we have ever been exposed to.

EDUCATION FOR SURVIVAL

Though this may seem at first to be education for catastrophe, it can also provide the catalyst for creating education for survival. For the human species, all of whom share a steadily worsening environment, there can be no more important consideration.

At the outset, let me say this: there is nothing whatever that is remotely political or even partisan in what I am saying to you tonight. The environmental deterioration in which we find ourselves knows neither Republican nor Democrat, white or black, rich or poor, young or old. To experience it, to suffer from it, to be concerned with it, to be committed to do something about it—all that is required is that you be alive. All else is quite literally irrelevant.

TECHNOLOGY OUT OF CONTROL

The plain fact is that the technology of living that we have created has gotten—we hope, only temporarily—out of control. Our mere existence is creating dangerous changes in the delicate balances by which we have thus far survived on earth. Our technology has so far been used primarily in ways which aggravate these changes. Only now are we learning how to measure the changes we know about—and to be wary of the subtle long-range changes of which we are not yet even aware.

I need not belabor you with statistics. You have read them, and heard them, and flinched at them and perhaps wearied of them.

Who, after all, can really visualize 142 million tons of pollutants discharged into the air of this country every year?

What does it really mean to say that $20 billion is the estimated cost of the havoc wrought annually by these pollutants?

Eight million junked automobiles, 26 billion discarded bottles and 48 billion cans, 150 million tons of solid wastes, 2,100 communities dumping billions of gallons of raw sewage into our waterways—these are statistics that boggle the mind, and they are repeated like clockwork every year, inching higher and higher toward the point that reads "human extermination." It takes something really different—like a river so filthy it actually catches fire—to engage our jaded attention.

We created this technology by exploiting our talent for invention, our dedication to learning, and willingness to work and work hard. Now we face the ultimate challenge of using these same national characteristics to regain control of our technology—lest uncontrolled it exterminates us.

The time we have to achieve this reversal may be no longer than the few years remaining in this century. In any event, there is no time to lose. *The key to human survival is education.*

WHY EDUCATION?

Why do I say that education is the key to survival? Why not new laws? Why not new rules and regulations and codes and all the rest of the complex apparatus of government which regulates nearly all human endeavor? Why is education more important that all of these admittedly important measures?

The answer is that in a free society it is always the citizen who must bear the ultimate responsibility for the choices that are made and the actions that are taken. In all our history we have found no better way than through the process of education for equipping citizens—you and me and our children—with the knowledge and the understanding needed to make these choices and to take these actions.

What we desperately need is not ingenious tinkering with the surface of our culture but a new vision of the possibilities of human life in our age. To whom should be turn for such a vision, and who can persuade our citizens to pay the price for carrying it to fruition?

Not so long ago, many people were confident that science could solve such problems, but such confidence is no longer as pervasive as it used to be. The scientists themselves are frequently known to express pessimism. All of the threats to human existence ironically derive, to a greater or lesser degree, from the extraordinary flowering of science-based technology in the twentieth century. That this flowering has brought many benefits to man, few will deny. That it also extends his power beyond his demonstrated wisdom to use it to his collective advantage is also hard to deny. There is growing conviction in this country that science is now too portent-laden to be left to scientists alone. In this regard, I am reminded of the prophetic words of Lord Snow in his book, *Two Cultures,* some years back.

It is at this point—at the last milisecond before midnight—that the humanism and social scientist are being invited to help salvage our society. It is ironic because, like Churchill under the clock in Parliament thundering unheeded warnings of disaster prior to World War II, the social scholars have long predicted the state of affairs to which we have come. Yet like Churchill, they must now assume a major responsibility for averting the impending doom.

PRIMACY OF CULTURE

There is only one way to do so, and that is to reassert the primacy of a man-centered culture which subordinates technology to the human condition. That is what the new national environment policy is really all about —a Renaissance of Man in the decade of the 70's.

This Renaissance takes as its paramount issue the quality of life. And who is better equipped to speak on the quality of human existence than the man of humane letters and social concerns? Who else has devoted his life to the most productive and liberating ways of approaching the human condition? I charge each of you with the burden of leadership, of speaking to the creation of exemplary men.

In this regard, I cite Classics Professor William Arrowsmith of the University of Texas whose views on education should constitute a statement of goals for us all:

"It is men we need now, not programs. It is possible for a student to go from kindergarten to graduate school without ever encountering a *man*—a man who might for the first time give him the only profound motivation for learning, the hope of becoming a better man. Since the humanities aim at humanization, their meaning and end are always, I believe, an exemplary man. Hence the humanities stand or fall according to the human size of the man who professes them."

It is clear, then, that scientists are not alone responsible for the woes of our civilization. Humanists and social scientists by their indifference must share with other citizens some responsibility for the current state of our world too. But the times are now suddenly ripe for a fruitful intercourse between the humanities and the sciences. The surge in inter-disciplinary team research and study represented by the concern for ecology constitutes a major opportunity for an impact upon public policy by the humanities and social sciences.

A major thrust will be made through the agency of education. I hope that you will not neglect the challenge presented to you to participate in the reorientation of American education toward man-centered environmental study. The newly awakened social conscience in our country demands a response by educational authorities. We ask that you join us in shaping an educational policy consonant with that Renaissance.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF GOVERNMENT

The responsibility of the government is to lead.

That is why the President, on January 1, 1970, marked the start of a new decade by signing the bill establishing a Council of Environmental Advisors. It is why he said, "The 1970's absolutely must be the years when America pays its debt to the past by reclaiming the purity of its air, its waters and our living environment. It is literally now or never." It is why he has dedicated this Administration to the saving of our fragile, threatened environment—on which our survival depends.

It is also the responsibility of government to set an example—to encourage the growth of public understanding of its activities, of public concern, of public participation. "Until he has been part of a cause larger than himself, no man is truly whole," the President said in his inaugural address.

Above all, it is the responsibility of all government—not just national or state, but every local unit that operates a public school system—to educate . . . to replace confusion with knowledge . . . to replace concern with commitment and action.

It is at this point that the humanists and the social scientists should be "doing their thing." The problems we have are not just scientific. They are social and they bear directly upon human interaction with the total environment. What we need desperately from the cognoscenti such as you here tonight is help in posing the right questions. If the growing surge of citizen concern is to give rise to new human survival techniques and attitudes, a leadership role for the humanities is essential.

Learning about environment and ecology and all that affect it is admittedly complicated. Even today, when we know how dangerously threatened our environment is, we have only a small corps of qualified professionals to call upon. But if government at any level should take the attitude that this is all too complicated for the average citizen to understand—that he is needed merely to pick up the bill—then we shall be inviting public apathy, and even the most ambitious programs will eventually fail.

We simply cannot afford failure.

TWO GENERATIONS

We must therefore begin immediately to use our full educational capability to learn as much as we can, as fast as we can, about how to save our environment. At the same time, we must begin to teach not just one but two generations of Americans, simultaneously, all that they must know in order to revive the earth on which we live.

Why do I say two generations? Simply because you and I and every other adult American must learn all this, just as must every American whose age puts him in the student population. We must learn it so we can understand it—and we must learn it in order to be able to teach it on a vastly

greater scale than anything we have so far envisioned.

The teacher we intend to send into our public schools in 1980 is today a sixth grader somewhere in America. He or she must be taught—beginning right now—along with every American boy and girl, about environmental quality, about ecology and about all of the complex and interacting elements that go to make them up.

We and they must learn together—and in the spare time we have left, we must begin to write the textbooks for this new educational enterprise. We must think about America as it will be in 1980—a nation with some 235 million citizens with different kinds of schools and different kinds of teaching and learning programs, and we must do this right now. That future teacher will enter college in 1976 and textbooks will have to have been written and published, courses mapped out and instructors trained in these new disciplines.

When we turn these brand-new teachers loose in 1980, they had better know much more than any of us do right now about the problems involved in human survival—or else the war may well be lost, although the battles may go on for a few decades longer.

What are the specific tasks to be assigned to this new environmental/ecological education? They can be summed up briefly: *awareness, concern, motivation and training:*

*Awareness of how we and our technology* affect and are affected by our environment;

*Concern* for man's new and unique responsibility to re-establish and to create beneficially balanced relationships among all forms of life within the closed earth system;

*Motivation and training* to enable us to acquire and spread the knowledge and skills that will help us solve interrelated environmental problems and prevent their future occurrence.

The end product of this kind of education—and it must take place at every level of the educational enterprise—will be to create, within the decade that has just begun, a citizenry with a clear understanding that man is an inseparable *part* of the system and that, as such, his continued existence is totally dependent on its continued functioning.

ALL EDUCATIONAL LEVELS

Departments devoted to the environmental sciences are being started at many of our nation's universities. This is an excellent beginning—but we must also begin now to develop similarly oriented programs in our grade schools, in our high schools and in our junior colleges. It is essential for students reaching the university level—and just as urgent for those whose education will not take them that far—that they already know the basic facts about environment just as you and I learned addition and subtraction.

These same basic courses must be developed and put into action at every stage of adult education. Logically, this should include not only adult education sponsored by formal school systems, but also the educational enterprises conducted by business and industry, by unions and by other organized groups. The future of society lies in its ability to react and respond to situations and events—and we are in a situation with regard to our environmental preservation that calls for a clear and vigorous response by every sector of American life. Eventually, as we gain ground, we should become able to *act* rather than merely *react*.

It is a matter of urgent necessity that we develop in both young and old an understanding of the society in which they live—an increasingly urbanized society with all the problems that this creates. We need to develop ecological studies designed to make everyone aware of the fragile and interacting relationships of land, air and water—and to give new understandings of the eco-concepts—that must govern the development of society, encompassing the demands of increasing urbanization.

We need in our schools to counteract the idea of environment as being something "out there" that can be visited and then left behind at the end of the field trip. Our goal must be to see that every school has access to an environmental study area where youngsters of all ages can grow up with the concept of environment as being everything that makes up their world, and with an understanding of the interdependency of all its numberless elements.

EEE

Through the development of EEE—environmental/ecological education—at every level of learning, I see some very exciting things:

Pre-schoolers will be using the out-of-doors as a classroom—for it is a matter of urgent necessity that our children early begin to understand their environment.

High school students will use civics courses to engage in work-study programs with city planners and environmental quality professionals. They will focus on all sorts of urban problems to which solutions must be found—waste disposal, water supply, pollution and population.

Undergraduates will participate in multidisciplinary classes under the guidance of master teaching teams to allow them to work out the great intellectual synthesis of the 1970's—the newly emerging coalescence of the humanities, the natural and social sciences, and the broad-based environmental studies that are being undertaken.

Graduate students will work in special study programs directed to creating new and different approaches to solving ecological problems.

Teachers will be given opportunities to acquire the knowledge and the methods of teaching EEE.

Out-of-school adults will learn to understand how and why the ecology and the environment interact; and while the professionals and the para-professionals work toward finding the immediate solutions we *must* have, all of us will acquire the kind of knowledge we can no longer do without. The entire level of mass citizen understanding and participation must be raised if we are to reverse the environmental skid. In this effort, we must rely on educational television, on community colleges, on business, on labor—in fact, on a total fusion of individual and group effort.

ECO-ACTIVISTS

If our communications do not fail us in this crisis, all Americans will, to some degree, become eco-activists.

Let me illustrate what this can mean.

In California, voters in San Bernardino County recently turned down a proposed coal burning plant despite the increased tax revenues it would have contributed. Residents in a Seattle suburb chose to preserve a wooded park area instead of clearing it for a golf course.

A recent example of the effectiveness of the working meld provided by mass communications, citizen response, and various levels of government working in partnership was the halting of the Everglades Jetport. An irreversible ecological tragedy was averted and we lighted a beacon of hope and inspiration for a nation of environmental underachievers.

The decisions to be made by each of us in the future will be on both small and very large environmental issues, but, whatever their degree, they will be more and more numerous in the years ahead. It is vital that we and our children be equipped with the wisdom and understanding that reject haphazard or emotional choices in favor of informed, reasoned decisions.

Undertaking this vast new educational enterprise will have far reaching and highly beneficial implications for American education. It will be a catalyst whose impact will register in every classroom and, I hope, in every home and office and plant in America.

Scholarship will benefit by the development of the essential inter and cross disciplinary studies that will be needed. The active involvement of our educational system in problems that pervade the lives of all will help to make the educational process more relevant and responsive.

This new emphasis in American education will help to make every individual more aware of how dependent each of us is upon the other. We shall—we *must*—learn that in the highly complex structure which is human society, survival depends on self-control (which includes control of technology—that mammoth extension of "self.")

The simple goal of all this educational effort is the realization that the acts of one react on all. If we can learn this lesson, we shall live in a better society. If we do not learn it, we may well have no society at all.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

What is the Office of Education going to do to help American education implement the environmental challenge outlined by the President and alluded to here today? A number of things:

Promote EEE as a major activity of the Office in the 1970's.

Set up a special environmental studies staff to coordinate existing programs, redirect existing resources, and plan new programs and activities. This can be done by drawing creatively on all the relevant resources in O.E., without creating another bureaucratic unit.

Support appropriate legislation for Federal initiatives in environmental education.

Call a major conference in June on the challenge of EEE to the American educational community.

Support wholeheartedly the Environmental Teach-In scheduled nationally for April 22. I urge all American educators, at elementary, secondary and higher levels throughout the nation, to concern themselves with this effort and to give this environmental event the impact it deserves.

Propose that teachers follow up the National Teach-In by organizing and planning regional *Ecological Environmental Teach-Ins for Teachers* in the Summer of 1970. The Office of Education and the Department of Interior would assist these efforts in cooperation with State and local groups and organizations.

Cooperate with the Department of Interior to put to the highest educational use the cultural and natural environmental resources of the National Park Service. The Department of Interior's National Environmental Education Landmark program represents a major step in the direction that education for survival must take.

And finally, begin to plan for our participation in the 1972 UN International Environmental Year. Since we are the leading industrial nation, we must take leadership in countering industrial violence to the environment. The spread of our industrial technology has brought with it the spread of its rot. As John Gardner recently said: "The problems of nuclear warfare, of population, or the environment are impending planetary disasters. We are in trouble as a species."

CHALLENGE AND RESPONSE

Before us stands a great challenge. Arnold Toynbee has told us that the essence of the story of mankind and the survival of civilizations is to be found in the cycle of challenge and response. Those that respond survive; those that do not decline and die.

I believe America contains the seeds of response. Some are disturbed by the enormity

of the challenge—but the very fact that we are willing and anxious to focus on our environmental problems is the best assurance that we do indeed still possess the energy to tackle them and the ability to forge the tools to conquer them.

In just six years, this nation will enter upon its third century of independence. How our children and their children will live in that century—or even if they will—is almost totally dependent on the commitment we must now make and the dedication with which we carry it out.

If we are committed and steadfast, then we can in good time step aside and make room for the future, with the reassurance that we have kept the faith . . . that in the brief but eloquent words of Ecclesiastes:

"One generation passeth away and another generation cometh, but the Earth abideth forever."

## TELEVISION COVERAGE OF CONGRESS: AN ADDRESS

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, in light of current discussion of television coverage of Congress, I am sure Members of Congress will read with interest the remarks of Dr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, at the annual Public Service Award dinner of the Advertising Council in New York City on December 15, 1969. Dr. Stanton, who received the Advertising Council's Annual Public Service Award that evening, makes a strong plea for the case that television broadcasting of the processes of government can add significantly to the quality of public understanding of important issues.

The remarks follow:

### INDEPENDENCE OF BROADCAST PRESS

I am deeply honored by this tribute tonight. I would like to linger over those generous words of Tex Cook, but I hestitate to indulge in any "instant analysis." However, I will try—on advice from high quarters—to respond "in a very dignified and courageous way."

I would like to think that this award is inspired less by anything that I have done, than by the contribution that broadcasting has made to a more concerned and a more informed society. And, since we meet tonight under the auspices of The Advertising Council, let me note that whatever success we have achieved in this is owed in considerable measure to advertising. For—as the free press, printed and electronic, has provided advertising with an attentive forum—advertising has furnished many of the economics sinews that have made that effort possible and has, in fact, made the free press in our time a viable reality. And in this connection let me add a footnote appropriate to this occasion: During broadcasting's short eventful life, advertisers have come to respect the independence of the broadcast press far more than have the leaders of our government.

It is of more than passing significance that we are gathered here on what by coincidence is Bill of Rights Day—the 178th anniversary of the adoption of the first ten amendments to the Constitution of the United States. If, in the familiar words of the British prime minister, William Gladstone, the American Constitution itself was "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man," the Bill of Rights was, as Jefferson insisted, "what the people are entitled to against every government on earth, general or particular, and what no just government should refuse or rest on inference." And the first article of the first amendment of the ten constituting the Bill of Rights provided that—

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

None of the principles, so simply and explicitly set forth in this very first Constitutional enactment of our Republic, long escaped attack, not in theory, but in practice. For vital as they have been and vital as they still are, they are far easier to pay lip service to than they are to live by. And, like liberty itself, they have been preserved, from the time that they were adopted, only at the price of eternal vigilance.

Yet, compared to the swiftness and the complexity of life today, the conditions under which the Bill of Rights was enacted in 1791 were paradoxically far most hospitable to its preservation than they are today. A slender strip of land stretched along the Atlantic seaboard, largely consisting of agricultural communities totaling scarcely eight million souls, the early nation had little communications beyond word of mouth, the land press and the stagecoach, and no power except that of muscles, falling water and the winds. Whole areas of life—health, education, transportation, economics, science, housing, utilities, urban living, commerce and environmental control—fundamental as they have since become, were never touched upon by the Federal government; and a man could live his entire life without being affected as an individual by any action of that government. Indeed, only on the local level did he have much to say in the affairs of government: The choice of the national leadership was delegated to electors free to choose anyone they saw fit, and the choice of United States senators was delegated to the state legislators free to make whatever bargains they thought politically prudent.

But thanks to the foresight of the political architects of two centuries ago, the citizens of the early Republic did have the guarantee of, among other minimum essentials of free political action, a free press—which is to say the right to know, the right to ask questions, the right to criticize, and the right to dissent. The importance of these rights was underscored only last week when the Vatican weekly, *L'Osservatore,* editorially praised the United States for facing honestly the My Lai episode in Vietnam, stating that the case demonstrated "the vitality of a democracy which does not close the mouth of those who publicly accuse and does not prevent—as unhappily happens often elsewhere—anyone from telling the whole truth, even a horrible and disgusting one. . . ."

### DISTURBING DOUBTS

Yet during the past month, we have had disturbing doubts cast from high places here at home on the rights to which the Vatican paper attached such great value. Whatever the merits of the specific issues involved, we witnessed contrived government attacks on both the degree and the extent of freedom of the press. Subsequently, assurances that the purpose of these attacks was merely to stimulate discussion of media performance, and thence self-improvement, ring hollow when their sources and pattern, not to mention their language, are considered and when the right to report the facts, or to express an opinion, is challenged only when they go against the grain of Administration policy. But the danger lies not solely—or even primarily—in the angry official castigations, or in the overt warnings of government intervention, or in the subtle threats of reprisal. It does not lie even in the implication that, at a time when this nation is more powerful than it has ever been in its history, it turns its back on the memorable words of Justice Holmes: . . . if there is any principle of the Constitution that more imperatively calls for attachment than any other, it is the principle of free thought—not free thought for those for those who agree with us but freedom for the thought that we hate."

The real danger is not theoretical but coldly practical: It is the pointed reminder that Big Brother—the government—is keeping its eye on you and if you don't do what it says is best, you'll be in trouble.

This is a direct inversion of the proposition inherent in the First Amendment: that the government is the servant of the people and not their master. And it would render impotent the instrument that the authors of the Bill of Rights saw as the major safeguard against that bleak inversion becoming a reality—the right of the people to keep their eyes on the government. Nor did the Bill of Rights draftsmen see this right to know as merely an indulgence. For a free society, they saw it as an organic need. We cannot keep that vital right alive by abridging it whenever the going gets rough or by not making the most of it when things are going well. As the problems and opportunities facing us get more complex, as society necessarily becomes more institutional and less personal, as we grow bigger both in numbers and in the social and economic dimensions of our activities, the only way we can keep the right to know alive is by expanding it—making sure that our citizens know more about our government and its action, not less.

It is one of the great godsends in our history that we have the means to bring this about just when we need it most—and to bring it about not in the distant future but tomorrow morning. No technical innovation, no vast investments are required—only the will to do it.

### ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS

My proposal is simply to use electronic communications to give the American people greater access to significant proceedings of the Congress and of the Supreme Court—that is, to allow television and radio to cover all proceedings of the House, the Senate and the Supreme Court to which the public and the press are admitted. We have been doing this for years with regard to the United Nations. We have been doing it with regard to party conventions. We have been doing it with regard to inaugurations and ceremonial joint sessions of the House and Senate. There is no reason why we cannot do it with regard to critical sessions of the highest legislative and judicial bodies in the land—bodies whose actions and determinations influence our lives, our pocketbooks, our present and our future.

An enlightened people—a people impelled by their heritage, their interests and their compulsions to govern themselves—need to know not only the decisions arrived at on their behalf but how they are arrived at and on what grounds. The course of the longest and the most expensive war in our history was determined in great measure by the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution of August 1964. The outcome of the discussions of that resolution in the United States Congress was to bear dramatically and materially on the life of every American, directly or indirectly. The same issues, though with varying standards of reference and from varying points of departure, were discussed in the United Nations General Assembly. Television and radio made it possible for the American people to witness the United Nations debate live and later in delayed broadcasts or on regular and special news broadcasts. But they were prohibited by archaic strictures, from witnessing the discussion in their own Congress.

Such deprivations with regard to Congressional proceedings are the rule, with the sole

exception of the Senate, where the individual committees permit the broadcasting of public hearings. In spite of the fact that broadcasts of Senate committee hearings have resulted in deep public interest, similar broadcasts are flatly prohibited in the case of committees of the House, and from the floors of both houses. We are encouraged that a remedy may be within reach, however, by the provisions in a bill (H.R. 11475) now before a subcommittee of the House Rules Committee. If passed by the House, this bill would permit radio and television coverage not only of committee hearings but of the House proceedings themselves. But the camera and microphone remain off limits in the case of the Supreme Court, despite the fact that its proceedings, like those of Congress, are open to anyone who happens to be in Washington and who can go to its chambers. For all practical purposes, the present test of a citizen's ability to see his government in action on matters of the utmost urgency to him is whether or not he has the time and money to go to Washington, often stand in line for a seat and then hope that there is room for him. Actually, through cameras and microphones, there is room for every American in those limited seats now available only to the privileged or accidental few.

Ever since the birth of the idea of self-government, the direct involvement of all citizens in their government has been the highest objective of democratic life. The Greeks sought it and for one of the most splendid, if brief, hours in human history realized it. And it was not for nothing that the New England town meeting used the largest meetinghouse available so as to accommodate the most people and would even spill out on the lawn if necessary; nor that the Constitution itself required, when the only communications medium was printing, the Congress to "keep a Journal of its Proceedings, and from time to time publish the same. . . ."

There was a time when there was no alternative to limiting access to high legislative and judicial proceedings to the handful of subscribers to the *Congressional Record* and visitors who could get to Washington. Today, it is indefensible. I think that I have heard most of the excuses that have been offered—and not one of them seems to me to hold water.

TELEVISION—FACT OF LIFE

Television is a fact of life in our times, but it does not create new rules of human behavior—it only reflects the old ones. To limit its role in communications on the grounds that it would in any important way alter the standards under which our elected or appointed officials conduct themselves is a wholly untenable proposition. Even if it did, the medium is available to them outside the legislative chambers; and in any case, the burden of responsibility must rest—not with the instruments that transmit legislative or judicial events—but with the participants who make those events. To do anything else would be not to report what is happening but to distort it—to decide in advance that some people and some occurrences cannot stand public scrutiny. I do not believe that this course accords either with the theory of an open society or the practice of good government. Moreover, the broadcasting of sessions of the Congress—and the same would hold with the Supreme Court—would obviously be selective, just as they have been in the case of the United Nations. Routine sessions of the Congress would not be broadcast, but the broadcasting of critical sessions, leading to major commitments on the part of the American people, would enlighten them on the causes and the rationale behind such commitments. And we must remember that Congressional powers are sweeping. Appropriations of money by the Congress are the ultimate determinants of national priorities. Foreign policy is strengthened or frustrated in the Senate, through its power to advise and consent. The effect on the judiciary, through confirmation alone, is direct and immediate. The Congress's powers of overseeing other government agencies are virtually without limits. Because of its ability to delegate rule making, to allocate funds, to approve appointments and to conduct investigations, it can reach into every governmental agency and office. But despite the great range of its powers, most major decisions that the Congress makes in these many fields are epitomized in a few significant actions rather than in the day-to-day sessions.

In the Supreme Court, too, there are obviously a great number of arguments and decisions that are directed to very specialized problems that would have no clear or pervasive importance to the great majority of the people. But those decisions that do concern all of us are apt to concern us very deeply—civil rights, for example, and applications of the criminal code—and we ought to have access to the great arguments of protagonists and opponents which inspire such decisions. "We are under a Constitution," said Charles Evans Hughes, "but the Constitution is what the judges say it is. . . ." Certainly, the judicial process would be strengthened if instead of dismissing opinions as judicial caprice, the people sensed, through witnessing its more crucial proceedings, the inescapable burden of finality that is placed upon the Supreme Court and the gravity with which it arrives at its judgments. Since the Court deals with specific cases and not in abstractions, the people could see for themselves that the process by which its opinions are arrived at are not casual, nor reached in a vacuum of lofty legalisms, but as resolutions of actual conflicts between human beings and human institutions that have their roots in the practical affairs of a few and their effects in the practical affairs of the many.

I have felt more at home tonight in this gathering than I could in any other, putting forth the proposition that all government is the concern of the many and not just of a few, because all of you are profesionally attuned to the many. No one has done more than advertising as a calling to extend the material benefits of a better, a richer and a more equitable life to the many. We have now at our command the capacity to bring the many more directly into the processes of government than has ever before been possible, because we can make them on-the-spot witnesses of consequential government actions. And to witness is to begin to increase understanding. And understanding leads to more effective and greater participation.

UNDERSTANDING FREEDOM

In an age of constant crisis and of burgeoning government activity, that understanding is not a luxury but a necessity. In his classic, *Congressional Government*, Woodrow Wilson introduced his essay on the House of Representatives with these words of warning: "No more vital truth was ever uttered than that freedom and free institutions cannot long be maintained by any people who do not understand the nature of their own government."

Today, we have the technical instruments to make possible the deepening and the broadening of that understanding. Let us use those instruments.

---

## INVESTIGATION OF POSSIBLE IMPEACHMENT OF JUSTICE DOUGLAS

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion in the House of late about possible impeachment of Justice Douglas. In that connection, my basic contention is that whether or not individual Members of the House believe at this point in proceeding with impeachment of Justice Douglas, information presented on the House floor to date certainly indicates the need for an investigation of the matter.

An extremely well-written column by Roscoe and Geoffrey Drummond, published on April 22, cites the evidence which has been put forward as of this time and concludes—properly, I believe—that "a fair and full-scale House investigation" of Justice Douglas is very much in order.

The writers assert that the case for impeachment has not yet been proved but they also declare that the House should move ahead with an investigation of Justice Douglas on the basis of the evidence I have assembled. I do not see how any House member can validly argue with that conclusion.

The Drummond column follows:

SHOULD JUSTICE DOUGLAS BE IMPEACHED?

(By Roscoe and Geoffrey Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—There is enough prima facie evidence not only to justify but to require a fair and full-scale House investigation of whether impeachment proceedings should be undertaken against Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas.

Republican leader Gerald Ford of Michigan has presented a disturbing and objectively persuasive case that further inquiry is needed.

We say in all candor that, when we first read that a resolution for an impeachment investigation was to be introduced, our instinct was on the side of dismissing it as coming primarily from pique and politics, as without much substance and as primarily related to the very liberal opinions Douglas has rendered as a member of the Supreme Court.

The case for impeachment is still not proved. But the case for thorough investigation by a House committee with subpoena power is proved to be valid by the evidence which Rep. Ford has assembled.

Our tendency was to doubt that the evidence would be so indicative. We suspect that many may have felt similarly, and we believe that no member of the House should vote either for or against the proposed impeachment investigation until he has examined the full text of the 21-page presentation Ford made to the House. Only a minority of the membership was present to hear it.

The instant reaction of many liberal Democrats is to try to discount, discredit and dismiss the case for a committee inquiry on the ground that it is directed against Justice Douglas because he is an outspoken civil libertarian and a judicial activist.

Rep. Emanuel Celler (D–N.Y.), chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, sees it as an attempt to punish Douglas "for his liberal views."

This is not true. Whatever may be the political motivation, the case of the 105 Republicans and Democrats who co-sponsored the resolution for a committee investigation as to whether impeachment should proceed does not rest on Justice Douglas' judicial opinion and only peripherally on the way he has used his position on the Supreme Court to berate the government.

Liberals will be doing themselves and the country great harm if they keep on reacting *automatically* against getting at the facts,

not on Mr. Douglas' opinions, but on his conduct; not on his views but on his behavior. We don't know that his conduct and his behavior will justify impeachment, but the evidence is sufficient to conclude that his conduct and behavior justify investigation in a forum where he can be called to testify under oath.

Was it proper and ethical for Justice Douglas to fail to disqualify himself in two appeals of Ralph Ginzburg, an editor and publisher, when Douglas was connected with the defendant as a paid writer?

Was it proper and ethical for Justice Douglas to serve for nearly a decade—while he was on the court—an organization (the Parvin Foundation) which had ties to gamblers and the underworld?

Could Justice Douglas believe that this gamblers' foundation was really out to improve the culture of Latin America instead of seeking a cover to enable those who financed it to get around where gambling concessions were up for grabs?

Was it proper and ethical for Justice Douglas, while on the court, to give legal advice to the Parvin Foundation on its troubles with the Internal Revenue Service?

Is it a proper suit or a grave abuse of his position on the Supreme Court for Justice Douglas to write articles (which are exploited because he is a justice), appealing primarily to the violence-prone and coming as near as possible to condoning violence while describing the American government as today's equivalent of the oppressive King George III?

Is this the way a justice of the Supreme Court should behave?

We believe that these and other disturbing questions demand investigation.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BROTZMAN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business, Board of Visitors, U.S. Air Force Academy.

Mr. RHODES (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business, Board of Visitors, U.S. Air Force Academy.

Mr. REIFEL (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. FUQUA), for Thursday, April 23, 1970, on account of official business.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for Thursday and Friday, on account of official business.

Mr. HAGAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Mississippi (at the request of Mr. COLMER), for today, on account of illness in family.

Mr. GETTYS (at the request of Mr. MCMILLAN), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HALL, for 15 minutes, today.

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDONALD of Michigan, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. SAYLOR, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHERLE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCKNEALLY, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. BYRNE, of Pennsylvania, for 35 minutes, today.

Mr. JOHNSON. of California, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. RARICK, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MIKVA, for 60 minutes, April 29.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. PERKINS and to include extraneous material.

Mr. BENNETT in two instances, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. HALL and to include extraneous matter in two instances.

Mr. COHELAN in two instances.

Mr. MONAGAN to revise and extend his remarks prior to the vote on the Karth amendment.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD, to extend his remarks with reference to the President's Message concerning the volunteer army immediately following the message of the President.

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

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. CÓRDOVA.

Mr. BROTZMAN.

Mr. ROTH in five instances.

Mr. HALPERN in two instances.

Mr. LUKENS.

Mr. WEICKER in two instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. KEITH.

Mr. DEVINE.

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mr. DUNCAN in three instances.

Mr. ARENDS.

Mr. HORTON in two instances.

Mr. MATHIAS.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN in three instances.

Mr. SKUBITZ in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in three instances.

Mr. WYATT.

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mr. BOW in two instances.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. MINSHALL in two instances.

Mr. DELLENBACK in four instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. HOGAN.

Mr. WIGGINS.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. PRICE of Texas.

Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. CARTER.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in three instances.

Mr. BOB WILSON in three instances.

Mr. MCEWEN.

Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. POLLOCK.

Mr. GOLDWATER.

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

Mrs. CHISHOLM.

Mr. BOGGS.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts.

Mr. FRASER in three instances.

Mr. OTTINGER in two instances.

Mr. MONTGOMERY in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in eight instances.

Mr. ROYBAL in six instances.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. DAWSON.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. PODELL.

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. MONAGAN in two instances.

Mr. ASHLEY.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

Mr. MOORHEAD in four instances.

Mr. GARMATZ in two instances.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

Mr. LEGGETT.

Mr. BIAGGI in 10 instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California.

Mr. ABBITT.

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS in two instances.

Mr. GILBERT in two instances.

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia in two instances.

Mr. PATTEN in two instances.

Mr. WOLFF in two instances.

Mr. CULVER.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. FALLON.

Mr. PHILBIN in four instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in three instances.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. O'HARA in two instances.

Mr. TIERNAN.

Mr. KASTENMEIER in two instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina in two instances.

Mr. KOCH.

## SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 533. An act for the relief of Barbara Rogerson Marmor;

S. 1177. An act to authorize the documentation of the vessel *West Wind* as a vessel of the United States with coastwise privileges;

S. 1775. An act for the relief of Cora S. Villaruel;

S. 1963. An act for the relief of Wu Hip; and

S. 1968. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit the removal of the Francis Ashbury statue, and for other purposes.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 27, 1970, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1963. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations and other provisions for the fiscal year 1970 in indefinite amounts in budget authority for authorized civilian and military pay increases (H. Doc. No. 322); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1964. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the complete report on funds obligated in the chemical warfare and biological research programs for the first half of fiscal year 1970, pursuant to section 409, Public Law 91–121; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1965. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 37, United States Code, to further the reduction of draft calls in the Armed Forces of the United States by increasing the pay rates of certain enlisted members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1966. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend titles 10 and 32, United States Code, to revise the promotion system for certain officers of the Reserve components of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1967. A letter from the Director of Selective Service, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1968. A letter from the Department of the Army, Director of Civil Defense, transmitting the quarterly report of Federal contributions program—Equipment and facilities, for the period ending March 31, 1970, pursuant to subsection 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1969. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Housing), transmitting notification of the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve subsequent to June 30, 1970, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1970. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Program and Policy, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting copies of Presidential Determination 70–3 in sealed envelopes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1971. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on further improvement needed in the management of magnetic tapes by Goddard Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1972. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts for the protection of public lands from fires, in advance of appropriations therefor, and to twice renew such contracts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1973. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Council for Science and Technology, transmitting the report entitled "National Atmospheric Sciences Program"; to the Committee on Inerstate and Foreign Commerce.

1974. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Commission as of March 31, 1970, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1975. A letter from the President of the Panama Canal Company, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for reimbursement of the Treasury by the Panama Canal Company for the annuity paid to the Republic of Panama; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1976. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a prospectus containing proposed amendments to certain authorized public building projects, pursuant to section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959; to the Committee on Public Works.

1977. A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1811 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Veterans' Administration to make direct loans to any veteran who is determined to be eligible for assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing under chapter 21 of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule III, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3328. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to approve an agreement entered into by the Soboba Band of Mission Indians releasing a claim against the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California and Eastern Municipal Water District, California, and to provide for construction of a water distribution system and a water supply for the Soboba Indian Reservation; with amendments (Rep. No. 91–1017). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of Union.

Mr. KASTENMEIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6951. A bill to enact the interstate agreement on detainers into law; (without amendment (Rep. No. 91–1018). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KASTENMEIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10019. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Marihuana; with amendments (Rep. No. 91–1019). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 14253. A bill to authorize the transfer of the Brown unit of the Fort Belknap Indian irrigation project on the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, Mont., to the landowners within the unit; without amendments (Rep No. 91–1020). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 546. Joint Resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the establishment of Yellowstone National Park, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rep. No. 91–1021). Referred to the Committee of the whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 17147. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 17148. A bill to exclude from gross income the first $750 of interest received on deposits in thrift institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 17149. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLISON of Missouri:

H.R. 17150. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 17151. A bill to establish the Arches National Park in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 17152. A bill to establish the Capitol Reef National Park and the Capitol Reef National Recreation Area in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 17153. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 17154. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for better control of interstate traffic in explosives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 17155. A bill to amend section 120 of title 23, United States Code, to increase to 75 per cent the Federal share of projects on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 17156. A bill to preserve and promote the resources of the Connecticut River Valley, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 17157. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER (for herself, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. MINK, Mrs. MAY, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. MOSS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mr FRIEDEL, and Mrs. CHISHOLM):

H.R. 17158. A bill to safeguard the consumer by prohibiting the unsolicited distribution of credit cards and limiting the liability of consumers for the unauthorized use of credit cards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 17159. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 17160. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the status of motor vehicles under section 4041; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 17161. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to provide for individual citizens suits and class actions in the U.S. district courts against persons responsible for creating certain environmental hazards; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 17162. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 17163. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code to make the killing, assaulting, or intimidating of any officer or employee of the Federal Communications Commission performing investigative, inspection, or law enforcement functions a Federal criminal offense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17164. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to require pay differentials for nurses in Veterans' Administration hospitals who perform evening, night, weekend, holiday, or overtime duty and to authorize payment for standby or on-call time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MELCHER:

H.R. 17165. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MELCHER (for himself and Mr. Olsen):

H.R. 17166. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of Commodity Credit loans to farmers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 17167. A bill to amend the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act to require a packaged perishable food to bear a label specifying the date after which it is not to be sold for consumption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas:

H.R. 17168. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 17169. A bill to amend the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act to require a packaged perishable food to bear a label specifying the date after which it is not to be sold for consumption as food; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 17170. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 17171. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 17172. A bill to amend chapter 83, title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the reduction in the annuities of employees or Members who elected reduced annuities in order to provide a survivor annuity if predeceased by the person named as survivor and permit a retired employee or Member to designate a new spouse as survivor if predeceased by the person named as survivor at the time of retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 17173. A bill to provide increased annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 17174. A bill to provide for the development of a uniform system of quality grades for consumer food products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 17175. A bill to provide for the development of a uniform system of quality grades for consumer food products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 17176. A bill to require that certain short-shelf-life durable products be prominently labeled as to the date beyond which performance life becomes diminished; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 17177. A bill to require that certain drugs and pharmaceuticals be prominently labeled as to the date beyond which potency or efficacy becomes diminished; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 17178. A bill to require that certain processed or packaged consumer products be labeled with certain information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 17179. A bill to require that durable consumer products be labeled as to durability and performance life; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 17180. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase the rates and income limitations relating to payment of pension and parents' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (for himself and Mr. AYRES) (by request):

H.R. 17181. A bill to remove time limitations on the duration of eligibility of veterans for guaranteed and direct loans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL of Maryland, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FALLON, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. LEGGETT, and Mr. MCDADE):

H.R. 17182. A bill to encourage States to establish abandoned-automobile removal programs and to provide for tax incentives for automobile scrap processing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT (for himself, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. POWELL, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. WINN, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 17183. A bill to encourage States to establish abandoned-automobile removal programs and to provide for tax incentives for automobile scrap processing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEICKER:

H.R. 17184. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 17185. A Bill to protect a person's right of privacy by providing for the designation of obscene or offensive mail matter by the sender and for the return of such matter at the expense of the sender; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 17186. A bill to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions to make permanent certain provisions thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 17187. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear and for other purposes; to the Committe on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 17188. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts for the protection of public lands from fires, in advance of appropriations therefor, and twice renew such contracts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROCK (for himself and Mr. BURTON of Utah):

H.R. 17189. A bill to amend the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 17190. A bill to establish means for developing comprehensive national, regional, and State land use planning policies and to provide financial assistance to States for the purpose of supporting and implementing such policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 17191. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 17192. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 17193. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN (for himself, Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. LEGGETT):

H.R. 17194. A bill designating the Luther Burbank Shasta Daisy" as the national flower of the United States, to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 17195. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey:

H.R. 17196. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWNING (for himself, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. POFF, Mr. MARSH, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WAMPLER, and Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia):

H.R. 17197. A bill to remove the present $1 million limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Navy from settling and paying the claim of the Chesapeake Bay Bridge and Tunnel District arising out of the collision of the U.S.S. *Yancey* with bridge-tunnel span; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERLENBORN (for himself and Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN):

H.R. 17198. A bill to amend title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a Student Loan Marketing Association; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MINISH, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PODELL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 17199. A bill to amend the National Emission Standards Act to provide for the elimination of automotive air pollution; to

the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN (for himself, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. TUNNEY, and Mr. VAN DEERLIN):

H.R. 17200. A bill to amend the National Emission Standards Act to provide for the elimination of automotive air pollution; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MINISH, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PODELL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 17201. A bill to impose an excise tax on automobiles based on their horsepower and emission of pollutants, for the purpose of financing programs for research in, and Federal procurement of, low-emission vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN (for himself, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. TUNNEY, and Mr. VAN DEERLIN):

H.R. 17202. A bill to impose an excise tax on automobiles based on their horsepower and emission of pollutants, for the purpose of financing programs for research in, and Federal procurement of, low-emission vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MINISH, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PODELL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 17203. A bill to permit the Governor of a State to elect to use funds from the State's Federal-aid highway system apportionment for purposes of paying additional costs incurred by such State in purchasing low-emission vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN (for himself, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. TUNNEY, and Mr. VAN DEERLIN):

H.R. 17204. A bill to permit the Governor of a State to elect to use funds from the State's Federal-aid highway system apportionment for purposes of paying additional costs incurred by such State in purchasing low-emission vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 17205. A bill to establish a National Bank for Cooperative Housing to aid in financing the purchase and construction of low- and middle-income cooperative housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN (for himself, Mr. MOSS, Mr. EILBERG, and Mr. MCDADE):

H.R. 17206. A bill to amend the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act to require a packaged perishable food to bear a label specifying the date after which it is not to be sold for consumption as food; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 17207. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to provide that aid or assistance thereunder shall not be reduced as a result of increases in old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 17208. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to prevent the loss of veterans' benefit amounts as a result of statutory increases in social security benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 17209. A bill to assist in combating crime by reducing the incidence of recidivism, providing improved Federal, State, and local correctional facilities and services, strengthening administration of Federal corrections, strengthening control over probationers, parolees, and persons found not guilty by reason of insanity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 17210. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in diseases of the digestive tract, including the liver and pancreas, and diseases of nutrition, and aid the States in the development of community programs for the control of these diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 17211. A bill to amend the law establishing the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 and the National Sea Grant College and Program Act of 1966 to provide for a program of comprehensive research in marine medicine and pharmacology; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 17212. A bill to reduce the salaries of Senators and Representatives to $30,000, to provide for cost-of-living adjustments thereafter in those salaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 17213. A bill to designate certain lands in the Lava Beds National Monument in California as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 17214. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MCCULLOCH (for himself, Mr. TAFT, Mr. HARSHA, and Mr. MILLER of Ohio):

H.R. 17215. A bill to amend the Act requiring evidence of certain financial responsibility and establishing minimum standards for certain passenger vessels in order to exempt certain vessels operating on inland rivers; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 17216. A bill to authorize the Secretaries of Interior and the Smithsonian Institution to expend certain sums, in cooperation with the territory of Guam, the territory of American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, other U.S. territories in the Pacific Ocean, and the State of Hawaii, for the conservation of their protective and productive coral reefs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 17217. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 17218. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 17219. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for an investment tax credit for small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 17220. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide salary step advancement for employees moving from prevailing rate pay systems to the classification and general schedule pay system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. FALLON, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MCFALL, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. NIX, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REES, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey):

H.R. 17221. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act so as to extend its duration, provide for inspection and enforcement procedures, establish national emission control standards, authorize classification of air-contaminant sources, designate penalties for violations of this act, authorize regulation of fuels and fuel additives, provide for improved controls over motor vehicle emissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H.R. 17222. A bill to require Federal contractors, and persons contracting for federally supported activities, to observe practices which will preserve and enhance the environment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 17223. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MINISH, Mr. ROE, and Mr. SANDMAN) (by request):

H.R. 17224. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to permit the mailing of lottery tickets and related matter, the broadcasting or televising of lottery information, and the transportation and advertising of lottery tickets in interstate commerce, but only where the lottery is conducted by a State agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 17225. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Grand River Band of Ottawa Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 40–K, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 17226. A bill to safeguard the consumer by prohibiting the unsolicited distribution of credit cards and limiting the liability of consumers for the unauthorized use of credit cards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ZION:

H.R. 17227. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.J. Res. 1184. Joint resolution to authorize the establishment of a Joint Committee on Peace; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.J. Res. 1185. Joint resolution designating the third Wednesday of April of each year as "Earth Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.J. Res. 1186. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim July 12, 1970 as "National Prayer Salute to Our Fighting Men in Vietnam Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.J. Res. 1187. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the week of May 17, 1970, through May 23, 1970, as "D for Decency Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.J. Res. 1188. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.J. Res. 1189. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Environment and Technology; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.J. Res. 1190. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIEL of Virginia (for himself, Mr. WAGGONNER, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. SATTERFIELD, and Mr. DOWNING):

H. Con. Res. 583. Concurrent resolution to designate May 1, 1970 as a day for an appeal for international justice for all American prisoners of war and servicemen missing in action in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. Con. Res. 584. Concurrent resolution relative to printing as a House document a history of the Committee on Agriculture; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 585. Concurrent resolution authorizing certain printing for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H. Con. Res. 586. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding further steps of the President concerning Cambodia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. ROE, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. YATES, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. MINISH, Mr. WHITE, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. KARTH, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. MOSS, Mr. CAFFERY, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. STRATTON, and Mr. DULSKI):

H. Res. 946. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H. Res. 947. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the President implement the majority report of the Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Control; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER:

H. Res. 948. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17123) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1971 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROTH (for himself, Mr. ADAIR, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HAYS, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. CARTER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. MIKVA, and Mr. MCDADE):

H. Res. 949. Resolution expressing the support of the House of Representatives with respect to the strategic arms limitation talks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 17228. A bill for the relief of Meyer Weinger and Fay Weinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 17229. A bill for the relief of Louis M. Lamothe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 17230. A bill for the relief of Antonio Stallone, Francesca Stallone, Paulo Stallone, and Antonina Stallone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H.R. 17231. A bill for the relief of Dr. Earl S. Bernard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 950. A bill commending Joel Ziegler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

457. By the SPEAKER. Petition of Andress Banabana, Br. Tubtobon, Sibulan, Negros Oriental, Philippines, and others, relative to payments to Filipino workers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

458. Also, petition of the Inter-Tribal Council of the Five Civilized Tribes, Poteau, Oklahoma; relative to retaining laws providing services for the Indian people by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

459. Also, petition of the mayor and the president of the council of the City of Linden, N.J.; relative to supporting antipollution programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

460. Also, petition of Andrew W. Schroeffel, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## POSTHUMOUS AWARD OF MEDAL OF HONOR TO PFC. RALPH H. JOHNSON, CHARLESTON, S.C.

### HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Pfc. Ralph H. Johnson, U.S. Marine Corps, Charleston, S.C., was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously for the supreme sacrifice to save the life of a Marine comrade and to prevent the success of an enemy attack on his unit.

On behalf of the President of the United States and in the name of the Congress, the Honorable SPIRO T. AGNEW, the Vice President, presented our Nation's highest award for bravery to Mrs. Rebecca Johnson, Ralph's mother, at a White House ceremony on Monday, April 20, 1970.

Mr. President, Pfc. Ralph Johnson's heroic action above and beyond the call of duty deserves the salute of a grateful nation. This gallant Negro gave his life for his country. Ralph unhesitatingly hurled his body on an enemy grenade to protect the lives of his comrades. He was instantly killed, but his selfless devotion deep in hostile territory prevented the enemy from penetrating the sector of his patrol.

Mr. President, the citation for Private First Class Johnson states, in part:

Realizing the inherent danger to his two comrades, he shouted a warning and unhesitatingly hurled himself upon the explosive device. When the grenade exploded, Private Johnson absorbed the tremendous impact of the blast and was killed instantly. His prompt and heroic act saved the life of one Marine at the cost of his own and undoubtedly prevented the enemy from penetrating his sector of the patrol's perimeter.

Ralph was a native of Charleston. His mother and five brothers and four sisters reside in the Charleston area. One sister lives in Washington, D.C. Ralph reflected the courage, the bravery, and the American spirit of many Negroes from South Carolina and other States who are serving in our Armed Forces. I am confident I expressed the feelings of all patriotic South Carolinians when I extended my deepest gratitude and sincere sympathy to Mrs. Johnson.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the citation and Private First Class Johnson's biography be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

MEDAL OF HONOR

The President of the United States in the name of the Congress takes pride in presenting the Medal of Honor posthumously to Pfc. Ralph H. Johnson, U.S. Marine Corps, for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty while serving as a Reconnaissance Scout with Company A, First Reconnaissance Battalion, First Marine Division in action against the North Vietnamese Army and Viet Cong Forces in the Republic of Vietnam. In the early morning hours of 5 March 1968, during Operation ROCK, Private First Class Johnson was a member of a fifteen-man reconnaissance patrol manning an observation post on Hill 146 overlooking the Quan Duc Duc Valley deep in enemy controlled territory. They were attacked by a platoon-size hostile force employing automatic weapons, satchel charges and hand grenades. Suddenly, a hand grenade landed in the three-man fighting hole occupied by Private Johnson and two fellow marines. Realizing the inherent danger to his two comrades, he shouted

a warning and unhesitatingly hurled himself upon the explosive device. When the grenade exploded, Private Johnson absorbed the tremendous impact of the blast and was killed instantly. His prompt and heroic act saved the life of one marine at the cost of his own and undoubtedly prevented the enemy from penetrating his sector of the patrol's perimeter. Private Johnson's courage, inspiring valor and selfless devotion to duty were in keeping with the highest traditions of the Marine Corps and the United States Naval Service. He gallantly gave his life for his country."

PFC. RALPH H. JOHNSON, USMC, DECEASED

Ralph H. Johnson was born January 11, 1949, in Charleston, South Carolina. He attended Sinemonton Elementary School, 1956–1958, and Courtnay Elementary School, 1958–1966, in Charleston.

He enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve at Oakland, California, March 23, 1967, and was discharged to enlist in the Regular Marine Corps, July 2, 1967.

Upon completion of recruit training with the 1st Recruit Training Battalion, Recruit Training Regiment, Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California, in September 1967, he was transferred to the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California. He underwent Individual Combat Training with Company "Y", 3d Battalion, 2d Infantry Training Regiment, and Basic Infantry Training with the Basic Infantry Training Company, 2d Infantry Training Regiment, completing the latter in November 1967. He was promoted to Private First Class, November 1, 1967.

In January 1968, he arrived in the Republic of Vietnam, and served as Reconnaissance Scout with Company "A", 1st Reconnaissance Battalion, 1st Marine Division (Rein), FMF. On March 5, 1968, while on Operation ROCK deep in enemy held territory near the Quan Duc Duc Valley, he was killed in action.

A complete list of his medals and decorations include: the Purple Heart, the National Defense Service Medal, the Vietnam Service Medal with two bronze stars, the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry with Palm, the Vietnamese Military Merit Medal, and the Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal.

Private First Class Johnson is survived by his mother, Mrs. Rebecca Johnson of 1 Sheppard Street, Charleston; his father, Mr. Willie Allen; five brothers, Mr. Luther Johnson, Mr. Howard Johnson, Mr. Robert Johnson, Master Kenneth Johnson, all of Charleston; and five sisters, Mrs. Helen L. Richards, Mrs. Annabelle Edwards, Miss Sandra Mae Johnson, Miss Frances Johnson, Miss Mildred Johnson, Miss Chole Johnson, all of Charleston, and Miss Sarah Johnson of Washington, D.C.

## VERNAL, UTAH, WOMAN NAMED MOTHER OF THE YEAR

### HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Alta Cutler Rust, county public health nurse in Vernal, recently was named Utah Mother of the Year for 1970. Her philosophy of "play together, pray together, and stay together," and emphasis on family life helped her rear five fine sons following the death of their father in 1951. Mrs. Rust will be in New York from May 4 to 8 for events honoring all State mothers and to compete for the title of "American Mother of the Year." The following story about her appeared in the Deseret News of April 18, 1970:

MEET MOTHER OF THE YEAR

(By Maxine Martz)

The whole town of Vernal has been rejoicing with Mrs. Alta Cutler Rust, their county public health nurse, since she was named Utah Mother of the Year for 1970.

"This is not a very big town," said Mrs. Rust, a widow and mother of five sons. "They are all overjoyed about it."

Today tribute was paid by the entire state to Mrs. Rust and all other mothers nominated this year in an award ceremony at 2 p.m. in the Assembly Hall on Temple Square.

Special honors also went to the two alternate mothers, Mrs. Lucretia Miles Evans of Salt Lake City and Mrs. Donna Ash Brock of Pleasant Grove.

"I am thrilled and very honored about this, but it's a little frightening to me," Mrs. Rust said, "I just hope that I can represent all the Utah mothers in the way they would want me to."

Mrs. Rust said her sons were "practically flabbergasted" when they learned of her selection. All but Richard, a professor of English at the University of North Carolina, were present for the award ceremony today.

Joseph C., an attorney, presented his mother with the official mother's pin. Harold L., who is a math teacher at Bellevue College in Nebraska, flew in from Omaha. Also present were David W., a teacher in the Uintah School District, and Marvin T., who will graduate from Brigham Young University this year.

"Richard will meet me in New York when I go there to the American Mothers selection," Mrs. Rust said. She will leave May 2, accompanied by two sisters and a sister-in-law. The events honoring all state mothers will run May 4 to 8, and will climax with announcement of the American Mother of the Year.

Utah has had two American Mothers, Mrs. Lavina C. Fugal in 1955 and Mrs. Harvey Fletcher in 1965, both now deceased. Tribute was paid to them in today's ceremony.

Mrs. Rust, a widow since her husband, Richard Dexter Rust, died in 1951, supported her family by working as a nurse, but still found many hours to devote to church work.

She served a two-year stake mission and four of her sons fulfilled missions for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

"I believe in that old philosophy, 'play together, pray together and stay together,' " she said. "We have always had a lot of family activity together and have been very close."

As a public health nurse, Mrs. Rust has contact with many young people in the schools and she still has confidence in youth.

"I think youth of today are just as good as ever," she said. "The majority of the kids still are the best people in the world. There are so few that are agitating these things."

Mrs. Calvin L. Rampton, wife of Utah's governor, introduced Mrs. Rust and the two alternate mothers at this afternoon's ceremony. Dr. Avard Fairbanks presented the Motherhood statuette, and Dr. Rex Campbell read capsule histories of all the nominated mothers.

The new Utah mother will be further honored at an open house and buffet from 5 to 7:30 p.m. this evening at the home of a sister, Mrs. Richard S. Pond, 3065 S. 18th East.

## THE HOSTILE DEMONSTRATIONS AGAINST U.S. AMBASSADOR TO SWEDEN

### HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the April 25 edition of the Journal and Guide of Norfolk, Va., includes an excellent editorial on the recent hostile demonstrations against Dr. Jerome H. Holland, the U.S. Ambassador to Sweden.

The demonstrations against Dr. Holland, which included offensive racial epithets, were disgraceful. Dr. Holland is a distinguished educator, former president of Hampton Institute, in Virginia, and one of very few Negroes appointed to ambassadorial posts.

I support the position taken by the Journal and Guide in its editorial. The editor-publisher of the Journal and Guide is Mr. John Q. Jordan.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Journal and Guide, Apr. 25, 1970]

HOLLAND IN SWEDEN

Dr. Jerome H. Holland, America's new ambassador to Sweden, was heckled with shouts of "Nigger, go home!" last week by anti-American demonstrators as he made his way through the streets of Stockholm to present his credentials to King Gustaf VI. The new envoy let it be known that he deeply resented the term.

It was not surprising that there would be anti-American sentiment found in Sweden. That seems to be the fashion these days in practically all foreign countries. But the demonstrating Swedes took it a step further by making their insults racial and personal.

Dr. Holland, who took the State Department post following his resignation as president of Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va., said he was not disturbed by demonstrations as such. "They are part of the political life in a free, democratic nation," he observed.

"However, I am just a little bit concerned when I hear such remarks as 'nigger,' both at the airport and today when I was driving to the palace. They shouted 'Nigger, nigger, go home!' " he said.

"That was a personal attack on me and I resent it. I haven't heard that for many years and then only in the most racist areas of the United States," he said.

U.S. Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr., of Virginia, who was chief sponsor of the nomination of Dr. Holland, was outraged when he heard of the racial epithets hurled at the ambassador.

"It is well known that Sweden opposes the policy of the United States in Vietnam, and that it has provided sanctuary for a number of deserters from the armed forces of the United States," Sen. Byrd said. "This, however, is no excuse for demonstrations against an able and dedicated man—particularly demonstrations in which he is insulted because of his race."

Knowing Dr. Holland as we Virginians do, the insults in Sweden will simply emphasize to him the depth and scope of his mission: to restore cordial relations between the United States and Sweden. And it is interesting to reflect that nobody ever called Dr. Holland a "nigger" in Virginia.

## METRO IMPACT—SAN FRANCISCO

### HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by Mr. B. R. Stokes, general manager of the Bay Area Rapid Transit

District at the Metro impact meeting of April 16, in Washington.

Mr. Stokes has been an inspiration to his colleagues and coworkers in BART, and I am sure that a report of BART's activities is of great importance to all who are interested in solving the rapid transit problem that confronts us.

The address follows:

METRO IMPACT—SAN FRANCISCO

When the significant events contributing to the development of the San Francisco Bay Area are catalogued, the list invariably includes the opening of the transcontinental railroad and the opening of the Panama Canal—both being transportation improvements of transcendent historical importance.

To that list must now be added the advent of BART—Bay Area Rapid Transit. In its profound impact on the economic, sociological and public improvement aspects of life in the Bay Area, BART may well make a mark more pronounced than those of by-gone eras.

So, for my purposes tonight, I'd like to discuss each of these areas of impact-economic, sociological and public improvement. In so doing, I may be broadening the base of the remarks of my two predecessors, Bill Patterson of Toronto and Mike Robbins of London, in this distinguished series. But I can assure you I will take nothing from Bror Hillbom, who will close your series next month. There is much all of us can learn from the magnificent example of Stockholm and its positive use of public transportation as a key tool in metropolitan policy making.

For you to understand the tremendous impact BART is having on its service area, you must first know a bit about the Bay Area and BART.

The San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District covers three counties bordering San Francisco Bay—Alameda and Contra Costa on the east side and San Francisco on the west. This area, renowned the world over for its natural beauty, covers about 1500 square miles and has a population, growing constantly, of about 2½ million people.

BART had its beginnings back in 1946, just after World War II, when concerned civic leaders and local government officials began to articulate their worries over mounting automobile congestion in the constricted transportation corridors.

A formal study commission was established by the State Legislature in 1951. Reconstituted in 1953, this study commission undertook pioneering transportation studies which included as a necessary prelude to mass transit recommendations the preparation of the first regional master plan for the entire nine-county Bay Area.

Completing its work in 1957, the commission recommended creation of a modern high-speed rail transit network which would tie together the two core cities of San Francisco and Oakland and which would link this twin-city core to the burgeoning suburban areas by a transportation system designed to encourage orderly growth outward from established centers and to deter haphazard sprawl.

Eventually, the commission recommended initial transit network of 75 miles should be expanded to a total of 385 miles covering all nine counties around the Bay.

It is that initial system which the Bay Area Rapid Transit District is transforming into concrete and steel today.

On November 6, 1962, voters of the three counties approved by a 61.2 per cent majority a $792 million general obligation bond proposal to finance construction of the 75-mile rail network with 34 regional stations.

Despite law suits which were costly in both time and money, despite delays caused by our efforts to neogtiate literally hundreds of necessary contracts and agreements with cities and other public agencies, despite inflation problems which skyrocketed costs, despite disputes over design aspects—despite all of the problems inherent in laying down the first entirely new rapid transit system in this country in half a century—our system today is about 70 per cent complete.

The first prototype cars will begin tests on our completed tracks this fall, and the first revenue service will begin a year later. By mid-1972 we expect to have the full 75 mile system in revenue operation.

By any measurement, BART will be the most modern rapid transit system in the world. Our transit vehicles, now being produced by the Rohr Corporation, will whisk passengers along our routes at top speeds of 80 miles an hour and will maintain average schedule speeds, including stops at all stations, of 45 to 50 miles an hour—about twice as fast as any system in the world today.

Every movement of trains on this system will be controlled automatically from our computer control center.

Passengers will travel to our stations by feeder bus or will park their cars in our spacious parking lots at all suburban stations. They'll enter the system through stations designed to complement the communities in which they are located by 14 firms of architects. Variety is the key note.

Once in the station, our patrons will utilize an automatic fare collection system which combines the best features of the taxi meter and the credit card. They'll travel on trains that were designed with the passenger in mind—air conditioning, carpeted floors, big view windows, a special lighting system and seats that are four inches wider than any transit seat in the country.

We've designed this system to do one thing—compete with the private automobile—and we're convinced it will do just that in terms of speed, comfort, convenience and economy.

By 1975, BART expects to be carrying 200,000 passengers per day, trimming commute times by as much as one-half to two-thirds, and reducing peak hour commute congestion through major inter-city corridors by as much as 40 to 60 per cent.

But even long before we get the opportunity to prove that we can rival the auto, BART is having an astonishing impact on economic development throughout its service area.

We consider the six subway stations in our district's core cities of Oakland, San Francisco and Berkeley to be the prime activity centers of our entire network. Already, more than $850 million in new office and retail construction is either complete or steadily rising within walking distance of BART turnstiles. This is more than the original $792 million bond issue passed in 1962.

In San Francisco, only three buildings of any significance had been built since World War II, with the Crown Zellerbach building the only one of any consequence to be built on Market Street in 40 years.

Since the BART bond vote in 1962, more than 500 floors of new office space have risen in the city, prompted in part by a floor space bonus provided developers by the city if the particular building provides direct access to a BART station. Right now seven new hotels have either been started or planned with a total of 2,669 rooms, and, commencing this year, at least another five hotels with an additional 2,600 rooms will be proposed.

The San Francisco Redevelopment Agency's ambitious Yerba Buena Center south of Market Street will be ready for occupancy in 1974, with 370,000 square feet of exhibit space on one level and another 50,000 square feet of conference rooms on another. Other highlights of the center will be a 14,000-seat sports arena and a 2,200-seat theater. A mezzanine extension from BART's Powell Street subway station will provide direct access to Yerba Buena.

At the foot of Market, excavation already is underway for a fourth subway station, one not even contemplated in the 1962 rapid transit plan. Supported by tax increment bonds levied on property owners expected to benefit from the facility, the station could well become the busiest in the BART network with its proximity to the Rockefeller-funded Embarcadero Center, already under construction.

No one disputes that the turmoil from rapid transit construction along Market Street has had a temporary dampening effect upon certain businesses, but when San Francisco's main business artery is transformed under a separate $24 million bond issue voted by the city's voters in 1967, it will take its place as one of the world's grand boulevards.

Charles W. Doe, writing in the January, 1970, issue of *Skyscraper Management*, reports: "the phenomenal growth of new office space in San Francisco bids to continue for at least the next three years, according to plans recently announced by various companies and investors." Such plans call for at least nine new major office buildings that will add some 5 million square feet of floor space to the San Francisco total. In commenting on the very low vacancy rate in all of the city's office buildings, Doe states that three of the nine buildings to be completed by the end of 1972 will be company owned and occupied with no space available for tenants. Doe reports: "We expect occupancy to continue at a high level and that the vacancy factor, now approximately 8 per cent, will be reduced to something less than 5 per cent."

To look at it another way, during the eight-year period of 1955 to 1962, investment in new office buildings in San Francisco averaged about $10,300,000 annually. From 1963 through 1969 that average rate of investments had climbed to $56,800,000 per year.

Using another yardstick, San Francisco averaged about 29 per cent of total new office construction investment in the nine counties of the Bay Area from 1955 to 1962. Since BART's successful bond issue and extending through 1969, the city's share of new office construction outlays has averaged 52 per cent of the regional total.

Conversely, new housing in San Francisco is a third of normal demand, and according to a recent report by Advance Mortgage Corporation, the market "could not have been much, if any, tighter, in World War II." In pointing out that in both New York and San Francisco few new apartments seem to be planned and with any relief apparently years away, the report continues: "The basic problem is probably transportation. The near-in land is almost completely built up and transportation over long distances is unreliable or frustrating. The San Francisco situation should get partial relief when the BART system, scheduled for 1972, is completed."

We consider this aspect of BART particularly important. Even in today's tight money market, funds for new housing are relatively more available in Southern California than in the Bay Area.

It could well be that one of BART's most significant consequences, by providing greatly improved accessibility to new residential areas, would be to make investment in housing more attractive in the Bay Area and thereby increase this area's housing supply.

Across the bay in Oakland, with its burgeoning service and related activity center now linked to the financial center of San Francisco by means of a nine-minute Trans-Bay Tube trip, BART-related developmental activity is progressing on an impressive scale.

We consider our 12th Street Broadway station to be the crossroads of the entire rail network. And Dillingham Corporation, rec-

ognizing the BART hub's potential, has proposed a $165 million city center project covering 15 square blocks adjacent to the station. On March 24, Oakland's redevelopment agency, which has been working with Dillingham, received word of an $8 million grant in federal "seed" money for the project.

Oakland expects the center to revitalize commercial and retail trade in its downtown area, with a shopping mall and four major department stores, as well as over 1 million square feet of office space in two 20-story and one 30-story buildings. The center is expected to provide 130,000 new jobs with a total payroll of $95 million. Oakland's mayor, John Reading, has confirmed the city's plan for a three-story, six-block garage below the project, making it the largest parking structure in the world.

In another part of Oakland, and oriented toward BART's Lake Merritt subway station and automatic train control center, the Del Monte Corporation plans a high-rise and commercial complex on 325 acres of land, complete with a 320-room hotel, 6300 apartments and 60 acres of commercial office and retail space. In that same area, the new $21 million Laney College campus has been reoriented to take advantage of the Lake Merritt Station, and just a half-block away is the magnificent $8 million Oakland Museum and a considerable collection of Alameda County and federal and state government buildings.

Further to the south, the BART station at the Oakland Coliseum lies near a rapidly-expanding industrial park. Perhaps more important, six governmental agencies, including BART, now are engaged in a federally-supported study for an extension of rapid transit from the Coliseum station to the sports and recreation complex and then on to a proposed 500,000-square-foot visitors and convention center and then on to the Oakland International Airport.

The university city of Berkeley has been particularly aggressive in early recognition of BART's impact and shaping its planning program to take maximum advantage of rapid transit.

Now that BART construction forces have moved on, Berkeley's main artery, Shattuck Avenue, has been restored as a gracefully-landscaped thoroughfare, whose highlight will be a relocated park surrounding the main entrance to the central Berkeley rapid transit station.

On opposing corners at the station's main entrance, a 15-story savings and loan building and a 14-story Bank of America building are rising, the first new buildings of that size to be built in Berkeley in 40 years.

Further, the City of Berkeley has purchased air rights over two other stations for $1 million.

The foregoing are prime examples of the developmental explosion that has occurred around BART's urban stations. However, I feel that I would be remiss if I did not point out some specific examples of suburban investment activity as our lines push into outlying areas and the start of revenue service draws ever closer.

I would like to mention such activity in the city of Walnut Creek, a walnut processing center in its sleepier days and today a typical suburban bedroom community of some 26,000.

The following developmental saga extends from July of 1969 through January 9, 1970, and involves what at first was termed a tower building to be built at the corner of North California Boulevard and Pringle Avenue, two streets that form boundaries of the BART station parking lot in Walnut Creek.

This 2.9-acre site changed hands four times in this six-month period, with the first sale at $3.50 per square foot; the second at $3.96 per square foot; the third at $4.75, and the fourth and current buyer, Dillingham Corporation, paying $5.32 per square foot for the property.

So in the space of six months the value of the site increased from $450,000 to $672,000. Today Dillingham plans a 16- to 18-story office building with the ground floor devoted to a savings and loan company whose services will be tailored to serving the BART rider. Timed to open when the station does, the building will double overnight the amount of office space in Walnut Creek.

Also in Walnut Creek a major apartment development of 800 units is going up within walking distance of the BART station, and a local bank is completing a nine-story office center nearby.

In Concord, an agricultural town of 15,000 in 1950 and now near the 90,000 mark in population, resale value of land immediately adjacent to the BART station is rising more than twice as fast as comparable land parcels located only one-half mile from the station.

Apartment land near the station today costs some $70,000 an acre. It has doubled in value in four years.

Systech Financial Corporation is building hundreds of apartment units in the Concord area, and its real estate people state that one $24 million development was influenced by the placement of the BART station. And in that same station area, two 10-story office structures and one 12-story building will start rising this year.

At the terminus of BART's Southern Alameda line is the city of Fremont, where a central business complex near the BART station includes a college site, core area of retail and commercial enterprises, an impressive new civic center now being occupied, and an already-complete large department store. Land in the area is now valued at $65,000 to $250,000 per acre, when no more than five years ago the same property was valued at $22,000 per acre.

When we speak of the timing of such development near the BART stations, a variety of factors must be considered. In some instances, such as in the city of El Cerrito, the community revamped its master plan well in advance of BART construction, expanding commercial activity around our El Cerrito Plaza station, oriented toward an existing regional shopping center, and calling for high-rise residential development around our El Cerrito Del Norte station. Such foresight recently paid off with the location of a 16-story office and commercial structure at the Plaza station.

In other instances, it is only now that some communities are girding themselves for the advent of BART, and rather belatedly are preparing for the galvanic impact of rapid transit. However, this, too, must be tempered by the fact that we are still 16 months away from revenue service. So it can be said that the bulk of new development triggered by BART has come about during the system's planning stages and during its heavy construction years.

Despite the tremendous developmental boom that has accompanied BART's emergence, it may well be true that BART's major impact will not occur until BART trains start to run.

Development depends upon land accessibility and a mobile population, and that is what BART is all about.

We will produce substantial travel time savings for transit users. And these travel times savings will induce the second major consequence of BART—a shift in urban travel demand from today's near-total reliance on the automobile to the relatively greater use of mass transit.

And it is the degree of this shift that will largely govern the magnitude of other BART impacts. BART can increase the local tax base by higher density residential development around its stations, which, in turn, will have a positive effect upon retail sales. But we'll need another five to ten years to determine just how sizeable these impacts will be.

Right now, BART is pumping nearly $1 million each week into the local economy through construction payrolls, and has expended over $850 million in construction and procurement contracts. That's immediate impact.

BART's joint usage of rights-of-way with the California State Division of Highways has resulted in millions of dollars in construction cost savings as well as redesign and upgrading of certain freeway facilities. That's immediate impact.

We have been used as a once-in-a-lifetime planning tool—in many instances, the only one—by many communities who have taken advantages of us to revitalize or knit together downtown cores that had no particular focus before we came along. As an example of true advance planning, the farming community of Brentwood in eastern Contra Costa County, a community of 5500, has placed location of a BART station on its master plan.

BART, unlike Montreal, Stockholm and some other transit systems, is empowered to build and operate a rapid transit system only in the narrowest sense of the word; we are forbidden from reaching out beyond our required right-of-way to develop property or demand its proper use. We can only suggest to affected communities, offer examples of what has occurred in other cities, and live up to our pledge to build as handsome, fast and comfortable a system as is possible. We have bent over backwards to encourage maximum use of the properties along our lines, and as a vivid example I can point to the nearly 30 private entrance agreements we have entered into with businesses bordering our subway stations where the store involved pays only for the private entrance, and is not obliged to pay BART for the privilege.

BART will provide the balance to Bay Area transportation, and at the same time will provide a developmental catalyst unmatched in the history of the West. At the same time, BART will make the totally delightful San Francisco Bay Region an even more delightful place in which to live and work.

But enough of BART's developmental impact, even thought this has only begun to scratch the surface. Let me turn now to two other areas of profound impact in the Bay Area—BART impact on our sociological fabric and public development.

Initial BART planning, tailored in part by the region's topography, located 16 rapid transit stations in neighborhoods formally classed as "target" poverty areas by local Economic Opportunity Councils. Some of them contain ghetto neighborhoods.

BART stations in or near newly developing employment centers of Southern Alameda County are within 15 to 30 minutes of the BART station in West Oakland. The Spanish-speaking communities of Southern Alameda County and San Francisco's Mission District are within minutes of both suburban and downtown employment centers.

North Oakland residents are only 21 rapid transit minutes away from bustling Concord, where industrial parks, shopping centers and service activities abound.

Residents of low-rent housing units, regardless of race, have a particular need for inexpensive transport to regional job and job-training centers. Such units lie right across the street from BART's West Oakland station, and two similar San Francisco projects are within walking distance of BART's Mission Street stations. That city's famed and crammed Chinatown is a short walk from our Montgomery Station.

Again in San Francisco, Hunters Point and Bayview dwellers, cut off from the mainstream of white, middle-class life by a major freeway and extensive industrial development, will be some 12 minutes by feeder bus from a BART station.

Black residential and commercial areas of

Richmond and East Oakland are within short blocks of BART stations.

"Reverse commute" is a common phrase in the transit industry's lexicon today. Given the proper feeder bus pattern to rapid transit stations, an intensive education program to alert the disadvantaged on how to use and where to find our stations, then the potential mobility of ghetto residents can be realized. BART is not a two-directional, "white-collar only" rail network whose pendulum pumps the office-worker into the granite canyons by day and back to Harper Valley at night. It can be much more, a multi-directional people-mover that can aid in fully realizing man's ambition to be truly a man: gainfully employed, living where he wants to live and working where he wants to work.

There is more—much more—to the sociological impact of our system. Let me touch on just three additional categories.

With the regional, high-speed service of BART tied to existing and future bus operations, the forgotten elderly with fixed incomes—excluded from driving privileges and isolated by an automobile culture—can become mobile once again.

And BART will mean that young people who before were dependent on the automobile—and all its attendant expense—to get to classes, now can avail themselves of a means of reaching a seat of learning at minimal costs.

BART stations are within minutes of nearly a dozen institutions of higher learning in the three counties, institutions which today have a combined student population of some 60,000.

Finally, in the area of sociological impact, BART will be the first rapid transit system in the world to offer service to all classes of the physically handicapped, including those who are non-ambulatory and confined to wheel chairs. At an additional cost of $10 million, elevators for the handicapped are now being added to every station.

I promised that I would address myself to just one more BART-related element that has materially changed the face of the Bay Area already and bodes well for a more concise expression in later rapid transit development, and here I am referring to public development coincidental to BART construction.

Three examples spring to mind: San Francisco's Market Street; Oakland's Broadway and Berkeley's Shattuck Avenue. All are each city's "Great White Way," and crucial to their economic lifeblood. And each city has taken advantage of BART's admittedly disruptive construction period to come up with face-lifting plans for thoroughfares growing slightly tacky through complacency and flight to suburbia.

Market Street, with its $24 million refurbishment, will offer city dwellers and visitors a handsome esplanade replete with BART-oriented plazas, 36-foot wide sidewalks, lavish tree plantings and a corridor of greenery running from the waterfront to Valencia Street. It could not have happened without the impetus of BART.

The same thing is happening in Oakland. Admittedly on a more modest scale than the grand San Francisco plan, Oakland will turn a stretch of Broadway from West Grand Avenue to Seventh Street into a tree-studded, pedestrian-oriented thoroughfare.

In Berkeley, Shattuck Avenue before BART was a scene of purposeful confusion, with center-street parking and poor pedestrian access to adjacent stores. This has all changed now, with Shattuck turned into a handsome boulevard complete with rest areas, parking bays, landscaping and lighting fixtures that complement the street's "new look."

These three examples point the way to similar joint operations by public agencies in other communities, as is being carried out by the city of Albany on a street bordering our handsome linear park through that community. BART is disruptive, and we have merchants' affidavits to back that up, but if we work together, the end result will be well worth the candle.

In summing up, let me say that we at BART have learned considerably from our experiences in the areas of economic boom, sociological impact and public development as our system grows. And we expect that other cities just now embarking upon rapid transit systems can learn from our experience. And as you educate yourselves, I think it is necessary to keep three things firmly in mind:

First, a rapid transit network can be an effective developmental tool, but it must be used. Affected cities, through master planning, zoning and land use changes, should determine early in the game what they want their cities to become.

Secondly, the rapid transit agency must launch and sustain a far-reaching educational program aimed at private and public decision-makers to make them aware of just how much the system can change the face of their particular region, if they will use it properly. This impact conference is certainly a major step in the right direction.

Lastly, a system such as BART's can be a strong catalyst in sociological change. It is up to the people who plan, build, ride and pay for such systems to see that this catalytic energy is harnessed for the maximum benefit to all.



## PUBLIC PRAYER

## HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I have long supported action to permit nondenominational prayer in buildings supported in whole or part through the expenditure of public funds, first by cosponsoring the late Senator Everett Dirkson's amendment and now by cosponsoring Senator SCOTT's resolution. I am glad to see my senior colleague from Pennsylvania offering his fine leadership abilities to this important issue. I feel the Scott constitutional amendment is a strong proposal, and deserves serious consideration by the Judiciary Committee and the full Senate.

The Reverend Robert G. Howes, national coordinator of Citizens for Public Prayer, 3004 Adams Street NE., Washington, D.C. 20018, has provided me with a document entitled "Prayer in Public Schools: Some Key Questions and Answers."

The views of Citizens for Public Prayer, one of the leaders in this area, should be of interest to all Senators. I ask unanimous consent that the document be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SOME KEY QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. Some, who do not support a Peoples' Amendment for Public Prayer, say we can still *teach about religion* in our public schools. Is this true?

The issue here is not teaching about but religion itself! Religion is so very much more than dates, Madonnas, which Pope ruled when, and who reformed what. Religion is so very much more than a citation from St. Paul sandwiched in between Confucius and Einstein in a morning exercise. Religion is essentially affective. Religion is the upreach of the spirit to God and the out-reach of the spirit activated by God toward our brothers. In short, *religion stripped of affection and spirit is not religion at all.* Teaching about religion may, however, be useful. Clearly, when we have once and for all eradicated the tragic precedent of the two seriously wrong prayer-ban decisions handed down by the Supreme Court in 1962 and 1963, we shall have to do a lot of thinking about the role of God and morality in our schools, but not vice versa. To accept substitutions which are, in most cases, wholly inadequate to the need, and abandon the thrust at the basis of the Court's illogic is like band-aiding a cancer. Besides, the closer any of the proposed substitutes comes to satisfying the need the more likely it is that it will be attacked by the same intolerant few who contrived the prayer-ban decisions. Only a carefully and prayerfully worded prayer amendment designed to restore the First Amendment to its original and common sense meaning can suffice.

2. What about *minority rights and tolerance* if the will of the nation prevails and free prayer is restored in our public schools?

Tolerance is a two way street. So long as his rights to silence and/or abstention are recognized, the dissenting child (and his parents) can do one of two things. He can deny others their rights to pray freely by loudly demanding his selfish privileges, or he can refrain from participating, recognizing in the process that others think differently than he does but that he is respected in his own difference. This, far from being a tyranny, is a splendid preparation for citizenship in a republic, a pluralistic society, in which very often delicate decisions have to be made in which there are majorities and minorities. The dissenter must always be free in his conscience. No pressure must be put on him to conform. But to suggest that this entitles him to deny the great majority the right to do what they feel in their conscience they should do is a travesty of democracy. A responsible pluralism in this, as in similar matters, is the very basis of our way of life together. Those who call for tolerance while intolerantly attacking the rights of their neighbors do so with obviously false credentials!

3. What connection is there between *the prayer-ban decisions and national sanity?*

We cannot, nor do we, contend that all the tragic occurrences in these United States since 1962 can be traced back to the Court's denial of the civil right of free public prayer in our schools. But the evidence of moral crisis and decay in the form of anarchy, arrogance of individuals and groups, oversexism, dope-ism is all around us. We do suggest that never in our history as a people together since Washington prayed in the snows of Valley Forge has it been more necessary than it is today that we become again a *Nation on Our Knees.* Never has it been more necessary than it is today that we reexamine our national conscience and reaffirm the common reverences of our past. Never has it been more necessary that our children in that place where they begin to learn the arts and sciences of American community know the great Fatherhood which arches over and inspires our brotherhood. Clearly, the issue of free school prayer is *a cluster issue.* Clearly, a re-affirmation of the civil rights of free school prayer could go far to calling us back to our senses and reinspiriting the democracy.

4. Summing up, what is really at stake in the fight to write a carefully worded *Peoples' Amendment for Public Prayer* into the Constitution, restoring the First Amendment to its traditional and common sense meaning?

First, and foremost, return of the civil right of free prayer to the public classroom. This great and good practice, instituted in the majority of our school districts and conducted for many decades with a minimum

of mistake and a maximum of good judgment, is obviously significant.

Second, denial once and for all of *a process of creeping secularism*. The precedents set in motion by the two prayer-ban decisions, will continue to wipe out one by one all other practices of public reverence among us—unless they are radically and totally repealed. Examples: attack on the Christmas prayer of the astronauts (1968), on the Pageant of Peace at the White House (1969), and indiscriminate proposals that "religion" be taxed. The prayer-ban decisions, as Mrs. Madalyn Murray O'Hair knows and shows so clearly, are not isolated or singular. They are the start not the end of the road. However the majority of the Court shielded the reality of what it did in nice phrases, the fact is evident. If non-denominational and voluntary prayer in public schools violates the First Amendment, no other practice of public reverence among us is safe! All future decisions under the First Amendment are now tainted at the source.

Third, re-affirmation of the democratic process. Nearly eight years after the first prayer-band decision, not one single normal floor vote in either House or Senate has been taken on hundreds of prayer amendment bills and despite continuing evidence that a massive majority of Americans wish the civil right of free public prayer restored. If the will of some 75% of the Nation cannot penetrate through to the floor of the Congress, something is wrong!

Fourth, a critical beginning in the drive to make America again a Nation on Our Knees. As the prayer amendment is debated in fifty states, the entire question of God among us will open again. Seldom, as detailed in No. 3 above, has this been more necessary.

## VICTOR O. JONES

### HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I note the death yesterday of Victor O. Jones, who was one of the most respected figures in New England journalism. He retired in 1965 as executive editor of the Boston Globe. His career, which was marked by many distinguished achievements, was spent on the staff of the Boston Globe.

Retirement is not an accurate word to apply to the conclusion of Vic Jones' career. He continued after that to write an incisive and well-read column for the Globe entitled "Notes From the Back of an Envelope."

Both the column and the man, who poured a lifetime of rich experience into the words he wrote, will be missed in years to come.

As a Harvard undergraduate, Victor O. Jones was hired by the Globe in 1926 as its college correspondent. He joined the staff on a full-time basis in 1929 as a sports writer. To capsule his career thereafter, he was successively sports editor, a Neiman Fellow, and outstanding correspondent in World War II, night editor, managing editor and, finally, executive editor of the Globe. He was an innovating editor who developed specialized teams of writers to report the many new facets of a changing world.

He was honored as a war correspondent with the European Campaign Ribbon which commended his work "under difficult and hazardous conditions." He traveled with U.S. forces across Europe. He was widely acclaimed for his stories about slave labor camps and Nazi youth recruited in the war's last stages. However, the Globe points out that he preferred to write about individuals, usually New Englanders, in the war.

He was a tireless and diligent editor whose characteristic command to his staff was "Get crackin'!" I think it appropriate that his associates have the last word about Victor Jones and I think the editorial, which I am inserting in the RECORD, is a beautiful expression of their feelings.

I believe that Victor Jones was a great newsman. I want to extend my sympathy to his wife, Elizabeth, and family. I share the thoughts expressed in the Globe's final tribute, which follows:

GOODNIGHT FROM THE DESK

It is not enough to describe Victor O. Jones, the former executive editor of The Globe who died on Tuesday, as a fine newspaperman, for he was that and a great deal more. In the true sense of a word much abused, he had class.

He stood for the values which endure. His wit was legendary. His courage was unsurpassed, whether at the front in World War II, or in times of great stress when the news broke fast, or when it was put to its sternest test by illness in recent years. His sense of fairness was a boon to all on The Globe, and his great loyalty an example for everyone.

There came a moment, early each morning in the old days, when all had been done that could be done for the morning paper, and Vic Jones would phone the make-up, stereo and press rooms. One can still hear his voice, a little high-pitched and cheerful despite the fatigue, and sounding somewhat like a chirp as he gave them his "Goodnight from the desk." We repeat it now in the same spirit, and may flights of angels sing him to his rest.

## CHAIRMAN WILBUR MILLS INTRODUCES TEXTILE BILL

### HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Chairman WILBUR MILLS provided hope for textile workers in America when he introduced H.R. 16920 on April 13. Since that date, he has been joined by 96 colleagues in the House. Chairman MILLS has announced that the Ways and Means Committee will hold hearings on this timely legislation early in May. Mr. MILLS, by his forthright and timely action, has encouraged the entire textile industry and its 2,400,000 employees in America. This has been particularly true in our area of the country where the textile industry is threatened by low-wage foreign imports and is our major industry, major taxpayer, and employer of our people.

The following editorial appeared April 20 with reference to Mr. MILLS' action in the Columbia State, one of the South's oldest, largest, and most respected daily newspapers published in our capital city of Columbia, S.C.:

WILBUR MILLS TAKES STAND IN SUPPORT OF TEXTILES

Regulating foreign trade can be as hazardous as juggling double-edged swords, but from time to time the risk must be run.

Rep. Wilbur D. Mills, the Arkansas Democrat who heads the House Ways and Means Committee, now has ventured on stage with a trade bill which seeks to protect American textile and shoe industries from ruinous foreign competition. His bill may or may not turn the tide, but it is a logical outgrowth of the breakdown in trade negotiations.

Our biggest trading partner, Japan, has simply refused to consider voluntary quotas on woolens and man-made fibers. About a third of the United States' enormous ($1.5 billion) trade deficit with Japan results from the traffic in textiles. The Japanese have been rather arrogant in their rebuffs to Nixon administration negotiators.

On the same day that Mills, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, introduced his bill, the Labor Department's Southeastern office in Atlanta announced that textile industry employment in the Southeast declined 5,900 in January and February of this year, for a total of 14,500 in a 13-month period.

The Southeast, of course, is the heart of America's textile territory and the major concentration is in the Carolinas. During the same 13-month period, the nation's textile workers were reduced by 33,000. The related apparel industry lost another 17,000.

These industries are important to America for many reasons, not the least of which is that they provide thousands of jobs where they are needed most—in the rural areas and in the urban cores. Since many of the tasks require relatively unsophisticated skills, the industry offers an important staircase out of poverty for many people.

Democratic Sen. Ernest F. Hollings has provided other figures that tend to link this job loss with low-priced imports. In one year (January, 1969, to January, 1970) man-made fabric imports jumped from 85 million square yards to 188 million square yards. For all textiles, the increase was from 163 million square yards.

The Mills bill would roll back imports to the 1967–68 average, although it would permit negotiated quotas above that. In addition, it would make it easier for industries to show injury from imports and obtain relief.

Rep. W. J. Bryan Dorn of South Carolina and other House leaders of the long textile fight hastened to cosponsor the measure. Mills' prestige gives it a better change of success than past efforts.

In the past, Mills has given an unfriendly reception to textile quota amendments coming over from the Senate, where three were sponsored by Senator Hollings. The senator says that the White House has opposed his amendments and that Mills has killed them.

Now, Mills has come forth with his own version of remedial legislation. It goes somewhat beyond the President's proposals of late 1969, but Mr. Nixon would be unwise to oppose this new bill openly at this time. What America needs is a united front in this area to convince the Japanese and other big importers that voluntary quotas are really their best bet.

Passage of the Mills bill (or something like it) would not necessarily mean that statutory quotas would be invoked in all instances. But it would be a samurai sword hanging over the head of the Japanese industrialists reminding them not to seek more than a fair share of the vast American market.

## IT IS TIME TO "GET DOWN TO EARTH" AFTER EARTH DAY

### HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, April 22, was Earth

Day. I wish to stress that activities of yesterday which stimulated improved understanding and awareness of the environmental problems we face have my wholehearted support.

Today, however, I want to take this occasion to welcome back to the House of Representatives those of my Democratic colleagues who yesterday fanned out across the Nation proclaiming their commitment to congressional action to stop pollution. Rhetoric has its role to play in the battle against pollution, but what we will be judged by is our deeds.

To date, the deeds of this session of Congress have been meager indeed, in spite of the fact that President Nixon on February 10—over 2 months ago—presented to the Congress a comprehensive legislative program to deal with environmental problems.

One committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, has recognized the urgency of the situation we face. This committee has held hearings on the President's air pollution bill, which was reported from subcommittee yesterday, and solid waste legislation. But this committee has jurisdiction over only two of the seven bills in the President's program.

The four water pollution bills and the parks and recreation lands bill lie dormant in the committees to which they were referred. In 2 months, these committees have not seen fit to schedule these bills for hearings.

There should be no mistaking where the responsibility for congressional inaction rests. It rests with the Democratic Party in the House which controls each committee and its agenda, as well as the schedule of the House.

I, therefore, call upon my Democratic colleagues to "get down to earth" after Earth Day and allow the House to work its will on the President's excellent and comprehensive environmental program. There is a great deal of unfinished legislative work to be done.

The lack of action in the House on the President's environment program in spite of Democratic rhetoric is an ill-fated sign. I fear that the powers controlling the Democratic Party in the House are content to let this priority legislation die without ever having been brought to the floor for a vote.

## FOR ELECTORAL COLLEGE

### HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I have read with great interest the remarks of Dr. M. Donald Coleman which appeared on the New York Times editorial page on April 22, 1970. As one who has studied the effects that direct election would have on this country and concluded strong opposition to direct election, I found Dr. Coleman's views most interesting. As the debate in Congress continues on this most serious legislation, I would like to bring Dr. Coleman's statement against abolishing the electoral college to the attention of my colleagues. The following is his letter to the editor:

FOR ELECTORAL COLLEGE

To the EDITOR:

The proposed constitutional amendment abolishing the Electoral College is being debated in the Senate Judiciary Committee. Very few people appear to understand this measure and the drastic effects it will have on our democratic processes.

Most of the 82 per cent of the people who wish some sort of electoral reform appear to think of this measure as both fair and progressive. A broader understanding of American political institutions will show it is neither.

Currently, the added weight the electoral system gives to the large states with their swing vote is the only way we have of counterbalancing the inequities of the Congressional seniority system. Those politically homogeneous states that return the same man year after year are getting vastly more power from their Congressional vote than we do in the more populous "swing" states.

In terms of practical power, one Senator from Mississippi has often been the equal of both from New York. Only the increased importance of the large state's voter in the Presidential election every four years can begin to counterbalance the lack of power he suffers in Congressional elections due to the workings of the seniority system.

POWER OF VOTE

We have had far too many examples of rural or Southern committee chairmen blocking legislation badly needed by urban millions without even letting the representatives of the people vote upon these measures.

The concept of one man's vote having the same power as another's will only be valid if we retain the substance of our Electoral College system. To change the electoral system without changing the seniority system in Congress would be a perversion of the doctrine we are attempting to use as a guiding principle.

In practice it would surrender power to those forces that have never had much enthusiasm for democratic processes and have constantly sought methods of subverting it for their regional interests. We will be entering an era when the needs of the huge urban centers are critical to our survival as a nation, while damaging the political machinery that induces Federal responsiveness to those needs.

At that point, those who say that the entire government machinery is unresponsive to the legitimate needs of the people, and so must be entirely destroyed, will have found themselves a valid argument.

Seen in this light, the so-called "inequities" of the Electoral College system must be seen as a countervailing force to the inequities of the Congressional seniority system. To alter that delicate balance will make our Government less responsive to the most urgent needs of our time and in the foreseeable future, and create the conditions for the destruction of our great democracy.

There are other remedies available to prevent the "faithless" elector on the election being thrown into the House of Representatives without doing such damage to the sensitive balance of powers that now exists.

M. DONALD COLEMAN, M.D.

NEW YORK, *April 19, 1970.*

## PROMPT CONSIDERATION OF POSTAL REORGANIZATION

### HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask for prompt consideration of the postal reorganization plan submitted to the Congress recently by President Nixon. Clearly the wildcat postal walkouts that occurred in March have shown the urgency required in solving the ills that exist in our postal service.

In the midst of this postal crisis, Postmaster General Blount and the leaders of the postal unions worked round the clock to hammer out the agreement ending the first postal strike in the history of the Nation.

Postal workers were promised a pay increase of 6 percent. They were also promised a framework within which postal workers in all parts of the country can bargain collectively with postal management over pay and working conditions.

In his message to the Congress on April 16, President Nixon said:

I support the proposed legislation that has been agreed to in the negotiations between the Post Office Department and the postal unions.

If this agreement is to become a reality, Mr. Speaker, we must give it prompt consideration. Let us act before another crisis comes to the postal service.

## REV. JIM ARGUE DELIVERS FUNERAL SERVICE FOR MAJ. GEN. JAMES E. RUDDER

### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of the sermon delivered at the funeral of Maj. Gen. James E. Rudder by Rev. Jim Argue of the Pulaski Heights United Methodist Church:

FUNERAL SERVICE FOR GEN. JAMES EARL RUDDER

We have come together here this afternoon for three important reasons. First, we have assembled because we wish to honor the man of James Earl Rudder who passed from this life Monday at the age of 59 years. Second, we are here because we wish to express in some visible and tangible way the love and concern we feel for the bereaved family. Finally, we have come together as Christians to worship Almighty God from whom our spirits come in the beginning and unto whom they return at the end.

Since this is a service of worship, it is appropriate that my remarks be ground in a text. For that purpose I have chosen I Corinthians 15:26—"the last enemy to be destroyed is death."

It is significant that we have assembled here during the Easter Season, for the great message of Easter is that death, for the Christian, is no longer an enemy to be feared. The man in Christ has already been received with his Lord. The resurrection of Jesus Christ is the ground for their assurance.

Now this a truth which can be understood ultimately only through faith. But are there no reasonable considerations to help us in this venture of faith? Let me suggest four truths which I feel will help us in this direction.

I

Let us begin by noting that life does survive a change in bodies. Paul uses the illustration of a seed planted in the ground. When it is planted it has one kind of a body, but when it comes up it has a very different body. The hard shell of the seed, when it has served its function, is surrendered and left

in the earth, but the life that is in it emerges to a new glory.

Now, Paul says, "So is it with the resurrection of the dead. What is sown is perishable, what is raised is imperishable . . . It is sown a physical body, it is raised a spiritual body . . . For this perishable nature must put on the imperishable, and this mortal nature must put on immortality."

Paul reasoned that it is just as normal for us to survive a change of bodies as for a seed to do so. He might have used any one of a number of other illustrations. Take a butterfly for example. It wasn't always a delicately beautiful thing with wings. It was a caterpillar once, confined to the earth. Then it wrapped itself in its grave clothes and lay as dead for a time, until one day the grave was opened and it emerged a new creature, no longer earthbound but the inhabitant of a new world.

Life does survive a change in bodies. We see it happen every day. Is it so difficult then to believe that the God who can draw a butterfly out of a caterpillar, a frog out of a tadpole, and a bird out of an egg can find something in us more precious than the shell that surrounds us, can draw it out, and give it a new body and continued life? Life does survive a change in bodies.

II

Let's consider a second thing: Life does move toward a goal. Take the process of evolution, for example. It moves from lower to higher forms of life; it is going somewhere. Or, consider the normal process of the growth of individuals. It is not haphazard so that we have no idea whether a young man of twenty will be crawling on the floor like an infant or serving as the president of some large company. To be sure, there is a wide variation in the intelligence and ability of twenty-year-olds, but we can be sure that the irresistible pull toward maturity will have brought all of them of average capacity up to a certain level of development. Life seems to be headed somewhere; it grows, develops, matures.

We ourselves, by our very nature, are purposive creatures. We have to be directing our lives toward some goal or life loses its meaning, and we disintegrate as personalities. So long as we have a clearcut and worthy aim in life, and direct our energies toward its accomplishment we are pretty well assured of mental health because we were meant to live that way. It is when life has no purpose that we begin to get neurotic. Purposelessness is unnatural and therefore destructive.

Is it so difficult to believe, then, that the God who set things moving toward a goal, and who planted purposes in our minds, should have a destiny for his own creation?

III

But let's move on to another thought. This may sound a little strange at first, but think about it before you dismiss it as unreasonable: Life often does prove the unbelievable to be true.

When Christopher Columbus returned to Spain after his voyage to the west, he reported to the authorities that he had been to the East Indies. They said that he was out of his mind. Everyone knew the Indies were to the east of Europe, not the west, just as they knew that the world was flat instead of round. It was unthinkable that one could go west to get east. Such a notion, they believed, did not correspond with natural law. But in due course of time, the unbelievable was found to be true.

Think of all the things that we take for granted today, that only a little while ago would have been flatly denied as completely impossible. A few years ago no one would have believed you if you had told them that there would come a time when we would ride about comfortably at speeds of fifty, sixty, seventy miles an hour in "horseless carriages." They would never have accepted the idea that you would be able to turn on a light by punching a button, hear a symphony by tuning in a radio, or watch a football game many miles away by looking at a little box in your own living room. The idea of flying would have been laughed out of court, and the prospect of a trip to the moon would have been called our sanity into question. But time takes care of our weak faith, and the unbelievable is found to be true.

Now, someone may say, "Yes, but all these things are found to follow natural law when you come to understand them." To which I would answer, "Of course! And so does the resurrection. God does not do things contrary to his nature." Besides the resurrection is not the only thing in our experience for which we have not found a natural explanation. There is as much mystery about the question of how we got here in the first place as about what will happen to us when we die. This earth was red hot once, like the inside of a furnace. Then it went through a long period of cooling off. After that, life appeared. Where did it come from? No one knows. How did it get started? No one can tell you. So far as our understanding of natural law is concerned, life does not generate spontaneously out of a fiery furnace. Now if God can bring life to a planet as dead as a poker, is it unreasonable to believe that he can bring a resurrection where there has been life?

Ralph Sockman suggests that we think of this matter in terms of a group of Eskimoes. Let's imagine a group of them that have never had any contact with the outside world. So far as their knowledge goes, the whole earth is an endless expanse of ice, snow, nothing more. Then a man from Southern California drops down in their midst, and proceeds to tell them of the wonders of the sunny southland. He tells about palm trees, and oranges and bathing beaches. But this doesn't mean a thing to them because there is nothing in their experience to correspond with it. How can you describe a palm tree to someone who has never even seen the ground—or a blade of grass? So the Californian must speak in negatives. He tells the Eskimoes that Southern California is a place where there is no snow or ice, no igloos, no midnight sun, no whale meat. It's not a very satisfactory description, but under the circumstances it is the best he can do.

Now the Bible approaches eternal life in this same manner: There shall be "no night" there. "There shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away." We can't know what it is like. We have no experience on which to base such knowledge. But we can know that it is normal for us to find the unbelievable to be true.

IV

Now let me point out one other thing: Life does include parental satisfaction of children's needs.

If a man buys a fine automobile and the best clothes for himself, eats expensive meals in restaurants, and travels where he wants to while his children are compelled to wear shoes that are too small and to do without needed medical attention because he hasn't enough money to take proper care of them, we say there is something wrong with him. That kind of behavior just isn't normal. Under normal circumstances a father will provide proper care for his children even if it means skimping on some things he'd like to have for himself. It is normal for a father to be concerned about the needs of his children.

Now, if we poor human parents, with all our faults still remember and care for our own, how much more must the Heavenly Father who put those parental instincts within us, care for his children. As Bishop Ensley puts it: "We should not question immortality until it becomes the settled practice of parents to desert their offspring. So long as they care, we have good reason to believe that the Parent of all cares."

It is said that in India fakirs sit beside pools of water and drop colored dust on the surface in such a manner as to make recognizable portraits of great men. Then a little wind comes up, or a pebble is dropped in the pool. The water is disturbed, and the picture destroyed. Now, I cannot believe that the creator of the universe is engaged in that kind of business, that he creates one like Moses or Jeremiah, or St. Paul, or Martin Luther, or Jesus, or even like you and me, and then allows the breath of death to blow us completely away.

Earl Rudder was a true child of God. His life was characterized by love. He had a deep and abiding love for the heavenly Father, a love that expressed itself in many ways both within and without the Church. He loved his country. His brilliant military record attests not only to his qualities of leadership, but also to the profound patriotism which was so much a part of his personality. He was an outstanding example of the citizen-soldier. His civilian achievements as a public servant equally well reflected his love for his country. He loved this university and gave it strong leadership during a period of great change and development. His personal life was also one of love. He was a good and loyal friend to many. Above all, he was a devoted husband, father, brother and grandfather.

We have made it hard for people to believe that Jesus has conquered death. Death, resurrection, life everlasting—these have been made to seem so strange and contrary to our experience. But death is no longer an enemy of the spirit. For the Christian, it is the most normal thing in the world. And I have an idea that when we pass through the portals of death that there will be a moment when it will all seem strange, and then we will know that we have come home.

## NBC WHITE PAPER ON MENTALLY DISTURBED YOUTH, APRIL 25, 7:30 P.M. E.S.T.

## HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, next Saturday, April 25, NBC Television will present at 7:30 p.m. e.s.t. a 90-minute news special on mentally disturbed youth.

The documentary, entitled "Cry Help," is being produced by the distinguished television producer, Mrs. Lucy Jarvis.

The film points to the urgent need for Federal leadership in the field of mental health. It precedes the publication next month by Harper & Row of "Crisis in Child Mental Health," the result of a 3-year study by a joint congressional commission.

As Mrs. Jarvis states:

We've got to go to the moon because that's part of man's dream, but part of man's dream is a better life here too.

I urge my colleagues to watch this splendid film, and I recommend that they read an article about the film in the New York Times this past Sunday based on an interview with Mrs. Jarvis. I insert the article in the RECORD, as follows:

THINGS TO LIVE FOR—LIKE THE BEATLES

(By Judy Stone)

*"There is not a single community in this country that provides an acceptable standard of services for its mentally ill children."*—Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children, June 30, 1969.—NAPA, CALIF.

At 6 A.M. in Ward Q 7 and 8 of Napa State

Hospital, a voice over the loudspeaker announced that it was time to get up and face the day. George, a slight, fair, 17-year-old paranoid schizophrenic, turned over in bed, shaking off the efforts of a nurse to rouse him. "Leave me alone. Leave me alone," he muttered. "Wake me up when I'm dead."

George is one of nearly 10 million Americans under 25 who require mental-health treatment. He is one of only 500,000 who are actually receiving some attention—attention, that is often indifferent, rarely helpful, and frequently harmful. And George is one of the lucky 24 admitted into Napa's unique Adolescent Treatment Program to get the kind of psychiatric care that may help him to become comparatively self-sufficient.

The way the richest country in the world shunts aside its mentally disturbed adolescents will be spotlighted on "Cry Help! An NBC White Paper on Mentally Disturbed Youth," a 90-minute news special produced by Lucy Jarvis. It will be shown Saturday night at 7:30, prior to publication by Harper & Row next month of "Crisis in Child Mental Health," the result of a three-year study by a joint Congressional commission. "The acute necessity for such a study," the commission report noted, "was painfully brought to the public by John F. Kennedy's assassin, who had been diagnosed as a mentally disturbed child for whom treatment was never obtained."

What triggered Mrs. Jervis's attention was a remark by the Massachusetts Commissioner of Mental Health, who told her: "The great tragedy is that although we're doing many things for kids under 14, if you're going to be mentally ill in this country, never be sick between 17 and 25 because then you'll be in serious trouble."

When Mrs. Jarvis began investigating, she was appalled at the lack of mental-health programs for that age group and the prohibitive cost of private hospitalization. What she saw convinced her of the necessity for community health centers where preventive work can be done. She found what she was looking for in California.

Last July California became the first state to make local communities responsible for the care of their mentally ill, with 90 per cent of the funds provided by the state, 10 per cent by the county concerned. But California took one step forward, two steps back: Governor Ronald Reagan had also slashed the budget for the State Department of Mental Hygience, substantially reducing hospital personnel and engendering bitter controversy.

MRS. JARVIS AT NAPA STATE MENTAL HOSPITAL

When NBC researchers arrived here last January, it was not a propitious time for the state to welcome them with open arms. But Mrs. Jarvis—an attractive, black-haired, brown-eyed powerhouse who can be alternately warm, charming, and intimidating, who has wheedled her way into the Kremlin, has talked to Khrushchev in exile and covered the Vietnam war for NBC—somehow found the key.

State officials first tried to direct her attention to the adolescent program in Southern California's Camarillo State Hospital, which had been redecorated (and the grass sprayed green) for Governor Reagan's one tour of "inspection." However, Mrs. Jarvis, wife of a corporation attorney and mother of two young adults, is too shrewd to be taken in by edifice complexes. "I felt it was real Plasticville," she said. "It was very fancy, very well decorated and the staff was very cold. Buildings don't function if there is no love and warmth and interest in the person."

At Napa, in northern California, she found a "shining light of accomplishment" in the Adolescent Treatment Program, carried out by a psychologist, a psychiatrist, two social workers, two teachers and two rehabilitation therapists. Unfortunately, as noted, this intensive care covers only 24 of the most seriously disturbed among Napa's average adolescent population of approximately 180.

Dr. Clem Helming, a graying father of eight who heads the program, says he believes in "the therapeutic community. We encourage even more involvement with children than most patients and teachers have. Other places believe you can't be an administrator and therapist at the same time, but we are. This is a community within a community. We are the parents, teachers, neighborhoods, policemen. We all have to demonstrate enough involvement with each other so that the youngsters are hooked. The staff meets and tries to criticize each other. I encourage others to criticize me. If we really can communicate with each other, it's a model for the kids. We have to remember there is in the psychotic person some element of a very creative person and this can be tapped. Their illness has resulted in an imbalance, so they live part of the time in an unreal world they create. We need to develop an atmosphere in which they can organize, integrate and grow. This is a very tiring process for the staff and there are no flashy, wonderful breakthroughs."

Although some Napa staff members objected to the television project, Dr. Helming believed it "helped the youngsters realize other people in the world were interested in them and believed in them." The TV crew, particularly director Tom Priestly, he said, "were keenly aware that they didn't want to hurt these kids and reached an understanding with the staff before taking any pictures."

Changes in some youngsters were apparent even in the few months the crew shot at Napa. When Mrs. Jarvis first met Gloria, a 17-year-old autistic girl, Gloria's long dark hair fell loosely over her face, concealing her deeply sad brown eyes. She could speak only her name. The daughter of poor Mexican-Spanish parents, she had been depressed and suicidal until a friend convinced her "there were important things to live for—'like the Beatles.'" Recently, she has been composing her own music and lyrics and playing the guitar. "When she was walking in the meadows, we followed her," Mrs. Jarvis recalled. "She was singing a song she wrote that would tear you apart—about a man who falls in love with a woman and feels betrayed."

At an evaluation session, Mrs. Jarvis observed Debbie, a middle-class girl who had earned straight A's in San Francisco's top academic high school. Debbie insisted on knowing if the hospital staff member questioning her was a psychiatrist or psychologist: "I don't waste my time with psychologists," she said.

"She was hostile and aggressive," Mrs. Jarvis noted. "I told her, 'Debbie, you are really beautiful.' She said, 'Look at my face. It's split down the middle. I'm a schizophrenic.' Debbie was quite articulate about her distaste for the great American middle-class myths. To defy her family, she had secretly smoked pot and dated black men, but she never received the punishment she seemed to think she merited. Then one day, she slit her wrists and her mother asked, 'Why?' 'My God, don't you know?' Debbie cried. Debbie is now out of the hospital, the family is in therapy and there is hope that she may be able to enter college soon," Mrs. Jarvis said.

In addition to observing and filming youngsters receiving treatment at Napa, Mrs. Jarvis and her crew also looked elsewhere in California, finding other young people who should have been receiving care but weren't.

"No matter where we went," Mrs. Jarvis continued, "we found kids like the ones at Napa. 'Gut-wrenching,' as our writer Jim Mills said. Each youngster we focused on exemplifies a different aspect of what happens—or doesn't happen—to a disturbed kid in America."

DOWNTOWN SAN FRANCISCO

In San Francisco's crowded, downtown "tenderloin," the crew found—not the hippie dropouts—but the throwouts. "They come from homes where there is no father or there are several different fathers or the parents are alcoholics," Mrs. Jarvis observed. "Some of them go to Hospitality House, where they find an accepting atmosphere and where there is a free feed once a week. There are about 3,000 of these kids in the area. A lot of them don't know their sexual identity. They become drag queens or lesbians and they won't go to the 'Establishment' for therapy."

At Hospitality House, Mrs. Jarvis and the crew found 15-year-old Sherrie, a tiny thing with long tangled hair and immensely shy blue eyes, a clinger to anyone who seems to care. Sherrie "spare-changes" people and gives most of the money away. "She lives in a world of pimps, whores and hustlers," Mrs. Jarvis said, "and sails through it all with aplomb, seemingly untouched. She seems to have no interest in sex or drugs, but she is beginning to paint—red things with the word 'death' in black letters. She is obsessed with death. She said her father took one look at her and killed himself 10 days later. She is charming, appealing and irrational. Her brother was in Napa, and a volunteer doctor who observed Sherrie at Hospitality House told us that she is deeply psychotic.

"If the kids in the streets are psychotic or paranoid and no adult gets to them, they may be picked up for hustling, panhandling, pimping, breaking and entering. If they don't get on the mental-hygiene conveyor belt, they get on the conveyor belt run by the correctional system. Once on that, they may never get off."

Since the California Youth Authority, the state correctional agency, has no psychiatric facility, psychotic youngsters are often sent to Vacaville, the medical institution for adult prisoners; some have not even committed a criminal offense, but are picked up for running away from home or exhibiting violent behavior.

PART OF MAN'S DREAM

"The doctors at Vacaville told me that by the time they get the kids, there is no hope," said Mrs. Jarvis. "The chief psychiatrist said, 'If there were a proper community health program, if the schools and the homes were exposed to it, we would be practicing preventive medicine instead of having a finger in the dike.'

"No one knows what causes schizophrenia, but the victims can be helped to function," Mrs. Jarvis continued. "We don't know if body chemistry, diet and prenatal care may be at the root of it. Until we take seriously the problem of the 16-to-21-year-old group, how do we know what causes drug addiction and the generation gap, the lack of communication, the emotional confusion, the rise in homosexuality? There may be a chemical root as well as an environmental one. The first thing they do with a paranoid schizophrenic kid is put him on a tranquilizing drug. How do we know the whole emotional history of one person as opposed to another doesn't depend on the chemical makeup of the body? My major at Cornell was biochemistry. I started out working as a nutritionist in a hospital and I strongly believe that there is a correlation between what we put into our bodies and what we are.

"I know this show will shake people up. There are fathers and mothers who have sick kids, don't recognize the signs and accuse them of being lazy. We have to make them understand what is happening to their children. If the communities don't have mental-health clinics, parents should exert pressure to get them. This thing is alarmingly on the rise. When you read the statistics, it's one thing, but when the statistics become a Gloria or a Debbie the shock is 10 times worse.

"When these kids grab hold of you and you find yourself involved, you want to cry for the whole world. You want to know where the hell we're going. I don't say, 'Why spend money to go to the moon, let's spend it on the kids.' We've got to go to the moon because that's part of man's dream, but part of man's dream is a better life here too. This is a rich and resourceful and arrogant country that can do both. We've got to stop feeling that, every time we talk about a program in which the Federal Government takes a share in helping individuals, we're in danger of becoming a collective society or a Communist movement. There's certainly enough money to do this, but is there the leadership?"

## AL HOFSTEDE: LIBERAL MINNEAPOLIS ALDERMAN IN TOUCH WITH THE PEOPLE

## HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on April 20 the Minneapolis Tribune printed on its editorial page a fine column about one of Minneapolis' young and progressive elected public officials, Third Ward Alderman Al Hofstede. The article by Joe Rigert contains a lesson that all elected officials should learn: never underestimate the intelligence of the American electorate, but do not overestimate the information they possess on public issues.

Al Hofstede's premise is that his constituents are open to necessary change if convinced of the need for change. Al's career is devoted to both informing those who elect him and listening to their views. He proves that this process can result in progressive programs responding to our grave urban problems. So-called middle America is not necessarily unsympathetic to "increased spending, open housing, urban renewal, handgun control, scattered site public housing, and other social measures." Al Hofstede, a leader in the best sense of that often misused word, is a credit to Minneapolis.

The article follows:

HOFSTEDE: LIBERAL IN TOUCH WITH THE PEOPLE

(By Joe Rigert)

The handwriting is clear; the message direct. "In this charity envelope a modest campaign donation of 25 pennies as I am kind of poor myself." Alderman Albert J. Hofstede of Minneapolis cherishes the letter as a reminder and a reassurance in these times of travail for elected officials caught between the conflicting pressures of urban needs and constituent reactions.

The letter has special meaning in both a personal and political sense, because Hofstede's 3rd Ward is a prototype of Middle America—that segment of society now supposedly most distrustful of government, concerned about taxes, upset over social change, anxious to preserve hard-won gains, and fearful of the upward and outward thrust of minorities.

The seeming paradox is that Hofstede was re-elected last year by a wide margin to represent this ward, and apparently continues to enjoy the kind of support typified in the letter, even while he has voted for spending programs, open housing, urban renewal, handgun-control, scattered-site public housing and other social measures presumably disfavored in such a constituency. Have the views of Middle America been misrepresented? Or is the 29-year-old alderman ahead of his constituents?

These questions are worth examining because they have major implications for whether political leaders can continue to move ahead in dealing with critical urban problems or must retrench in response to a mood of negativism. To answer the questions, it is necessary to look behind the labels and to review Hofstede's response as alderman.

It is necessary, first, to realize that the ward is no monolith. Hofstede counts 13 white European nationality groups, along with sizeable numbers of poor whites and Indians. Many of the residents fled oppression to come to America, built their own homes, churches and schools and maintain strong ties to their communities. They are blue-collar workers for the most part, unskilled or semiskilled, drawing modest wages. They are advancing in age.

"In one sense, it is a very beautiful community, because of the cross section," says Hofstede. "They still have the customs and songs. You have to attend their Easter ceremonies—it's all there. The foods. The Lebanese dinner. The Ukrainian Easter dinner. It's all different—it all has different meanings."

It is necessary, second, to recognize the full scope of attitudes in the ward. Hofstede describes his constituents as "very warm and friendly people," much smarter about issues than generally credited, rightly concerned about taxes and inflation, lacking a sense of participation in their government, inclined to want to hold back after the rapid change of recent years, ambiguous about race and poverty.

"These people have worked hard for what they have. It is difficult for them to understand why some people get something for nothing, as in welfare, or why they burn down buildings. And yet they understand, too. You can't tell me somebody who left the old country because his land was taken away, or who was in a concentration camp, or couldn't read certain books, when he sees what black people are going through can't understand it."

It is necessary, finally, to note Hofstede's premise that his constitutents are open to change if convinced of the facts. This was perhaps best illustrated in the early 1960s when Hofstede, then a college student, joined a Catholic priest and a few other residents in going door-to-door, setting up meetings and otherwise working to convince people of the need for an urban renewal project to revitalize the St. Anthony neighborhood. The project since has brought new homes, schools, highrises for the elderly, and stabilization for an area that was going downhill.

So, while renewal critics seek a referendum provision for future projects, Hofstede says, "I'm not scared of a vote, providing people know what they are voting on. I have a lot of trust in the people. They understand when an area is going down. They know when they need assistance."

This matter of "trust" crops up often in Hofstede's discussion of his relationship with constituents and in his explanation of why he feels he is able politically to vote the way he does on the broad urban issues. Hofstede says that he tries to develop that trust by listening to his people, putting himself in their position to understand their views, being honest with them and answering to their needs.

If the trust is there, he says, "I think people will respond to the positive approach. The main problem is that you equip people with enough information so they can make a decent decision. People want to do new things but they want to have a reason for it."

Hofstede stresses the need for a positive, progressive stance in government, in the best interests of his ward and the total city. "We are either moving forward or backward. There is no status quo. We have to keep moving ahead," he says.

Thus Hofstede talks of industrial development to bring jobs and a better tax base. He says it takes more money each year just to keep the city going—"we can't be afraid of that issue." He notes that every day of delay adds to the cost of a civic center. He says poverty will grow and engulf the city if the problem is ignored.

A strong desire to do "what is right" runs through the alderman's conversation. "I just believed in it," he said, explaining one controversial vote not calculated to win favor in his constituency. But Albert J. Hofstede, son of a truck driver from Holland, a college graduate and beneficiary of the progress he favors, also stays close to his people, partly through that letter and the 25 pennies he keeps on his desk. "When you deal with a $70-million budget, you get so enwrapped in this thing, you can begin to look upon people as a mass. You got to look at them as individuals."

## JUDICIAL QUALIFICATIONS

## HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply disappointed at the recent action of the California State Judicial Qualifications Commission in recommending a mere "public censure" as an appropriate penalty in the case of serious allegations of improper conduct and gross ethnic discrimination made against Judge Gerald S. Chargin of the superior court in Santa Clara County, Calif.

In view of the fact that the commission, itself, concluded that Judge Chargin's conduct "constituted conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice that brings the judicial office into disrepute," it is simply incomprehensible to me that the commission could recommend a penalty that can only be regarded as a light slap on the wrist for actions that amounted to both a serious matter of ethnic discrimination, and an effective denial of the equal protection of the law that our Constitution guarantees to all citizens.

I firmly believe that the commission's recommendation is a disservice to the cause of ethnic justice in America, for it must be made unmistakably clear to all that the kind of behavior displayed by Judge Chargin will not be tolerated in our courts.

In my opinion, Judge Chargin has disqualified himself from sitting in judgment on his fellow men, and, in the best interest of all concerned, should have the good sense to resign from the bench.

For, how can the law and the courts command respect when those who would assume the role of judge in our society and mete out punishment to violators of the law, have, themselves, no respect for the people they serve?

If Judge Chargin should fail to resign voluntarily, I strongly urge the California Supreme Court, which has authority to act in such cases, to reject the inadequate recommendation of the State judicial qualifications commission, and order the immediate removal of Judge Chargin from office as being clearly unfit to continue to serve in that capacity.

By way of background, Mr. Speaker, the allegations of misconduct on the

bench arose as a result of statements made by Judge Chargin at a juvenile court hearing held in San Jose, Calif., on September 2, 1969.

According to the court reporter's official transcript of the hearing, which I have had an opportunity to review, Judge Chargin's remarks from the bench amounted to what can only be called an outrageous and insulting ethnic slur against the entire Mexican-American community in the United States.

I have communicated repeatedly to the chairman of the judicial qualifications commission to protest in the strongest terms possible the intemperate bigotry and bias shown by Judge Chargin, and to urge his immediate removal from judicial office as having disqualified himself from continuing to sit on the bench.

The inexcusable and offensive language used by Judge Chargin, which I will not dignify by repeating, is simply unacceptable to the people of our country, and has no place whatsoever in a civilized court of law.

His remarks attempt to perpetuate a profound misunderstanding about the Mexican-American community, its rich cultural heritage, its highest aspirations, and its many significant contributions to American life.

In my opinion, Judge Chargin stands convicted by his own words as clearly unfit to serve in any judicial capacity, and he should be removed from the bench forthwith.

For further background information on this important matter. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the following items: the text of a letter I wrote to the State judicial qualifications commission stating my firm position on the case; an editorial entitled, "A Judge Who Disgraced the Bench," which appeared in the Los Angeles Times; and excerpts from the commission's news release announcing its recommendation to the California Supreme Court, with relevant quotes from its official "Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Recommendation."

The material referred to, follows:

STATE JUDICIAL QUALIFICATIONS COMMISSION,
*350 McCallister Street—Room 3041,*
*San Francisco, Calif.*

GENTLEMEN: This letter is written to wholeheartedly endorse the action taken by the State Attorney General's Office in urging that a ruling be made as soon as possible on the case of Judge Gerald S. Chargin, who, while presiding at a Juvenile Court hearing in San Jose, took it upon himself to indict the entire Mexican American community by his very intemperate anti-Mexican remarks.

The bigotry and bias of the Judge is clearly evidenced by his language and is unjustified under any circumstances, especially so, coming from the bench. It is not only an affront and insult to persons of Mexican descent in both Mexico and the United States, but also regrettable that the Judge chose to present such an inaccurate and distorted picture of the Mexican American community.

The Los Angeles Times, in its strong editorial indictment of the Judge, has cogently expressed my own feelings in commenting that "Nothing can excuse language so harsh and so intemperate as to arouse an entire community to anger over such racial slurs. There can be no other conclusion than that Judge Chargin is not qualified to sit on the bench. He stands convicted by his own words."

Because I, too, feel that the Judge stands convicted by his extremely unethical deportment—and by his words has attempted to perpetuate profound misunderstanding about the Mexican American community, its culture, its aspirations and its contributions to the United States—his removal from the bench forthwith is required.

I firmly believe that this letter reflects the attitude of the Mexican American community with respect to this case.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD R. ROYBAL,
*Member of Congress.*

---

[From the Los Angeles Times, Oct. 3, 1969]

A JUDGE WHO DISGRACED THE BENCH

"We ought to send you out of the country—send you back to Mexico . . . You ought to commit suicide."

"You are lower than animals and haven't the right to live in organized society—just miserable, lousy, rotten people."

"Maybe Hitler was right. The animals in our society probably ought to be destroyed because they have no right to live among human beings."

Were these the mouthings of a lynch mob or the taunts of a racist sheriff?

No. They were uttered by the Honorable Gerald S. Chargin, a judge of the Superior Court of the State of California, presiding at a juvenile hearing in San Jose.

The outrageously intemperate language used by Judge Chargin clearly requires that he be removed from the bench.

Before the judge on September 2 was a 17-year-old Mexican American youth accused of incest involving his 15-year-old sister. He had originally pleaded innocent but reportedly changed his plea.

In his diatribe against the young defendant, Judge Chargin broadened his remarks, including this gratuitous reference to the sister: "Well, probably she will have half a dozen children and three or four marriages before she is 18."

The judge's indictment of "miserable, lousy, rotten people" led Dep. Public Defender Fred Lucero to object that "The court is indicting the whole Mexican group . . . What appalls me is that the court is saying that Hitler was right in genocide."

To which Judge Chargin replied: "What are we going to do with the mad dogs of our society?

"Either we have to kill them or send them to an institution or place them out of the hands of good people because that's the theory—one of the theories of punishment is if they get to the position that they want to act like mad dogs, then we have to separate them from society."

Although the judge told the defendant "You will probably end up in state's prison before you are 25, and that's where you belong anyhow," he finally ordered the youth released on probation.

Chargin excused his behavior by saying that "it is an accepted fact that these lectures are stated in harsh terms to impress upon the minds of the youth the seriousness of the situation in which they find themselves."

Nothing, however, can excuse language so harsh and so intemperate as to arouse an entire community to anger over such racial slurs.

The transcript of the Sept. 2 hearing has now been forwarded by the Attorney General's office to the Commission on Judicial Qualifications with a formal request to "expedite" an investigation.

There can be no other conclusion than that Judge Chargin is not qualified to sit on the bench. He stands convicted by his own words.

---

COMMISSION NEWS RELEASE

The Commission on Judicial Qualifications has unanimously recommended to the California Supreme Court that Superior Court Judge Gerald S. Chargin of San Jose be publicly censured for his remarks at a juvenile court hearing September 2, 1969. The Commission found the remarks were "improper and inexcusable. Taking the words at their ordinary meaning they were insulting to the minor's family, offensive to large segments of the public, and caused widespread expressions of deep concern about the impartial administration of justice in California. Whatever their purpose, a literal interpretation of the words was that the Respondent had feelings and attitude of ethnic bias." The Commission then concluded that Judge Chargin's conduct "constituted conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice that brings the judicial office into disrepute."

The judge has 30 days to petition the Supreme Court to reject the recommendation.

Along with its report to the Supreme Court the Commission filed the record of the proceedings beginning with the Notification of Charges dated December 18, 1969, and including the transcripts of hearings held February 9 and March 2, 1970 in San Francisco before Special Masters. The Commission employed San Francisco attorney, Burnham Enersen, as Special Counsel and Examiner. Enersen presented the case against the judge who was represented by San Francisco attorneys Gerald D. Marcus and Arthur T. Bridgett.

FINDINGS OF FACT

. . . . . In the course of his remarks at said hearing, Respondent had several opportunities to qualify, retract or explain his remarks, in particular when the Public Defender remonstrated that Respondent was condoning genocide and was condemning Mexican Americans as a group. On each such occasion, Respondent persisted in his conduct . . . . . .

. . . . . The remarks of the Respondent at said hearing were improper and inexcusable. Taking the words at their ordinary meaning they were insulting to the minor's family, offensive to large segments of the public, and caused widespread expressions of deep concern about the impartial administration of justice in California. Whatever their purpose, a literal interpretation of the words was that the Respondent had feelings and attitudes of ethnic bias.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Judge Gerald S. Chargin's conduct of the Juvenile Court hearing on September 2, 1969 constituted conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice that brings the judicial office into disrepute . . . . . .

RECOMMENDATION

The Commission having found, and hereby concluding that the conduct of the Respondent as found in the Findings constitute conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice that brings the judicial office into disrepute, the Commission by virtue of the powers vested in it by Section 18 of Article VI of the California Constitution, hereby recommends to the Supreme Court of California that the Respondent, Gerald S. Chargin, be publicly censured.

---

## PRIDE IN NORTH CAROLINA'S OLIVER

### HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues today my pride in a young North Carolinian by the name of Oliver.

After attending the University of North Carolina, this talented Tar Heel made a nationwide impact through his

recorded hits, "Good Morning Starshine," "Jean," and a host of others. It has been accurately reported that Oliver has become a household word with the "12 to 84 set."

Having firmly established himself in the entertainment world, this young man has now channeled his obvious appeal into another direction—that of drug abuse education. Oliver believes very strongly that the entertainer has a positive role to play in combating drug abuse. Accordingly, he has lent his full cooperation to the House Select Committee on Crime in its all-out effort to educate the general public—particularly young people—on the subject of drug abuse.

He recently accepted a bid from that committee to narrate a radio production entitled "Facts and Fables of Drug Abuse" which is currently being presented on North Carolina radio stations and other stations throughout the Nation.

The program's emphasis is on revealing the medical and social facts about drugs rather than on an overall condemnation of all drugs. It is believed to be the first such project ever undertaken by a congressional committee.

Acknowledging the attitude of many entertainers that cooperation with the Government is "selling out to the establishment," or the "square" approach, I think it is especially significant that Oliver has become the leader in his field in this effort and that he has done it successfully.

I believe that every citizen who has a sincere desire to alleviate the tragic problem of drug abuse has justifiable reason to share my pride in North Carolina's Oliver.

---

## POPULAR SINGER JOINS FIGHT AGAINST DRUG ABUSE

### HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, last April the House of Representatives created the Select Committee on Crime. Since that time the committee, under the able direction of our colleague, CLAUDE PEPPER, has investigated all aspects of crime in our Nation. As the members of the committee sorted through the various causes of crime, I believe most of us were shocked by the major impact that drug abuse has had on crime.

And we were also shocked by the spreading use of drugs by the young people of America—teenagers and preteenagers. In an effort to reach these young people with the facts which we learned during our committee hearings about the horrible problem of drugs, Chairman PEPPER authorized the committee staff to prepare and release a 30-minute radio show aimed at the youth of our country.

The radio show tape has now been released to stations around the country. As an indication of the show's acceptance and popularity, more than 400 stations have requested copies of the tape.

Much of the success of the show can be credited to a young singer and composer by the name of Oliver who narrates the program. Oliver is the first entertainer to join the committee in its search for popular personalities who are willing to speak out against the use of drugs.

The committee was most fortunate to have Oliver volunteer his services, because he can reach the young people. His first recording, "'Good Morning Starshine," was a million-dollar seller. His next release, "Jean," topped the hit lists for weeks. He is in constant demand for college concerts, and for guest spots on TV shows.

In short, he is an excellent entertainer who appeals to the youth of our country. And we are very pleased that he has been willing to use this position of respect to speak out against the use of drugs.

We certainly hope that more entertainers will follow Oliver's fine example.

---

## APRIL 22 IS QUEEN ISABELLA'S BIRTHDAY

### HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to announce today, April 22, is the 519th birthday of Queen Isabella of Spain and call this historic event to the attention of my colleagues and the American people.

Queen Isabella was a remarkably foresighted person for the time in which she lived. Without her encouragement and assistance, Christopher Columbus could not have set sail on his journey to the new world. We Americans owe a debt of gratitude to this extraordinary woman for her major part in the discovery of the new world.

It has been my honor to sponsor legislation which would authorize the President to proclaim the 22d day of each April as Queen Isabella Day. The Governors of 29 States have signed proclamations setting this date aside to honor Queen Isabella. This has been accomplished through the tireless efforts of John Paul Paine, president of the National Committee for a Queen Isabella Day. A list of these Governors and their States follows:

Albert Brewer, Alabama; Ronald Reagan, California; John Dempsey, Connecticut; Russell Peterson, Delaware; Claude Kirk, Jr., Florida; Lester Maddox, Georgia; Richard Ogilvie, Illinois; Edgar Whitcomb, Indiana; Robert Ray, Iowa; Robert Docking, Kansas; Louie Nunn, Kentucky; John McKeithen, Louisiana; Kenneth Curtis, Maine; Harold LeVander, Minnesota; Warren Hearnes, Missouri; Forrest Anderson, Montana; William Cahill, New Jersey; Nelson Rockefeller, New York; Robert Scott, North Carolina; William Guy, North Dakota; James Rhodes, Ohio; Dewey Bartlett, Oklahoma; Robert McNair, South Carolina; Frank Farrar, South Dakota; Preston Smith, Texas; Calvin Rampton, Utah; Deane Davis, Vermont; Linwood Holton, Virginia, and Warren Knowles, Wisconsin.

It is my hope that in the near future the U.S. Congress will take action on legislation remembering Queen Isabella, a farsighted queen and a courageous woman, who has benefited the lives of all of us citizens of the Americas.

The fine organization of Catholic women, "The Daughters of Isabella," in their good works, commemorate and honor Queen Isabella.

---

## CREDIBILITY GAP IN CAMBODIA?

### HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, it was reported yesterday that the Nixon administration has agreed to supply several thousand automatic rifles to the Cambodian Government. These rifles are reportedly of Soviet design captured from Communist forces in South Vietnam.

My immediate reaction to this news, Mr. Speaker, was "Oh no, not again." We are told that this action is not to be construed as a commitment by the United States to meet requests for weapons on a large scale. But can we believe this? We do not even know the full story. Is the Nixon administration digging its own "credibility gap?"

Lloyd M. Rives, U.S. charge d'affaires in Pnompenh, was instructed to keep it a secret that these rifles would be supplied by us. In addition, Secretary of State Rogers just recently assured Senator FULBRIGHT that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee would be consulted before future aid was given to any Southeast Asian country. When the question was posed to Press Secretary Ronald Ziegler yesterday as to whether the administration would consult Congress, he replied, "This is a matter under study."

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, and to my colleagues, that the consultation of the Congress should be automatic, not just "under study." There are too many unanswered questions concerning the extent of our involvement in Cambodia and Laos to allow the administration to have a free reign.

Yesterday was Earth Day, a time when we all committed ourselves to saving our environment so that our children could breath clean air and drink clean water. Was this only rhetoric, or are we truly ready to commit ourselves and our money toward this end? We are presently spending 20 times as much in Vietnam as we are to fight water pollution, and twice as much on a supersonic transport as we are to fight air pollution. Are we now to foresake a clean environment for Cambodia?

I am today introducing a resolution stating that it is the sense of the Congress that the President not only consult but get approval of Congress before any further steps are taken with regard to

Cambodia. I urge the immediate adoption of this resolution, for we can wait no longer for unfulfilled assurances.

## MONETARY REGULATIONS

### HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. Alden R. Wells, of Exeter, N.H., publishes the Alden R. Wells Monetary Report and the Alden R. Wells Quarterly. Mr. Wells is knowledgeable in monetary fields, and at his request I include in the RECORD at this point a petition by Mr. Wells calling upon the Congress to use its constitutional powers to alter its regulation of the monetary structure of this country.

Mr. Wells' concern is the evidence of depression based on deflation, a concern that troubles many citizens and the Congress as well.

The petition follows:

PETITION

In the interest of domestic tranquility, I, Alden R. Wells, of Exeter, New Hampshire, hereby petition Congress to use the powers to regulate the value of money granted it by the Constitution (Article I, Section 8) to change its regulations.

GOLD

When the United States Treasury agrees to sell gold to a foreign nation it is selling an asset and should correspondingly reduce its liabilities. Not only is this proper accounting, but it also conforms to reason. If private expenses, they are on the road to bankruptcy. Since no government can go bankrupt in the private sense, the effect of ignoring this rational practice is to change the value of money. When the United States sells gold it is selling a monetary asset and should use the proceeds to reduce a monetary liability—debt.

Correspondingly when the Treasury purchases gold it can quite properly increase its liabilities by increasing its debt.

When an agreement to sell gold is reached present regulations require that a check in an equivalent amount of dollars be deposited by the foreign government in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. A check is then drawn on this deposit, delivered to the United States Treasury, and title to the gold is transferred. Regulations next require that the proceeds of this sale be given as a grant to the New York Reserve Bank to be distributed among all Reserve Banks. By this step the Treasury has been deprived of the ability to reduce its liabilities although it has sold an asset.

The Federal Reserve System has received the gift of a new asset. This new asset is used to buy United States Treasury debt in the open market. Because the Federal Reserve Bank's liabilities are unchanged by this transaction, it must cancel another asset. The asset it cancels is an old empty asset (gold certificates) without current meaning because Congress in the 1960's canceled gold certificate backing on bank deposits and currency. According to the New York Reserve Bank, in its pamphlet "Open Market Operations", the purchase by the Federal Reserve Bank of Treasury securities (Treasury debt) in the open market permits commercial banks to expand their demand deposits approximately 6.67 times the amount of the purchase.

Since $9,707 million gold has been sold under these regulations in the 1960's alone, commercial banks could add $64,745 million to their deposits and therefore their loans, and did so. All of this money was created out of thin air, no one worked for it, and consequently the value of money declined—or more popularly expressed, inflation occurred.

Present regulations require a reversal of these practices when the United States Treasury purchases gold. The money created out of thin air is withdrawn. On January 8, 1970, the Federal Reserve Bank gave its check of one billion dollars to the Treasury to enable it to pay for one billion dollars of gold it had purchased. The Federal Reserve Bank sold one billion dollars of Treasury securities to raise the funds to make the payment and thus canceled $6.67 billion potential commercial bank deposits with the stroke of a pen. Should Congressional regulations remain unchanged, the 1970's could produce as great an increase in the value of money—deflation—as they have already produced a decrease—inflation—in the 1960's.

CURRENCY

When the public purchases additional currency the government profits by the difference between the cost of making the currency and what it sells for. This profit is customarily called seigniorage. In the case of paper money the profit, of course, is much larger than in the case of coins. The issuance of currency is a liability to the government because if for any reason the public wishes to sell it back, the government must redeem it. Since the government has added to its monetary liabilities it should reduce another liability by acquiring and retiring an equivalent amount of debt.

Because Congress changed regulations, all paper money is now issued by the Federal Reserve System. Here too the Treasury has granted to the Federal Reserve Bank as a gift the seigniorage or profit. With this gift the Federal Reserve Bank purchases Treasury securities in the open market. These purchases, however, only replace deposits commercial banks lost when the public gave its checks in return for currency. Inflation thus becomes one for one rather than the 6.67 for one when gold is sold. Recently this gift to the Federal Reserve Bank has been running $2.5 billion to $3.0 billion per year. Altogether it totaled $47,472 million at the end of 1969. In the 1960's alone approximately $20 billion grants of this nature were made to the Federal Reserve Bank. Should the public require less currency in the 1970's, this inflation becomes deflation.

DOMESTIC TRANQUILLITY

These two grants by the United States Treasury to the Federal Reserve System totaled approximately $30 billion in the 1960's alone and caused a credit inflation of approximately $85 billion. Congress need look no further than this to find the chief cause of inflation in the 1960's. Already its regulation of money has begun a similar deflation in the 1970's.

Both common sense and common knowledge from today's observable events will affirm that changes in the value of money are unevenly distributed among the people. In an inflation the rich become richer and the weak—the poor, the aged, and the infirm—become poorer. Civil servants will even defy the Courts and the Law when inflation grows serious. When deflation occurs almost everyone suffers.

No one should be surprised that the inflation of the 1960's has caused the vigorous poor to act violently, nor many of the young to reject society and even resort to drugs. I have predicted these results as a consequence of the changing value of money under current Congressional regulation of its value. I have found that my objections to these regulations have been ignored because first prosperity based on this inflation occurred. Before we have a depression based on deflation, I petition Congress to change its regulation of money to conform to common sense, and to recapture from the Federal Reserve System the grants that have been made.

ALDEN R. WELLS.

EXETER, N.H.

## SECRETARY CHAFEE CHALLENGES JACKSONVILLE UNIVERSITY GRADUATES

### HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Navy, John H. Chafee, former Governor of Rhode Island, spoke Sunday, April 19, 1970, to the 337 graduating seniors at Jacksonville University in Jacksonville, Fla. He received the honorary degree of doctor of laws in an impressive ceremony which I attended.

Secretary Chafee made a stirring and challenging speech to the graduates of the independent university located on the banks of the St. Johns River.

He asked the seniors: "Can we make modern civilization work?" The Secretary said that this generation could, if we can find peace in the world, and preserve our environment in a state that can be enjoyed by all.

I commend Secretary Chafee's speech to Members of the House of Representatives and insert an article reporting on the speech which was printed in the Florida Times-Union and Jacksonville Journal, April 20, 1970:

[From the Florida Times-Union, Apr. 20, 1970]

NAVY CHIEF ADDRESSES GRADUATES

(By Ron Sercombe)

Members of the graduating class of 1970 at Jacksonville University, 337 strong, face two great challenges, Secretary of the Navy John H. Chafee believes.

Secretary Chafee, who delivered the principal address at commencement exercises Sunday afternoon on the university campus was awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree by the university's president, Robert H. Spiro, during the ceremony.

"One of your challenges will be our international relations," Secretary Chafee said. "Resistance of the temptation to shrink within a 'Fortress America' will be one of the major challenges you will encounter continuously.

[From the Jacksonville Journal, Apr. 20, 1970]

CHALLENGES CITED TO JU GRADUATES

(By Jim Davis)

The only way to meet the challenges of the future is to stand up and be counted, graduating seniors at Jacksonville University were told.

"May you always have the courage . . . to be vigorous, forthright position-takers in this era of mass conformity when the vice of unconcern is too often called the virtue of tolerance," Secretary of the Navy John H. Chafee told the 337 seniors, largest graduating class in JU history.

Speaking at the first of two commencement ceremonies scheduled this year, Chafee said there are two great challenges facing the youth of America today.

One of the gravest dangers, Chafee said, is a growing demand for isolationism.

Americans must resist "the temptation to shrink within a 'Fortress America,'" Chafee said.

"From all corners of this country," said the secretary, "will arise in ever stronger tones the tempting siren song—'cancel all these international commitments, let those foreign nations take care of themselves . . . stop the aid to foreign countries which is spending us into bankruptcy.'"

"It will be an appeal to retreat within our own borders and let the rest of the world go by while we tend to things that count, such as improving our cities, schools, lakes and rivers."

But, Chafee said, "if Americans value their freedoms, if they are serious about preventing nuclear wars and establishing peace, it may be necessary to bear more than their share of the burden."

"But if we value the rights we call freedoms, if we are serious about preventing nuclear wars, if we want peace for ourselves and the world—then we must bear our share of the burden—the burden of aid to foreign nations, of the maintenance of a well-trained and well-equipped military establishment, of preparedness to honor our commitments.

"The other major challenge is a national problem.

"Can we, as a people with a population continuously growing, work out a mode of living that will permit us to keep our material gains, while simultaneously preserving our individual freedoms and the environment around us?

"Can we cram more and more people into megalopolis, continue to improve our standard of living with more and more waste per person, more automobiles, more liberties—and still, with all this, preserve our natural beauties, wildlife, unspoiled beaches—a place to get away from it all?

"In other words, can we make modern civilization work?

"If we can, we will have set a standard that will provide encouragement and direction for the rest of the world.

"If we can't, adjustments will have to be made—adjustments that will not necessarily curtail our liberties or reduce our material benefits.

"It seems to me that both of these challenges are filled with excitement and opportunities which will call forth the very best in each of you."

Sunday's commencement was Jacksonville University's largest.

Distinguished graduating seniors received their share of honors.

Miss Frances "Terry" Hockett, who has served the University in many of its highest elective and appointive student offices, received the University Council President's Cup for outstanding leadership.

An accounting major, Miss Hockett is the daughter of Mrs. Belvia T. Spradley, 3903 Lane Ave., So. The cup was presented to her by Maloy Ray Rash Jr., vice president of the council, in the absence of Edward G. Ballance, president.

The cup is awarded annually and the name of the winner is placed on a plaque in the University Council Building.

Vincent Anthony Spagna, a 21-year-old biology major, was awarded the University Gold Medal for Scholarship, graduating summa cum laude with a 3.984 overall academic average out of a possible 4.0.

He is the son of Dr. and Mrs. Angelo Spagna of Brooklyn, N.Y. This gold medal is awarded annually by Fred B. Noble, honorary chairman of the board of trustees, to the senior who has earned the highest scholastic average. The recipient must have been enrolled in the university for at least 96 semester hours.

The exercises, held under blue skies and hot sunshine, opened with an organ prelude by Oliver Henry Douberly, followed by the academic procession with music by the Jacksonville University Chorus, directed by C. Edward Bryan. The invocation was read by University Chaplain Marvin Whiting and opening remarks were made by President Spiro.

Degrees were conferred by President Spiro. Farewell remarks were made by William Patrick Dostaler, president of the graduating class.

"The burden must be borne—of aid to foreign nations, of maintenance of well-trained and well-equipped military establishment, of preparedness to honor commitments," he said, but added that "the dollars do go out with a continuing and annoying regularity."

The other major challenge is a national problem, according to Chafee.

"Can we as a people, with a continuously growing population, work out a mode of living that will permit us to keep our material gains, while simultaneously preserving our individual freedoms and the environment?" Chafee asked.

The secretary said if Americans can meet the second challenge, they will have "set a standard that will provide encouragement and direction for the rest of the world."

But if Americans fail, warned Chafee, the adjustments "will entail the curtailing of our liberties, not a reduction in the material benefits that modern civilization provides."

Persistence and a willingness to be counted as individuals, Chafee told the graduates, is what is needed to meet the tests the future will hold.

Among graduating seniors honored was Miss Frances (Terry) Hockett of 3903 Lane Ave., who received the University Council President's Cup for outstanding leadership. She held several of the university's highest elective and appointive student offices.

Vincent Anthony Spagna, 21-year-old biology major, won the University Gold Medal for Scholarship, graduating summa cum laude with a 3.984 overall academic average out of a possible 4.0.

Spagna is the son of Dr. and Mrs. Angelo Spagna of Brooklyn, N.Y.

In addition to Spagna, four other students were graduated summa cum laude yesterday: Cecelia Gloria Brown, Mary Todd Larsen, Carol Miller Williams and Betty Ann Duer.

Thirteen were graduated magna cum laude: Diane Warner Hansen, Sherrill Marie Hitzing, Linda Jo Landis, Nan Susan Rahne, Elaine Reiner Weignacht, Arnold Richardson Woolverton, James Norman Hester, Jay Henry Menna, Philip Wayne Sloan, Cynthia Lambert Haimowitz, Karen Lee Goff, Kathryn Lois Morrow Shanks and Roman Gary Shultis.

Fourteen graduated cum laude: Margery Rae Brady, Mark Weston Draud, Burnis Eugene Harnage, Patricia Anne Jones, Joan Emily Mertens, Bobbie H. Prevatt, Richard James Singletary, Karen Claire Smith, Sharon Banning Stanley, Joseph Jack Abid, Cheryl Ann Aldridge, Patricia Ann Bartle, Elizabeth Lovejoy Dershimer and Faye East Fowler.

## AMERICA'S EXHIBIT AT THE WORLD'S FAIR

### HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, at the request of former Congressman O. K. Armstrong I would like to place in the RECORD at this time a letter he sent me from Osaka, Japan, describing his observations of the U.S. exhibit at the World's Fair. I think this body will find them informative and interesting.

I include the letter at this point for insertion in the RECORD:

OSAKA, JAPAN,
*March 27, 1970.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: Since you were kind enough to request that I give you a report on the American pavilion and its exhibits, I am doing so at my earliest possible moment. I am sorry to be so critical, but honesty impels me to be frank about our participation in this, the first world's fair in Asia:

The theme of this Expo '70, this first world's fair in Asia, is "Progress and Harmony for Mankind." I have seen many of the exhibits in the national pavilions that show this theme—in flashing motion and in brilliant colors, and by every type of modern display.

But not in the United States pavilion. With a few exceptions, the American exhibits are about as modern and attractive, about as animated, as the wooden Indian prominently displayed holding the traditional cigars in his hand—a throwback to the mid-19th century, and an insult to every Indian in the U.S. today.

Progress and harmony in the United States would need to show the development of such great factors as industry, agriculture, transportation, communications. Instead, you've got a major section on "folk art." It contains a big collection of old weathervanes, which tell no more the story of American progress than a collection of old and discarded buggy whips.

Religion? Certainly, that's an important item in progress and harmony in American life. I expected that the great religious faiths, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish, along with something that indicated freedom of worship, would be displayed. Instead, what do we find? Fifty feet of valuable prime space taken up with the exhibit of the "Shakers," a radical sect that was firmly opposed to all progress, whether material or spiritual. The Shakers refused to conform to the laws and the customs of their communities. They created disharmony, split families apart, and raised havoc generally among their neighbors. So they get an exhibit, showing an old rope bed and an iron stove. The Japanese visitors to our exhibit may well wonder if this shows how rural American families live today, for they can't take time to read how the Shakers became "extinct."

There is a photo of the traditional white church building, presumably in New England, but with the identification blurred out, and no signs of life. No minister, no congregation. There could have been some indication of the influence of religion on American life and harmony such as the visit of the Pope, Billy Graham preaching, a Jewish rabbi. But not in our exhibit.

On the plus side, two exhibits are outstanding: The astronauts with their rock from the moon, and the sports exhibit. I was informed by many observers that at least half the crowds that throng the entrance and extend back for hundreds of yards waiting to get in, want to see the moon rock and the paraphernalia of our astronauts. This exhibit is superb. The old portraits of George Washington and other famous Americans are worthy.

So also is the sports exhibit, made up of many items used by famous sportsmen, such as uniforms, bats, balls, glove, golf club, and so on. There are some good enlarged photos of such sports figures as Walter Johnson, Bobby Jones, Babe Ruth, Jim Thorpe. Only criticism here might be that the identifications are in a type too small to be seen and understood readily.

There is a major exhibit of photography, and the pictures are excellent, so far as the craftsmanship is concerned. The Japanese appreciate good photography, of course. But what do the photos prove? The theme of progress and harmony simply is not there. One photo shows a young woman out for a stroll

dressed only in her shorts, with bare breasts. We assume that the Japanese interpret that as "typically American."

Best of the collection, in my opinion, are the pictures that show American homes, mostly in rural and small-town settings. But where are the people? There are no signs of life.

There are photos of Negroes. They are all "still life." Four young people lounging around on a mattress on the floor. The shabby interior of a Negro home, with the American flag used as a drape for the picture of a former President—as though the typical American Negro does not know that you don't use our flag for a decoration of any kind.

What a chance it would be to show the progress and harmony of racial integration in the United States! A Negro nurse working in a hospital with white nurses; children of both races on a school ground; integrated teams of construction workers—such would have truthfully depicted progress and harmony in American life.

The theme of Expo '70 could have been presented in the American pavilion by our progress in aviation, first with a big picture of the flight of the Wright brothers at Kitty Hawk; then Lindbergh on the way to Paris in 1927; then other notable achievements in flying; the big 747 jets, leading up to our excellent exhibit of the astronauts. That would mean something.

Farming? There's a big photo of a barren, rocky hillside. Where are the "amber waves of grain" in the plains states, the cornfields of Iowa and Illinois, the cattle in the western feedlots, the citrus trees of Florida and the vineyards of California?

American industry? What could not have been shown by the greatest industrial nation on earth? What a chance to show progress of the American Indians, by depicting their recent establishing of industrial plants on their reservations to create jobs and payrolls.

As for the progress and harmony brought to mankind through the American automobile, why not show one of Henry Ford's early cars, followed by later models of many makes, down to the sleek, modern autos? Instead we have in our pavilion a Stutz "Bearcat" of 1930, a German car and so expensive that only a few in a million could own one; and a freak auto made from a bathtub!

At the end of the line of exhibits are two grotesque items: In a darkened area you are supposed to stand still and gaze at the wall. Soon you'll see a blazing flash of light behind one of the panels. If you gaze long enough, I was told, you'd get some sort of color reaction in your eyes. Next you enter an even darker room, and if you stand on a certain spot, you are told, you can even see your reflection.

Trouble with the whole exhibit is that people do not have time to stop and read the small type, in English and Japanese, that explains each exhibit. Most of the visitors are Japanese, and generally they come in large groups, following closely together. Most of the people scarcely slow down until they get to the sports and astronauts exhibits.

In contrast, the exhibits of many other countries put us to shame. The pavilion of Great Britain glows with modern life. So does that of Canada, and you can add that of the Republic of China as outstanding. The long queues of people waiting to get into our American pavilion often are in line for two hours. Canada has a stage where they entertain their visitors waiting to get in, with music, skating, and other fun. We could at least do something like that for our patient spectators.

I feel that our pavilion could be quickly improved, and by volunteers from American industry, agriculture, and so on, to replace some of our absurd items—such as the "extinct" Shakers, the wooden Indian, a lot of the "folk art," and the last two darkened rooms.

I voiced my criticisms of some of the exhibits I have mentioned here, to one of our officials. He replied: "But we were not supposed to show the *best* in American life."

So far as I am concerned, the best in American life is nothing to be ashamed of. It would fit beautifully into a world exposition of 1970.

O. K. ARMSTRONG.

## EARTH DAY—A VINEYARD VIEW

### HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was Earth Day, as nobody needs to be told, and all across the country people were meeting and speaking and listening and acting on the pollution problem man finds himself faced with.

Given time, Earth Day may well become an institution in America—and well it should. For it expresses one of the most basic human feelings—the love of nature, and the need to live in harmony with it.

Henry Beetle Hough, who is something of an institution himself, has taken his usual experienced and insightful look at this situation, and has found it good.

So for those who love nature, and who love the English language, I take pleasure in introducing into the RECORD the Vineyard Gazette's view of Earth Day. I think my colleagues will agree that, as usual, Mr. Hough is again both readable and right.

The item follows:

EARTH DAY

What a good word "earth" is! Its quality and meaning are so basic, universal, and indivisible that the word itself in a spring month such as this can carry the outdoor smell of newly thawed soil into the recesses both of closed houses and closed hearts.

Earth Day is well named. This is the informal and living, the fragrant and eternal term applied to the National Environmental Teach-In scheduled for Wednesday, April 22. The special day will be only the central focus of a full month of conferences, displays, demonstrations, and educational projects. The co-sponsors and co-chairmen of the Teach-In are Sen. Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin, a Democrat, and Rep. Paul N. McCloskey of California, a Republican. The prospect is that as many as 2,000 colleges and universities and 4,000 public schools will hold Earth Day observances.

Meantime, so quietly, so effectively and without the usual hurrahs and procedures, that it seems the result of spontaneous generation, the Vineyard Environmental Action group is already at work. The group is made up of young people, and, so far as one can learn, eager and informed young people.

Do they have any hippies in their membership? They can at least reply that they have no stuffed shirts, and maybe that exchange is a fair stand-off. The relevant fact is that the urgency of environmental restoration and protection has found initiative and a will to action among young people of Martha's Vineyard.

They are to have a Clean Earth Walk from Vineyard Haven to Oak Bluffs to Edgartown, including the state beach, on April 25, "to pick up litter and demonstrate that man is still capable of locomotion without the internal combustion engine." They also have work projects related to conservation and in particular to the checking of erosion.

"This earth, a spot, a grain, an atom," John Milton wrote in Paradise Lost. We are learning its smallness as well as its greatness, the fact that it can be spoiled, and the fact that it is all we have.

## IN SUPPORT OF POW'S

### HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on May 1 there will again be a "demonstration" in Washington. But, unlike others before it, this gathering of Americans will be unusual in its mood, for it will assemble in support of our American soldiers in Vietnam, rather than against them. On that date, citizens will fill Constitution Hall to honor publicly and pay tribute to those American soldiers held prisoner of war or missing in action in Southeast Asia. In the true American spirit, the participants in the May 1 rally will demonstrate to the wives and other relatives of these men that Americans do care, and show the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong that their conduct toward the men they hold is not condoned by the American public.

Senator BOB DOLE of Kansas, who has secured the aid of a 12-man congressional committee, has been instrumental in and "the moving force" behind the organization of this project. Also, Senator DOLE is coordinating plans for the event with the National League of Families of American Prisoners in Southeast Asia, with veterans' organizations and with interested private citizens, such as H. Ross Perot, the Texas industrialist whose humanitarian and colossal efforts to achieve the release of these Americans is well known.

I have joined with Senator DOLE in promoting this national day of tribute to these deserving Americans who are giving unselfishly of themselves for the preservation of freedom which every true American holds dear. The plight of the POW's and the MIA's is surely one issue on which all Americans should unite, regardless of political persuasion or ideological bent. This is not a partisan matter, for an American soldier in a Communist prison camp languishing in the jungles thousands of miles away is not the responsibility of any one political party or philosophy. He is the concern and responsibility of every U.S. citizen—and indeed of free men anywhere in the world today. He is part of that brotherhood of mankind which unites people of nations all over the globe dedicated to a high standard of human dignity.

It is my fervent hope that public outrage in every peace-loving nation of the world will reach a crescendo of such magnitude that Hanoi adheres to the humane treatment specified for prisoners of war in the Geneva Convention.

Yet, there is another cruel aspect of

this issue which the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong could so easily eliminate by simply releasing information regarding the status of these soldiers. Our cold, calculating enemies are extending their inhumanity to our very shores, for they are toying with the minds of the families of their prisoners. Unfortunately, they are finding it easy and effective to use American citizens sympathetic to their objectives against fellow Americans.

Hanoi must release the names and conditions of the more than 1,450 U.S. servicemen believed held by their forces. The most elemental standards of human decency demand an end to their inhumanity to these men and to their loved ones in the United States. Surely it is not too much to request that they provide an answer for the families of these missing American soldiers who plead repeatedly, "Is he dead or alive?"

## THE 519TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF QUEEN ISABELLA

### HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, April 22 marked the 519th anniversary of the birth of Isabella, Queen of Castile and Aragon, who provided moral and financial support for Columbus' expedition to the New World.

At a time when we in Congress are debating the question of manned space exploration, we would do well to recall Queen Isabella's courage and foresight.

The mayor of Reading, Pa., the Honorable Victor R. H. Yarnell, recently issued a proclamation on this subject. I, therefore, insert Mayor Yarnell's proclamation in the RECORD at this point:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, April 22, 1970 marks the 519th anniversary of the birth of Queen Isabella, dynamic Castillian queen, who through her faith and confidence in Christopher Columbus, gave the civilized world a new dimension; and

Whereas, Queen Isabella, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon, by her support of Columbus in his plans for exploration, earned for herself a unique place in the history of Western civilization; and

Whereas, in her own time, Isabella was a queen noted for her clear intellect, energy, virtue and patriotism; and

Whereas, the qualities of confidence in the future, spirit of adventure with a purpose and sacrifice in the cause of human progress exhibited by Queen Isabella are characteristics worthy of emulation in our twentieth century era of exploration.

Now, therefore, I, Victor R. H. Yarnell, Mayor of the City of Reading, do hereby proclaim April 22, 1970 as Queen Isabella Day in the City of Reading and urge that all citizens, schools, historical and other interested organizations suitably observe this significant event in the history of the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the Seal of the City Reading, Pennsylvania.

VICTOR R. H. YARNELL,
*Mayor.*

## THE RETURN OF L. B. J.

### HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Life magazine, in its current issue, has an outstanding article on a return visit by former President Johnson to Washington.

This is an excellent article, beautifully written by one of the Nation's best wordsmiths, Hugh Sidey.

Because of its interest to my colleagues and the American people, I include the article in the RECORD:

THE PRESIDENCY: THE RETURN OF L. B. J.

(By Hugh Sidey)

As dawn broke on one of those frantic journeys by Lyndon Johnson to the remote parts of Asia several years ago, a group of reporters in a state of total exhaustion encountered Press Secretary George Christian. With what strength they had left they expressed themselves forcefully about the whole mad mission and its leader, the President of the United States. Christian, who was then 40 going on 80, looked back through his own bleary eyes and said very quietly, "When he's gone, you guys are going to miss him."

L.B.J. came back to Washington for a visit the other day and maybe it was just to prove Christian's point. A casual observer of the scene during the week he was here might have wondered just who was President anyway. The papers ran more pictures of him than they did of Nixon. Johnson saw more important men and was quoted at greater length in and out of print than the resident Chief Executive. L.B.J. attended an East Room worship service, had breakfast with Nixon, wandered through the new White House press room casting a skeptical eye on the lush fittings given to those with whom he contended so long, lunched with Secretary of State William Rogers, met with friends from the Senate, walked out onto the floor of the House for handshakes with everybody from pages to Speaker.

The old issues that tormented Johnson's Presidency are of course still matters of bitter debate, but for the time they were put aside. When Lyndon Johnson is taken simply as a man, he is still one of the natural wonders of the world. There cannot be another who was so violently shaped by the conflicting forces that have marked our society in this century. He grew out of the lingering frontier, was thrust into leadership of an urban society, witnessed or participated in more of the nation's history of the past 40 years than any other living man, and accomplished it all with energy of a tornado.

That appealing humaneness came back to the city with him. He arrived like a sultan—limousines, Secret Service agents, aides and secretaries. His suite at the Madison Hotel jangled and clanged and men rushed with whispered, ordered and fretted. The former President brought with him the manuscript of his first presiedntial book. Summoning the pages as if they were a national treasure his former aides and friends, he produced the pages as if they were a national treasure to be savored and of course praised, maybe even corrected. The Washington *Post's* publisher, Katherine Graham, asked him to dinner and the old antagonisms were swept away. For half an hour he huddled in the corner with her son Don Graham, a District of Columbia policeman, asking the young man all about his experiences on the beat, reminiscing about the night Don's father, the late Phil Graham took the 12-year-old boy to visit the Senate when Johnson was majority leader. "That night we ruled the world," L. B. J. chortled.

For four and a half hours he debated with the *Post's* editors about Vietnam, supporting his version by quoting documents, phone calls, conversations with the gusto of an automobile salesman. Summoning the hard core White House correspondents who had followed him for those five White House years, he sat three and a half hours on a sofa in the home of Leonard Marks, former USIA head. The old stories poured out and it was as if he had never yielded the power. There he was again with Kennedy, Ike, McNamara, Rusk, Clifford and the rest. He waved his arms and thumped his listeners, stuck his nose in their faces, laughed and needled. He was "mashing buttons" and sending aircraft carriers and passing bills and still, even in retrospect, he was baffled by his inability to communicate. And as he talked there was the sound and substance of Texas, of land and the small people, the ones he never forgot even in his days of power and wealth and glory. He told how Judge Moursund still refused to be interviewed and how his Austin friends couldn't get a nursing home built even though he offered help from the White House at the last minute. There were more cowboys and small-town merchants and schoolteachers in his conversation than kings and premiers.

While he talked somebody handed him a note and he leaped up to go to the phone as if it were Kosygin on the hot line again. One night he spent half an hour in a corner with Abe Fortas, the two of them rocking with laughter. He conversed for long serious minutes with General Maxwell Taylor, one of his Vietnam advisers. At the home of his former aide Jack Valenti he scooped up Valenti's daughter Courtney, now 6, who squealed just the way she used to, "Oh, there's the Press." A friend went to the Madison and bumped into Johnson thumping down the hall in his pajamas, people scurrying for cover, gawking.

When the evenings got late, Lady Bird would tug at his elbow as she used to and he would ignore her. She would say "Dahlin', it's time to go," and he would say, expansively, "Anybody who wants to leave, can," and order another cup of Sanka.

He tried to convince his listeners that his hair was long in the back simply because he lived 65 miles from a barber and "I can cut it a little up front but I can't see the back."

His cronies gave him plenty of chances to lambaste Nixon but he refused. Somebody wondered if he would have been startled when he was in the Senate by a vote like that for Supreme Court nominee Harrold Carswell. He smiled thinly and changed the subject.

When they asked if he missed Washington and all its people and power and reporters, he looked them in the eye and winked and said, "Yes, but some of it I miss so nice."

Okay, George Christian, wherever you are. You were right. We miss him.

## LAKE ERIE IS NOT DEAD

### HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, human beings have a tendency to exaggerate situations, and this perhaps ties in with the ingenuity that humans have for creativity.

We should caution, however, against letting our imagination run away with itself, for it can cause a cloud to fall on

reality. In such an instance this would interfere with an accurate appraisal of a condition and interfere with its practical consideration.

A case in point is the pollution status of Lake Erie. Mr. Robert J. Bielo, executive director of the Pennsylvania Fish Commission, wrote an article on this subject which appeared in the November 1969, issue of the Pennsylvania Angler magazine. Because this article strives to bring the pollution situation into proper perspective, I insert it in the RECORD and call it to the attention of my colleagues:

LAKE ERIE IS NOT DEAD

A few weeks ago the National Broadcasting Company produced a television program entitled, "Who Killed Lake Erie." Scenes of undescribable filth involving domestic sewage, industrial wastes, trash, rubbish and oil and even a burning river highlighted the story.

The program title implies Lake Erie is dead and presumably those responsible for the condition of pollution shown in the film were its killers.

Actually, Lake Erie isn't dead! In fact it is far from dead and may be emerging once again as an exciting fish producer. This does not change the fact that several million Americans have made a good try at killing this extremely productive lake. Fortunately "killing" a great lake isn't easy and in spite of man's activities the lake has persisted as an important commercial fishing and recreation attraction.

It is pleasing that Pennsylvania is far ahead of Michigan, Ohio, New York and Ontario in cleanup efforts. It now remains for these other shareholders of Lake Erie to add emphasis to their pollution abatement programs and speed the recovery of this lake.

Evidence that Lake Erie is not dead is readily available to anyone who is truly interested in the subject. One of the most obvious forms of this evidence is the abundance of fish life in the lake. Certainly pollution and quite possibly overfishing years ago led to the decline of the famous blue pike and the white fish.

The loss of these extremely valuable species cannot be minimized. Whether or not conditions in the lake will ever again support abundant or even modest populations of these fish only future generations will known. It is tragic but typical that we must destroy natural resources before we truly recognize their value.

Fortunately nature is extremely resilient and Lake Erie is still very much alive and highly productive. Smelt, yellow perch and sheephead have become more abundant in recent years. None of these fish are as desirable as the lost white fish and blue pike, however, their increasing abundance clearly points to a natural shift to accommodate changing environmental conditions within the lake.

The recently introduced coho salmon have for the moment shown great promise as an exciting sport fish that can thrive in Lake Erie. Early returns seem promising and coho fever will no doubt grow as the number of these fighting silver beauties introduced into the lake is increased.

Actually the most important job the coho can do for Lake Erie is to help keep alive public interest in the quality of this lake. Now, while coho fever is high and while public concern for the preservation of our environment runs high, is the time to press for an all out effort to control and abate pollution of this vitally important water resource.

Most of us find little difficulty in recommending the other guy—namely industry—get busy and clean up. Sadly it is a far different story when we personally have to shell out for new and improved sewage treatment plants to handle our own wastes.

Other than a few isolated cases, everyone who isn't on an effective and updated sewage collection and treatment system is a polluter. Now is the time to see if you qualify as a polluter. If so there is no better time than now to get your name and your communities' name off the "polluter" list!

---

## THE LONG, LONG WAIT OF CHIANG KAI-SHEK

**HON. E. Y. BERRY**

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD an article from the September 17, 1969, Christian Science Monitor:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 17, 1969]

THE LONG, LONG WAIT OF CHIANG KAI-SHEK

(By John Hughes)

TAIPEI, TAIWAN.—Bobbing a hundred miles off the coast of mainland China, Taiwan is a poignant reminder of American obligations in Asia. It is a reminder that, though the Vietnam war will end, United States commitments in Asia will not.

Twenty years ago, the bedraggled remnants of the Chinese Nationalist Army forsook the mainland in the face of a continuing Communist onslaught and sought sanctuary on this island, about the size of Massachusetts and Connecticut combined.

Though the prospect of Nationalist divisions storming back onto the mainland is hardly worth considering, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's elderly regime has used its time in exile to turn Taiwan into a showcase of prosperity.

With an annual growth rate of around 10 percent, Taiwan's economy is one of the most prosperous in Asia. So well has it done, that the United States has long since halted economic aid. Foreign investors stream in. Though its population is only 14 million, Taiwan has built its foreign trade to half that of Communist China, despite the mainland's population of more than 700 million.

For security, however, the Chinese Nationalists are dependent upon the United States. Experts say their armed forces of some 600,000 men, currently being modernized and streamlined, would put up a good show against a conventional invasion. But it is the Americans they count on to shield them from Communist China's nuclear-strike capacity.

If the United States is not to abandon its commitment to the Nationalists, the problem of Taiwan will be one of the most vexing for American statecraft and conscience as the Nixon administration gropes for some better understanding with Peking.

COMMITMENT SPELLED OUT

The commitment is no vague one. It is spelled out by written treaty which obliges the United States to come to Taiwan's aid in the event of "armed attack." The treaty is bolstered by a 1955 resolution from the United States Congress authorizing the use of American forces for the "securing and protecting" of Taiwan.

Though the commitment is a firm one, it has not been translated into a massive American military presence on Taiwan.

At least one American picket ship is always on patrol in the Taiwan Strait, between the mainland and Taiwan. But stationed on the island are only 1,000 American Army and 800 Navy personnel. Most of them are advising and training Nationalist China's 400,000-strong Army, and its Navy of ships up to destroyer size.

The bulk of American servicemen on Taiwan are Air Force personnel, numbering around 7,000. Some are training the Chinese Nationalist Air Force, which has been American-equipped with F–100's, F–104's, and F–5A's. But most are involved with Air Force supply operations from bases on Taiwan for the Vietnam war.

When the war ends, many of the Air Force men will leave. Taiwan will also lose its lucrative rest-and-recreation business from Vietnam, whose GIs rate the island more attractive than Japan for their five-day leaves.

But the advisory and training role of the American military mission will presumably go on. Staying on, too, will be the United States Taiwan Defense Command. This is the contingency-planning organization, staffed by some 170 American military men, which, in the event of trouble, would become operational and summon up American ships and planes to Taiwan's defense.

RIPPLES OF ANXIETY

Of late, though, the American commitment is spelled out by treaty, and the command structure for American military assistance is installed, there have been ripples of anxiety through the Chinese Nationalist Government.

On Vietnam, the government's position is one of some ambivalence. On the one hand, American prosecution of the war fits neatly into the pattern of Nationalist leader Chiang Kai-shek's own strident anticommunism. But on the other hand, the principal enemy for the Nationalists is not Hanoi, but Peking. Though they are sophisticated enough to know that it is unlikely to happen, it is toward Peking that they would like to see American militancy directed.

Thus, though the Nationalists are wary of any sellout in Vietnam, President Nixon's decision to start withdrawing American troops has been received here with relative equanimity.

But there is far less equanimity about talk of an American military cutback in such countries as Thailand and the Philippines, and specifically at American air bases in Japan and Okinawa, the latter the nearest that could give aid to Taiwan if trouble should erupt.

Says one government official: "The fate of Okinawa is in doubt, and nobody knows what's going to happen in Japan after the Sato government. If the Americans give back Okinawa to the Japanese, and if the Japanese impose the same restrictions on American bases in Okinawa as they have in Japan, we'll have lost our defense against [Communist] China." (The United States is barred from storing nuclear weapons at Japanese bases and cannot fly combat missions without Japanese approval.)

Warns Yu Ta-wei, Harvard educated and a former defense minister and ordnance expert:

"If the Americans pull back their nuclear bombers from Okinawa to Guam, they'll be 1,400 miles further away. That spells defeat."

SECURITY EMPHASIZED

Thus the Chinese Nationalists are concerned about any American military cutback in the area which would reduce security on their flanks and make them more vulnerable to attack from Communist China, which still trumpets its intention of "liberating" Taiwan.

Parallel to this runs Nationalist anxiety over the prospect of changing American attitudes toward the Chinese Communists. Every time President Nixon or Secretary of State William P. Rogers expresses the desire for better relations with Peking, the political seismograph in Taipei registers a minor

earthquake. The decisions by Canada and Italy to recognize Communist China heighten Nationalist apprehension.

Yet there is considerable confidence that President Nixon, despite his pronounced desire for better relations with Peking, will not sell the Nationalists short. Mr. Nixon has been a favorte here since his militant defense of Quemoy and Matsu in the television debates which took place during his 1960 campaign for the presidency against John F. Kennedy. Quemoy and Matsu are the Nationalist-held islands just a mile-and-a-half off the coast of mainland China, opposite Amoy.

Mr. Nixon's image remains that of a staunch anti-Communist, and the belief is that he will not abandon Taiwan—the price Peking has set—in return for more cordial relations between the United States and mainland China.

Mr. Nixon has visited Taiwan seven times. Says one top Nationalist official:

"We think he understands us better than any American president before him. We know him as a friend. And he's done nothing since assuming office to suggest he has become any less of a friend."

SYMPATHY "COUNTED ON"

The Nationalists also count on the sympathy of the American military establishment. Says Vice-Adm. John L. Chew, chief of the United States Taiwan Defense Command: "I'm personally opposed to recognition of Communist China. I consider it inimical to our defense interests in Southeast Asia."

The other factor from which the Nationalists draw reassurance is the Chinese Communists' lack of response to American overtures. While this frostiness continues, there can be little prospect of rapprochement between Washington and Peking.

But these are fairly short-term considerations. Peking's mood could change. Understandably, the Chinese Nationalists are among the most interested analysts of Chinese Communist intentions.

If new attitudes are developing in Washington, Nationalist China's attitudes are also becoming somewhat more flexible. Officially the goal remains "recovery of the mainland." Nobody publicly questions this. It is the raison d'être of the Nationalist regime. It provides the basis for the legitimacy claimed by the Taipei government—that it is true government of all China, temporarily exiled from the mainland, but will one day return.

ART WORKS STORED

Yet it is a goal blazoned less and less. Some observers believe the disinclination of President Chiang and his son, Defense Minister Chiang Ching-kuo, to see American correspondents these days may in part be due to their reluctance to discuss the "return to the mainland" campaign.

Experts believe that privately President Chiang has accepted the unlikelihood of his leading his Army back to the mainland. Instead he believes that Chinese outside the mainland must wait for political upheaval inside China which might unseat the Maoists.

In the meantime, President Chiang views Taiwan as the guardian of Chinese treasures and tradition. Vast amounts of Chinese pottery, painting, scrolls, and other exquisite works of art were brought out of China by the Nationalists when they left in 1949. Much of this is stored, but some is on view at a splendid museum on the outskirts of Taipei.

President Chiang has also fostered a campaign to revive and maintain classical Chinese studies. The idea is presumably that all this should one day be handed back to China once the frenzy of Maoism has passed.

While his regime appears privately mellowing at home, it pursues a foreign policy aggressive in its goal of asserting the Nationalists' legitimacy and presence.

For a country of only 14 million, Taiwan runs a remarkable technical-assistance program to other countries. More than 1,200 experts from Taiwan are currently assigned to 27 countries, the bulk of them in Africa. Emphasis is on agricultural development, specifically rice production at which the Nationalists are highly proficient.

Distinguished foreigners are sought out and encouraged to visit Taiwan for exposure to the Nationalist government, its achievements, and its leader, President Chiang.

The Nationalists also operate a skilled foreign service, whose diplomats bravely flourish the flag of "free China" (a white sun in a blue sky over a crimson ground) around the world.

EFFECT AT UN WEIGHED

All this has helped preserve Nationalist China's position at the United Nations and has denied entry to Communist China. Last year the vote was 58 to 44 against the Communists, with 23 abstentions. This year the Nationalists expect no serious trouble. Despite Canadian and Italian moves to recognize the Peking regime, the frenzy of the cultural revolution has done little to furbish for the Communists an image of responsibility and statesmanship.

A new dimension to Nationalist China's foreign policy is its cautious contact with the Soviet Union. Anti-Communist feeling remains strong on Taiwan. There is no particular enthusiasm for the Soviets, and nobody suggests that the Nationalists are about to establish diplomatic, or even trade, relations with the Soviets, even in the event that Moscow sought such a relationship.

But in the face of their mutual dislike for Communist China, there has been some cautious gropings between the two countries. Last year a Soviet journalist, Victor Louis, was admitted to Taiwan. During a week's stay he talked with a number of Chinese Nationalist officials, including Defense Minister Chiang Ching-kuo, President Chiang's son. Nationalist officials publicly try to dismiss the incident, terming it devoid of significance. But Mr. Louis is widely believed to have other, more official, status within the Soviet establishment than that of a mere journalist.

Despite denials from both Moscow and Taipei that any accord is being formulated between them, it seems probable that the two are engaged in some exploratory soundings to see whether there is any area exploitable for mutual gain.

THIEU VISIT RECALLED

The fact that the contact irritates Peking may be satisfaction enough in itself for the Chinese Nationalists. Some observers speculate that on the Soviet side, though Moscow is unlikely to abandon its own public championship of Communist China at the United Nations, the aim may be to quietly encourage those supporting Nationalist China in their continued resistance to Peking's admittance.

Hints of Soviet interest in an Asian defense alliance have been quickly picked up in Taipei. Said the English-language China News: "The [Russian] idea of an Asian alliance directed against the Chinese Communists is an interesting development that will be thoughtfully considered in capitals from Washington to Taipei."

The newspaper was swift to add that "while free Asians welcome any increase in anti-Communist vigilance, they are not going to organize any cheering section for a stronger Soviet presence in this region."

But as one high Nationalist official says: "In our eyes, the Peking regime is a rebel regime. We feel entitled to use any means at our disposal to get rid of it."

Such comment may be partly an attempt to stiffen American resolve in Asia and encourage United States support for a new defense alliance of non-Communist states. President Thieu of South Vietnam visited Nationalist China and South Korea earlier this year. Nationalist China's Defense Minister Chiang Ching-kuo was also in South Korea.

This has stimulated some talk of a new regional-defense grouping to include South Vietnam, South Korea, and Nationalist China. The Nationalists admit they are interested. But they are sophisticated enough to know, as one official puts it, "that an alliance of the three divided countries in Asia makes no sense without American support."

With doubt, for the present, over the United States's intentions in Asia after the Vietnam war, and with all kinds of question marks about Japan's role, there seems little real action, but only talk, about such an alliance.

As throughout the past 20 years, the crucial factor for Nationalist China is the mood and fealty of the United States.

However, while these "cosmic" problems, as one Western diplomat calls them, loom over Taiwan, there is nevertheless considerable quiet preoccupation with internal affairs. In some circles there is debate about the stability of Taiwan once President Chiang, now 82, no longer dominates the political scene.

Long tipped as his successor has been his son, Chiang Ching-kuo, the Defense Minister. He controls the armed forces, the security apparatus, as well as the youth movement and veterans' organization. In terms of real power there seems not much doubt that he is strongly positioned to take over from his father.

But he has not been installed as vice-president, and the constitutional procedure requires that the present incumbent of that office, Yen Chia-ken, succeed to the presidency. There is also among veteran Nationalist politicians a strong republican current, and opposition to the concept of dynastic succession.

QUESTIONS UNANSWERED

Should Chiang Ching-kuo overcome these obstacles and succeed to the leadership in title as well as fact, there are unanswered questions about his style and intentions. Though President Chiang is still a legendary figure who can claim, whatever the validity of his present position, to have once represented China, his son has no such standing.

Moreover, the bulk of Taiwan's 14 million are local inhabitants upon whom the exiles from the mainland have imposed their authority. With some exceptions, like Taipei's ebullient Mayor, Kao Yu-shu, local inhabitants have not been permitted to rise high in the Nationalist administration or Army. For them, Chiang Ching-kuo is an unknown quantity. Will he clamp down on them, or seek to draw more locals into the government?

What does seem assured is that Chiang Ching-kuo, or whoever succeeds his father, will inherit an economy buoyant and expanding.

Last year saw a growth rate of more than 10 percent in gross national product. Per capita income was up by more than 7 percent to $237 per person. Exports increased by a remarkable 25 percent. However, a good slice of this was made up of textiles, and aware of possible restrictions on the American market, Taiwan is seeking to diversify.

If problems there are, they are problems of success. Taiwan now must expand and consolidate the infrastructure to cope with all this prosperity. Thus harbors and airports are being expanded. Electric-power output is to be doubled in 8–10 years, and Chinese buyers are even now negotiating for a nuclear-power plant.

With all the bustle even the traditional pedicabs have been outlawed from Taipei's streets and replaced with hundreds of small taxis. The only pedicabs being built now are for export—to the United States.

## PRESIDENT REMAINS HOOKED ON VIETNAMIZATION POLICY

### HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, as I have listened and questioned the various aspects of our overseas commitments in the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee of which I am a member, I have become increasingly concerned over the disparate appraisals over the success of failure of the "Vietnamization" effort. I am now in the process of sorting out the validity of these interpretations.

An article by Mr. Joseph Kraft that recently appeared in the Washington Post raises some interesting questions about our overall strategy in attempting to liquidate our Vietnam commitment. The ability to secure a negotiated settlement to the war still remains a central feature of the Nixon plan. Mr. Kraft quite perceptively points out that the present regime in South Vietnam has, because of the drawn-out troop withdrawal schedule recently announced by the President, very little incentive to widen its political base or enter into active negotiations.

I have consistently pressed for a settlement negotiated by the Vietnamese themselves. I sincerely hope that the scenario suggested by Mr. Kraft will prove to be incorrect. Yet I feel that the Members of Congress and readers of the RECORD should read this article, entitled "President Remains Hooked on Vietnamization Policy" and I would like to insert this article at this point:

PRESIDENT REMAINS HOOKED ON VIETNAMIZATION POLICY

(By Joseph Kraft)

"A political settlement is the heart of the matter," President Nixon said in his latest nationwide address on Vietnam. And that belated recognition marks an advance in the public rhetoric.

But not nearly enough of an advance to justify the enthusiastic reception. For neither Mr. Nixon nor his chief adviser, Henry Kissinger, have yet faced up to the logic of a political settlement. They are condemned to do just what they have been doing all along because they have not acted to promote in Saigon the change required to engage the other side.

The rhetorical gain should not be minimized. The President cast decisively away the favorite horror stories of his predecessors. There was not a word of dominoes falling from Japan through Indonesia. Not a whisper about a billion Chinese armed with Nukes. Still less about a test between us and the Communist world.

Banishing the specter of sampans sailing triumphantly under the Golden Gate Bridge made it possible to localize the issue. Mr. Nixon took a new step toward legitimizing the local South Vietnamese insurgents, or Vietcong, by asserting—for the first time, I think—that they were present at the Paris talks "as one of the parties to the negotiations." He strongly implied that the big question—"what the fighting in Indochina has been about over the past 30 years"—was simply who ruled on the spot.

Which is indeed the trouble. The Saigon regime of President Nguyen Van Thieu is a narrow militaristic regime, determined to wipe out the insurgents and to repress the legitimate internal opposition. As long as Saigon is ruled by this group, the other side is going to keep on fighting—in South Vietnam if it can and in Cambodia and Laos if necessary. Weapons will be downed, fighting eased only if there is some sign of evolution away from the Thieu regime.

For as anybody who talks to them senses immediately, the leaders of the other side have come to entertain the deepest suspicions of American purpose. In the marrow of their bone they believe this country talks peace in order to disarm them while waging a war to maintain a puppet regime in Saigon. They truly think, as the North Vietnamese party secretary, Le Duan, said in Moscow on the Lenin anniversary, that: "Nixon's group still stubbornly carries on an aggressive war against South Vietnam trying to deceive American and world opinion with phrases about peace."

Engaging the other side in serious negotiation requires a demonstration that political settlement is subject to a wider influence than that of the Thieu regime. There is a need to show that fighting is not the only way to achieve change in Saigon.

One means to that end is to broaden the government itself through addition of more representative figures. Another, suggested by Professor Roger Fisher of the Harvard Law School, is to invite a group of representative South Vietnamese to come forward as advisers to the American peace delegation in Paris where they could quickly get together with the other side in an all-Vietnamese clambake.

But plainly these changes can only be made if the United States is willing to put pressure on the Saigon regime. That pressure is not going to be applied while Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker continues to serve in Saigon. For he believes in the present regime with all the fervor of a puritan soul.

Nor is the pressure going to be applied if the President stretches out the troop withdrawal as he seems to have done. With a sure guarantee that all American ground forces will not be withdrawn until at least 1971, President Thieu does not have any great incentive to make concessions to those who would cut themselves a deal with the other side.

The fact is that Mr. Nixon has only talked about political settlement. He has not moved to meet the other side's minimal conditions for a settlement. He thinks he can force acceptance of his terms. And so he is still hooked on the policy of Vietnamization, a perilous policy that casts the United States in the image of a gambler who quits a losing game by backing out, pistols drawn while threatening to plug the first hombre that makes a false move.

## "THE POLITICS OF PARANOIA"

### HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the mid-April issue of the Spivack Report contains a thoughtful and reasoned article concerning the current attacks on the U.S. Supreme Court. I particularly call to the attention of my colleagues the warning contained therein against the spirit of revenge. This seems to be the dominant factor in what Robert G. Spivack's newsletter terms "The Politics of Paranoia" in describing the "low politics" involving the High Court. The article follows:

THE POLITICS OF PARANOIA

MR. NIXON AND THE CARSWELL CASE

Why, when a moderate conservative like Judge Harry A. Blackmun was available, did President Nixon choose G. Harrold Carswell for the U.S. Supreme Court? That's the question that mystifies Nixon-watchers still trying to understand the new President and his modus operandi.

The first answer that suggests itself is that he had political debts to pay. Then there was the question of how to undercut the Wallace-for-President movement. While the zanies of the lunatic Left have been the secret weapon of Republican right-wingers, George Wallace has posed a serious threat. After all he did get 10,000,000 votes—more than any third party candidate in U.S. history. So the selection of Judge Clement Haynsworth, a sometime friend of Sen. Strom Thurmond, made some sense. But G. Harrold Carswell? He was, in fact, closer to Sen. Richard Russell than to any Southern Republican. One of his most loyal supporters, Sen. Robert Dole of Kansas, said that Carswell's credentials were so thin that even "if he had come from Maine" he would have had difficulty being confirmed.

Why, after the defeat, did tne President come down so hard on the Senate even causing those who backed Carswell to pull back in amazement? Of course, there was and is a great deal of hypocrisy in both houses of Congress. Few of the Senators who were shocked by Haynsworth's apparent conflicts of interest could bear as close an examination of their own business connections. Many of those who shied away from Carswell's brand of "racism" themselves belong to country clubs where the only blacks are the hired help.

But for a President to accuse Senators of hypocrisy? It's not done, if only because their capacity for revenge is unlimited. Lyndon Johnson would not have made such a blunder, if it turns out to be a blunder. Why did Richard Nixon do it?

There undoubtedly are many explanations for the President's behavior since the Carswell episode. Even in the simplistic atmosphere that now pervades Washington there is no single explanation for Mr. Nixon's miscalculation in the Carswell case, nor for the Senate's rejection of Haynsworth on rather flimsy grounds. Since Judge Blackmun appears to have the necessary qualifications and is very likely to be confirmed there is an inclination in many quarters to let bygones be by-gones, say that all's well that ends well and forget about the Administration-Senate confrontation.

But the President's selection of Carswell and his reaction in the face of a major legislative defeat require analysis if only as a clue to future White House behavior now that Mr. Nixon's political honeymoon is over and the first shots have been fired in the political wars of 1970 and 1972.

THE HIGH COURT AND LOW POLITICS

The Justices of the Supreme Court have no constituency. No matter whether it was FDR and "the Nine Old Men" or RN opposing the "permissiveness" of the Warren Court, the Court is usually a safe target. There is always a residue of discontent with its decisions whether they concern civil rights, crime or litigation that simply involves money matters.

Republicans of almost all persuasions have long been convinced that there was political mileage to be made by attacking the court. That's why they jumped so hard on Justice Abe Fortas. They got him on the Wolfson matter. But they were after him long before that because he was LBJ's friend. When the former President proposed him as Chief Justice they had a ready-made issue, cronyism. The fact that Fortas was one of the ablest lawyers ever to serve on the Court, that he was a scholar and that he had a high sense

of propriety notwithstanding the Wolfson indiscretion did not matter.

For Mr. Nixon and those in his wing of the G.O.P. the Court has long been a useful whipping boy. Fortas preferred not to be whipped. But once he gave ground and stepped down there was no restraining the primitives. They had tasted blood and they liked it.

In many ways the fight over Carswell was a lawyers' fight. Justice Fortas' friends were active in the background. When Mr. Nixon recommended Haynsworth they could hardly wait to make the point about conflict of interest. When organized labor made known its unhappiness with his decision that was the end for the South Carolinian.

Mr. Nixon then went in for a kind of revenge of his own. If the Senate would not take a Haynsworth then he would jam a Carswell down their throats. Since Carswell had the support of such an eminent Democrat as Georgia's Russell it seemed the President could not lose. Moreover organized labor, still worried about possible repercussions from the Haynsworth affair, backed off at first from another collision with The White House. Civil rights leaders were told "We're tired" when asked why they did not mount a campaign against Mr. Nixon's No. 2 choice.

Why, though, did Mr. Nixon prefer to fight on after the vote was taken, why did he feel he had to have the last word? The answer most often suggested is that he received more poor advice from the Attorney General, whose staff work had already proved deficient. Probably this was a factor. But equally important was Mr. Nixon't own feeling that there was political capital to be made out of the Senate's action and that playing the politics of paranoia was the best way to do it.

The argument that this Senate would never confirm a conservative Southerner was particularly flimsy and coming from a Californian may have seemed patronizing to some Southerners. There were in the Senate itself two Southerners who would have been confirmed without delay, segregationists, but highly competent lawyers, Sen. John Stennis of Mississippi and Sen. Sam Ervin Jr. of North Carolina. For his own reasons the President would not nominate either man.

THE DOUGLAS CASE AND OTHER DIVERSIONS

Once politicians begin playing politics with the Court they never seem to know when to stop. The time to stop is before the practice ever starts. That's what a President should be saying, not indulging in the practice himself. There was very little demonstration of statesmanship on the part of Haynsworth's opponents and it was equally absent on the part of Carswell's partisans.

Now, with obvious White House sanction if not actual encouragement, the spirit of revenge for Carswell is being demonstrated by a kind of congressional lynching bee organized against Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas.

To be perfectly candid about it Justice Douglas has not acted with judicial restraint or detachment in many areas, personal and public. But to begin the kind of "trial" that Rep. Gerald Ford seems to be urging is to engage in the kind of harassment carried on by The Chicago Seven, who admit their purpose was to give Judge Julius Hoffman a heart attack. The Republican aim appears to be to whip up public sentiment from now until November so that "the issue" of 1970 is the Court. That some Democrats have played the same game in reverse makes it no better.

But it's going to take some respected public figure outside The White House to restore a measure of sanity to debate about the Court and to get partisans on all sides to cool it. Possibly the confirmation of Judge Blackmun will serve that purpose.

## LENIN'S BIRTHDAY IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CELEBRATED BY FIFTH COLUMN AND CIA

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's leading Red gossip newspaper carried a high society report this morning of the some 1,500 comrades and friends who jammed the Soviet Embassy here in Washington to participate in the 100th birthday celebration of the nortorious Bolshevik butcher, Vladimir Ilych Lenin. Among the notables in attendance was Harry A. Kissinger, special assistant to President Nixon; Mrs. Majorie Merriweather Post; daughter of Dr. Linus Pauling, announced winner of the International Lenin Peace Prize, and none other than the distinguished Senator from Arkansas who feels that the existence of a Communist conspiracy is but a myth.

To those who were present, with full knowledge and acceptance for the responsibility for their actions—or under orders—there is no need to show their participation as an act of disloyalty against humanity.

To those in attendance who may have been duped or seeking a controversial thrill, I insert the article "Truth About Lenin—His Lack of Humanity; His Cruelty; the Myth of His Leadership; His Sickness," written by another international socialist, Alexander Kerensky, and related articles following my remarks:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 23, 1970]

LENIN'S BIRTHDAY PARTY

(By Dorothy McCardle)

The top of the staircase at the Soviet Embassy was dominated by a larger-than-life portrait of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin last night as 1,500 guests jammed the second-floor reception rooms at the biggest birthday party ever held there.

Lenin, regarded as the father of Communist Russia, would have been 100 years old. He died in 1924 after serving as Soviet Prime Minister for seven years.

"We regard Lenin as you Americans regard George Washington," said a Soviet official.

There was an arrangement of flowers beneath his portrait. Directly ahead of his sober gaze were illuminated color views of Russia as it looks today.

Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, special assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, represented the Nixon administration and was center of attention.

He was surrounded by foreign diplomats and held an earnest conversation with the ambassadors of Pakistan and Chile. Amused by all the attention, he said he was enjoying his reputation as a ladies' man these days.

"I don't have to work nearly so hard to get a lady's attention," he said with tongue-in-cheek fun. "Two years ago, before I got this reputation as a swinger, I was much more resistible. Now, it's great to be irresistible."

Watching him with fascinated interest across one of the long buffet tables was Mrs. Barcley Kamb, wife of a geophysicist from California's Technology Institute in Pasadena. Linda Kamb is the daughter of Dr. Linus Pauling, the noted chemist who was announced as a winner of the International Lenin Peace Prize over the weekend.

When Mrs. Kamb learned the identity of Dr. Kissinger, she went in search of him. But she missed him in the huge crowd.

"I knew he must be somebody interesting," she said. "He looks so interesting, and everybody was so interested in him."

The slim young Mrs. Kamb with long red hair was a guest at the party through chance. She and her husband had been with her father when he learned of the Lenin award in San Francisco on Saturday. Then the Kambs flew here for a geophysical conference. She went to the Soviet Embassy yesterday morning to learn more about the Lenin Prize and how her father will receive it. After she identified herself, she and her father does not have to go to Moscow to receive the award. It can be presented to him here at the Soviet Embassy by the ambassador.

Soviet Ambassador and Mrs. Anatoliy F. Dobrynin missed the party because they are back in Moscow. But they are expected back in time for the May 8 reception at the Embassy which will celebrate the 25th anniversary of the Soviet Union's victory over Nazi Germany.

The Soviet charge d' affaires, Julv M. Vorontsov, the minister counselor, headed the receiving line of embassy officials. They greeted Marjorite Merriweather Post, who was there with her daughter, Mrs. Leon Barzin, of Paris, and her longtime Palm Beach friend, retired banker Duncan Annan.

Sen. and Mrs. J. William Fulbright and Sen. Stuart Symington represented Capitol Hill.

Dr. Howard Mitchell, who is retiring as conductor of the National Symphony Orchestra, said that he will go to Russia for the month of November as guest conductor of several Soviet orchestras as a part of the celebration of Lenin's centennial year.

This was a birthday party without Western birthday cake and candles, but two long buffet tables were laden with all kinds of Russian delicacies. These ranged from caviar to rolls stuffed with seasoned ground meat (the Soviet hamburger), to salmon, salads and cabbage prepared by several different recipes. Drinks for every taste were served at several bars, from vodka to gin to plain orange juice. By the end of the party, every platter was empty, as if a hungry army had swept through.

---

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 22, 1970]

RUSSIANS AT LENIN FETE HEAR CUBAN, VIET THANKS FOR ARMS

Moscow.—Cuban and Viet Cong leaders opened the celebration of the Lenin centenary today by thanking the Russians for the guns, fuel and money needed to defend themselves against Americans.

Cuban President Osvaldo Dorticos told 6,000 persons in the Kremlin Hall of Congresses that the Soviet Union stood by Cuba in the struggle against imperialism, an obvious allusion to the United States.

"When imperialism began preparing armed aggression against us, we began receiving free of charge from the Soviet Union weapons to secure our defenses," Dorticos said.

"When imperialism tried to paralyze our economy by cutting its fuel supply, the Soviet Union gave us an uninterrupted supply," he said. "When imperialism closed its markets to our sugar, the Soviet Union decided to buy it."

VIET CONG GRATEFUL

Ho Xuan Son, representing the Viet Cong, praised the Russians for "rendering effective, tremendous help to the Vietnamese people who are fighting against American imperialism."

Romanian President Nicolae Ceausescu called for freedom within communism and reconciliation of differences between Communist nations. He did not specifically men-

tion Red China, but referred to the problems created by the Sino-Soviet feud.

"Lenin saw in Marxism not a collection of dogma . . . but living instructions for action," he said. "Considering that what unites the Communist parties is more powerful and far above the divergencies among them, our party promotes relations with all fraternal parties." He stressed the word "all."

Ceausescu has refused to join the Soviet-led attack on China.

The gathering in the Kremlin's modernistic hall was the largest assembly of Communist parties ever held.

EXCITEMENT MISSING

The city was decorated with red banners and last night a giant portrait of Lenin, the hero of the 1917 Russian revolution, swung high over Red Square suspended from a balloon in the gleam of spotlights.

After months of overpowering exhortations in the press, on radio, in the movie theaters and on television urging Soviet citizens to follow Lenin's precepts, there was little real excitement evident.

The Communist Chinese and their European ally, Albania, were not invited, but there were representatives from 12 Communist nations and party representatives from 66 non-Communist countries.

A surprise member of the audience was Soviet First Deputy Foreign Minister Vasily V. Kuznetsov, who heads the Soviet negotiating team seeking a border settlement with the Chinese in Peking.

The talks have been dragging on, with no announced results, since last October.

---

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 22, 1970]

"BIGGEST" SOVIET ARMADA REPORTED IN NORTH SEA

LONDON.—British ships and aircraft turned to the North Atlantic today to keep tabs on what the Defense Ministry described as the biggest armada of Soviet ships ever seen there.

A ministry spokesman said 90 Soviet ships, including eight guided missile destroyers, 25 submarines and dozens of intelligence trawlers, massed in the North Sea off Scotland yesterday.

"It appears to be part of a worldwide Soviet naval exercise to coincide with the Lenin centenary," the spokesman said.

He said the exercise was code-named Ocean and Russian ships were staging a show of force in several seas, including the Mediterranean and the Pacific.

"The Soviet Union gave us advance warning they would be holding naval exercises in the North Atlantic until the end of May, but we did not expect to see so many ships," the spokesman said.

"As far as we know, it is the largest build-up of Russian ships seen so far in the North Atlantic," he said.

He said a Royal Navy minesweeper, two frigates, two survey ships and two patrol aircraft had been sent to shadow the Russian maneuvers.

"We regard the operation as nothing more than a formal exercise by the Soviet Union, but we are keeping watch as a matter of course," the spokesman said.

---

[From the Sunday Telegraph, Apr. 19, 1970]

THE TRUTH ABOUT LENIN—HIS LACK OF HUMANITY; HIS CRUELTY; THE MYTH OF HIS LEADERSHIP; HIS SICKNESS

(By Alexander Kerensky)

Tsar Nicholas II of Russia abdicated on March 15, 1917, and thus brought to an end the monarchy which had ruled Russia for many centuries. But it was not until November 7 of the same year that the Bolsheviks under Lenin finally seized and set up the Soviet regime which has ruled Russia ever since.

In the intervening eight months Russia was ruled by a Provisional Government—the only one in all the country's troubled history which can be said to have enjoyed a measure of genuine popular support and to have tried to realise some at least of the political and social ambitions of the people of Russia. By far the most important figure in that Government, and its Prime Minister from July onwards, was Alexander Kerensky, a young lawyer of deep Socialist and humanist convictions and a brilliant orator.

The Russian revolution of November, 1917, was partly the outcome of a personal battle between Lenin and Kerensky. Lenin won the battle and went on to rule Russia until his early death in 1924. Kerensky evaded the Bolsheviks, went into hiding and eventually arrived in London early in 1918. He finally settled in New York, where, at the age of 88, he still lives in an apartment filled with mementoes of his last political battle, fought out more than half a century ago.

On April 22 the centenary of Lenin's birth will be celebrated in Russia with all the pomp of which the Soviet regime is capable. For months the Soviet Press has been filled with articles extolling Lenin's virtues and achievements. Communists from all over the world will assemble in Moscow to join in the celebration. U.N.E.S.C.O. has even found it possible to hold a symposium as a tribute to Lenin's memory.

April 22 is also by a strange coincidence the birthday of Alexander Kerensky. (Perhaps even stranger is the fact that he and Lenin were born in the same Siberian town. Simbirsk, now known as Ulyanovsk after Lenin's family name.) He seldom makes public statements these days. But last week he agreed to accept a commission from *The Sunday Telegraph* to give his own personal appraisal of Lenin, the man who beat him and in so doing destroyed the dreams of the Russian liberals.

The following is his article in his own words. The annotation in brackets is by David Floyd.

Two years ago U.N.E.S.C.O.'s general conference authorised an international symposium as a tribute to Lenin's work for mankind. In March, 1969, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, welcoming this symposium, hailed Lenin as a "prominent humanist" and lauded his practical and theoretical contributions in the cause of economic, social and cultural rights. The symposium is under way in Tampere, Finland, as part of the Lenin centenary celebrations.

I write to refute the spate of generalisations and panegyrics regarding Lenin's alleged contributions to human progress and freedom. The words used in describing Lenin have simply been taken from Moscow's *Pravda* and *Izvestia*, from the mouths of Communists who, unable to live without God, are attempting to make a god out of Lenin. These hagiographers are professional propagandists. It is time for the truth about Lenin to be stated unequivocally.

Lenin was never either a humanist or a lover of freedom. He was a cruel man.

Once he assumed power in October, 1917 [November in the Western calendar], he continued to apply the methods he had developed in the underground: dictatorial control, terror and destruction. Intolerant of any opposition, he put to death over a thousand persons in the first few months of his regime. He took over personal direction of the terror, scribbling note after note to Dzerzhinsky—the first head of the C.H.E.K.A. (secret police)—naming the persons he selected to have put out of the way. Dora Kaplan's assassination attempt, the Green Revolution and the Kronstadt Revolt led Lenin to even greater excesses of terror and in 1921, at the Tenth Congress, he introduced the principle of a monolithic Communist party which would harbour no factions or dissent.

[In August 1918 Dora Kaplan approached Lenin as he was leaving a public meeting in Moscow and fired three shots point-blank at him. One bullet pierced his neck and another his collarbone. The bullet in the neck was not removed until 1922; the other remained in his body until his death.

The Kronstadt Revolt took place in March 1921 among the sailors of the Russian Baltic Fleet. It was a revolt against the new autocracy established by Lenin. The rebels demanded the restoration of basic freedoms and democratic institutions. The revolt was put down with great brutality by a hastily assembled military force led by Trotsky.]

The period of War Communism (1917–21) was a reign of terror, disorganisation and destruction of all institutions and liberties. Above all, Lenin had no sense of statesmanship, nor could he have. He did not care for Russia. To him Russia was but a stepping-stone on the path to world revolution. Under his aegis, the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk with the Kaiser's Germany reduced Russia to a minor power. It remained for others to undo the havoc perpetrated by Lenin on the Russian land and peoples.

THE AUTOPSY—AND WHAT IT REVEALED

Lenin arrived in Russia in 1917 already with a deteriorating central nervous system—a condition caused by syphilis which he contracted in 1903. This diagnosis had been made by a London doctor, whose name I cannot disclose, to whom Lenin turned for advice about the headaches and insomnia from which he suffered during the Second Congress of the Social Democratic party. Henceforth, Lenin lived in constant awareness of the incurable disease which would eventually leave him demented. The autopsy performed on Lenin in 1924 by a commission of doctors in Moscow revealed that more than half of his brain was destroyed.

It is only as a sick man that Lenin can be understood, and when one speaks of sick people one does not condemn them, but rather, views them with compassion.

[The allegation that Lenin contracted syphilis at some stage of his life has been bandied around for many years but never proved. Despite the extensive research that has been carried out into his life since his death and the many biographies that have appeared in recent years, the allegation remains unsubstantiated. It is very unlikely that it is capable of proof, even if Mr. Kerensky were to reveal the evidence of the unnamed London doctor whom Lenin is said to have consulted in 1903.]

AS A BOY, SECRETIVE AND BROODING

I cannot say much about Lenin's early life, because, although we were born in the same town and our families were acquainted, I did not know him. After the death of Lenin's father, Ulyanov, my father virtually became the family's guardian. He helped the widow and the children and personally intervened on Lenin's behalf on two occasions: first, to obtain university admission for him after the execution of his brother and, then again, after Lenin's expulsion from Kazan University, to obtain admission to the University of St. Petersburg.

[Lenin's brother, Alexander, was four years older than he. He belonged to the anti-monarchist party known as the People's Will and in 1882 he volunteered for the job of assassinating Tsar Alexander III. The conspiracy was exposed and he was arrested in 1887 and executed.]

From my recollections of family conversations, Lenin was described as a secretive boy, brooding, and without close friends. But he studied hard and earned good marks. The abnormalities in his character did not become apparent until 1903, when he was stricken with the dread disease for which at that time there was no full cure. Cognisant of this Lenin turned his energies to splitting the Social Democratic party in order to carve for

himself a path to power through tight, organisational control.

I remember when I heard Lenin speak at the First All-Russian Congress of the Soviets and the Front-Line Organisations on June 1, 1917—it was our only encounter and it has remained indelible in my memory. Lenin was advocating the deposition and arrest of ten Ministers, myself included.

"Down with the ten capitalist Ministers and everything will be splendid!" he cried. Everyone present roared with laughter. At this reaction, Lenin picked up his briefcase and left the auditorium.

My speech followed his and, addressing myself to the Bolsheviks in general and to Lenin in particular, I said: "Be careful! Out of this chaos, like a phoenix out of the ashes, there will come a dictator—and it will not be me. . . . You are recommending childish prescriptions—arrest, kill, destroy! Who are you—Socialists, or police of the old regime?"

It was clear to me already then that Lenin's only interest was the assumption of dictatorial powers and I did not forget the record of the Bolsheviks under the Tsarist regime when their members worked hand in glove with the dreaded *Okhranka*—the secret police. Several members of their Central Committee were, in fact, agents of the secret police and they used their special powers freely to arrest, suppress and destroy the Liberals, Leftists, Socialists and other progressive-minded people who were not allied to the Bolsheviks.

TO KNOW HIM, KNOW THOSE WHO LED HIM

Lenin's "April Theses" and his book "State and Revolution", both produced in 1917, already clearly showed the workings of his mind. Even members of his own Bolshevik party were at that time aghast at the destructive, anarchistic streak in his writings and called these "the ravings of a madman."

But to appraise Lenin's works, it is not enough to label them the ravings of a madman. Nor should the error be compounded by depicting his writings, as is the fashion today, as the product of a genius.

To understand Lenin, one must first discard the myth of his leadership in Russia. Before his arrival in 1917 he was absent for a full decade and was virtually unknown to the masses at large. By admirers and detractors alike, little or no attention has been paid to those who led Lenin—to those who influenced his thoughts and who actually directed his actions—but the fact is that all his life there were others behind him. To know Lenin, in short, is to know who those others were.

In Lenin's adolescence it was his elder brother, Alexander, who was later hanged for the assassination attempt on Tsar Alexander III.

In his university days at Kazan Lenin fell under the sway of a fellow-student extremist, Fedoseyev. In exile in Siberia, he followed Struve—one of the founders of the Russian Social Democratic party—and later, in Switzerland, he joined Plekhanov, whom he idolised. After the 1905 revolution his alter-ego was Malinowsky, who was at the same time an agent of the Tsarist secret police, a member of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik party and a representative in the Fourth Duma (Parliament).

Subsequently, it was Dr. Helfand (alias Parvus), a member of the German Social Democratic party and an agent of the German Government, who directed Lenin's actions and thoughts. To Parvus belongs the idea of a permanent revolution and it was he who arranged for Lenin's passage to Russia in 1917. A go-between, Fürstenberg (alias Ganetsky), provided the vast German funds, negotiated by Parvus, to subsidize the destruction of Russia from within.

Equally ignored by admirers and detractors of Lenin are those from whom his so-called "original" ideas were taken. His writings on imperialism were taken directly from Hobhouse. [L. T. Hobhouse, born in Cornwall in 1864, was a philosopher and sociologist whose writings revealed a strong sympathy for collectivism. From 1907 until his death in 1929 he was Professor of Sociology at London University. One of his works was "Democracy and Reaction" (1904), in which he protested at imperialism.] Again, Lenin's dictum on converting the imperialist war into civil war was taken from the Italian Social Democrats. His innovation in organisational tactics was taken from Nechaev—a Nihilist-terrorist who advocated violence and a network of conspiratorial cells as the road to power.

If there was one "idea" that was Lenin's own—it was his lust for power. He craved power, all power, and at all costs—and not only in Russia. His "idea" was to become the supreme leader of the world, through a world revolution—for which he was willing to sacrifice generations of Russian peoples, treating them as fodder.

Building on Lenin's terroristic methods and on Lenin's idea of a monolithic party, Stalin sharpened the organisational tools to elevate himself to undisputed and unchallengeable power through wholesale destruction of party members and leaders on a scale hitherto unknown in history. Glorifying Lenin's memory, as Lenin before him glorified Marx's, he pronounced himself their successor and initiated a cult of his own personality. But, unlike Lenin, Stalin was a statesman. During the war he restored the Church and harnessed Russian patriotism for the defeat of Germany and the restoration of the boundaries of the Russian Empire.

The future Russia, however, will never be comparable either to the autocracy or to the empires of the past. It will grow into a commonwealth of free and independent peoples—a path and a vision by which my Government was guided in 1917.

FACTS THAT CANNOT BE CONCEALED

The history of the Russian people has been one straight beam—an arrow—towards freedom, and this cannot be bent. The invasion by the Mongols in the thirteenth century; the conquest by the Poles in the sixteenth century; the "Times of Trouble" in the seventeenth century and the disaster that Lenin wrought in 1917—all are but episodes which the Russian people had to endure and each of which they have overcome. They will overcome Leninism, too. Russia has had a glorious past and glorious personages to revere and love before whom Lenin stands but as a warped, maimed caricature with a demented mind.

Already the cult of personality has been officially denounced. Already Stalin's body has been ejected from the Mausoleum. Already some facts can no longer be concealed, even about Lenin, and terror has been denounced. It remains for the whole truth about Lenin to become known and the criminality of Bolshevism to be exposed for the rest of the edifice—the cult of personality and the cult of a monolithic party that dictates a single interpretaton of truth, nationally, internationally and on every level of personal existence—to crumble.

I may not live to see Russia realise her destiny as a free, humane country with its people dedicated to the betterment of mankind. But you may see it, and certainly your children will. Russia can never be destroyed—from within or from without—and all those who attempt to do so will be doomed to failure. It is with this faith in the Russia that I know and love that I am able to depart in peace.

---

TWO MOMENTS WHEN KERENSKY MIGHT HAVE STOPPED LENIN

(By David Floyd)

When I asked Alexander Kerensky a few years ago to tell me something about the Bolshevik leaders he knew he said: "I would much prefer not to talk about them at all. People always think my views are determined simply by the fact that they overthrew me and my Government." Today it is difficult to avoid the impression that his views of Lenin are coloured by the fact that he was the loser in the battle of 1917.

In our earlier talk Kerensky gave a fairly balanced view of Lenin and Trotsky. "Lenin was a great force, but a negative force, and he was a fanatic. Trotsky was simply a man who was out to make a career for himself; he was very self-centered."

Lenin's strength, he said, lay in his "utter amorality." "Lenin drew all the moral conclusions from the formula that there is no God. I consider that a man without conscience, without the feeling that there is a higher force with which he must reckon, is nothing but a monkey with a human brain. That's a frightening force."

But, I asked Kerensky, surely Lenin enjoyed a certain popularity?

"Of course he did—very considerable popularity in certain circles. But the main thing was—and this is what everyone forgets—that Lenin and all the others wouldn't have lasted a single day in Russia if they had said, as Hitler said 20 years later, 'I am making use of your democratic machine because I loathe democracy and intend to destroy it.'

"Lenin acted the part of the consistent democrat. He accused me of not wanting to permit the Constituent Assembly to meet, of being ready to surrender to the Germans, and of God knows what else. But when his comrades wrote to him in Finland to tell him their doubts about the wisdom of organising a revolt and to suggest that it would be better to wait for elections and a new Constituent Assembly he told them that only fools could think like that. The Assembly would be anti-Bolshevik, he said—there could be no question of waiting for it. As for the soviets, he called them a good weapon for seizing power which would afterwards become a useless toy."

As Prime Minister, Kerensky was in a position in the summer of 1917 to arrest Lenin and perhaps to have put an end to the possibility of a Bolshevik victory. I asked him why he didn't do so.

"You see, I was at the front at the time, unfortunately. All the information necessary for his arrest was in our hands and the arrest should have been made at the very beginning of July.

ARREST AVOIDED

"But when, in my absence, the July uprising began, one of the closest collaborators of the Minister of Justice handed some documents over to the journalists and Lenin got to know about what was planned. Moreover he was tipped off by one of our own officials that he already had a warrant out for his arrest. So he fled."

"Otherwise you would have arrested him?" I asked.

"Of course—all the others who stayed in Petersburg were arrested. But there is a more serious charge which can be laid against us and against me in particular. That is: why didn't we arrest Lenin at the moment of his arrival from exile in Switzerland?"

Kerensky supplied the answer to his own question:

"The reason was that we thought the fact of Lenin's being able to travel across Germany [in the 'sealed train'] would be sufficient in itself to compromise him. And when the question was raised in the Provisional Government the War Minister said he had no means of stopping the train at the frontier."

So Lenin remained at liberty, and within a matter of months had toppled Kerensky's Government and installed himself in power. Kerensky attributed his defeat to a combination of many factors; the war situation and the consequent confusion, the Germans' support for the Bolsheviks, the Allies' uncertainty, Lenin's skillful exploitation of the

situation, and finally the revolt against the Government led by General Kornilov. "So there arose a situation in Russia where the Government was being attacked from two sides, from the Left and from the Right," Kerensky explained. It was an impossible task for any man.

Did he feel he had done his best at the time?

"Of course, I don't want to say that, in such conditions, we didn't make mistakes. But the revival of the Bolshevik movement and its final victory could have been avoided if it had been a struggle between two forces—the Russian democratic Government with the Western democracies on one side and Lenin along with Ludendorff [German Chancellor] on the other.

"If I had known then that certain very influential people abroad—I won't name any names—were going to encourage Kornilov, then I should have behaved very differently. There are, of course, things I regret I failed to do. But let's not talk about that."

Kerensky was not with his Government when the Bolsheviks finally burst into the Winter Palace and arrested the Ministers. He had left Petersburg to meet the troops which were supposed to be approaching the city.

How did he get away?

"I left Petersburg in the open official car in which I usually travelled with my staff, the commander of troops and others, and we told the driver to drive at his normal speed through the main streets where there were Bolshevik patrols. As we were driving in the direction of Tsarskoye Selo we were fired at for the first time. But they missed us."

Kerensky made his way to Moscow and went into hiding, disguising himself with long hair and a moustache. "Finally at the beginning of June I left Moscow in a special train for Serbian officers who were being repatriated. The Government allowed them to leave without arms. It was among them, with no uniform or weapons, that I also left."

Finally I raised the question of the fate of Tsar Nicholas and his family, who were butchered by the Bolsheviks in Ekaterinburg. Could Kerensky have done anything to save them?

He alleged that the blame lay with the British Government, which withdrew permission earlier given for the Tsar and his family to be given asylum in Britain. "The Tsar arrived at the Stavka (Headquarters) on March 18 to take leave of his fellow officers. He had been their Supreme Commander for two years. He then scribbled four requests down on a scrap of paper. They were: to be allowed to return in safety to his family in Tsarskoye Selo; to be allowed to live there quietly with his suite; to be given safe conduct to Murmansk; to be allowed to go to England.

REBUFF TO THE TSAR

"The Minister of Foreign Affairs went to Sir George Buchanan, the British Ambassador, and handed him the Provisional Government's request. A few days later a reply was received that hospitality would be offered in Britain. But then, after the direct intervention of King George V, the agreement was withdrawn."

(In his memoirs Kerensky amplifies the circumstances of the King's move. He quotes a passage from Harold Nicolson's official biography of George V showing that the King intervened as a result of Left-wing criticism and the belief that public opinion in Britain was opposed to the proposal.)

"When Sir George received these instructions," Kerensky continued, "he did not tell us about it in good time. So we prepared the Tsar's departure, and when Foreign Minister Tereschenko went to Buchanan to ask him for a cruiser to be sent he was told it would not be possible."

"How did the Tsar take this rebuff?"

"I told him that, since it was impossible to send him to England, I would request him to go to Tobolsk."

"Was he terribly disappointed?"

"Of course."

---

[From the Anglo-Ukrainian News, February 1970]

NEW COLLECTIVE FARM STATUTE

(By Bohdan Hryuan)

The Third All-Union Congress of Collective Farmers, which had been in preparation for several years, finally took place in Moscow on November 25–27, 1969. The agenda consisted of a single item—adoption of the new Model Statute of Collective Farms.

The previous, Second Congress of Collective Farmers, took place as far back as 1935, in Stalin's time, and its purpose was to celebrate formally "the victory of the collective farm system" in the countryside and to adopt the "Model Statute of Collective Farm" dictated by Stalin, by which the collective farms were guided for nearly 35 years up to the latest congress.

The Stalin statute reflected the strict centralising trend of the Bolshevist regime. On its basis, the Bolshevist State, or rather its rapacious bureaucracy, was able to dictate arbitrarily the entire activity and life of the collective farms to the least details. Although the document contained a number of democratic sounding formalities, as e.g. it provided for a general meeting of collective farmers, the election of the collective farm chairman at such a meeting, etc., in actual fact the local district authorities did not pay serious attention to these vestiges of democratic procedures, but usually "proposed" this or that, and the general meeting of collective farmers, as a matter of course, adopted such "proposals" unanimously. Any opposition was unthinkable because the "proposals" were backed by the guns of the militia or the secret police, deportation to Siberia, concentration camps, or even shooting in the back of one's head, as happened in Vinnytsia, among many other places. For several long decades the collective farms received from the administrative organs strict plans of sowing, or deliveries of food produce, etc. Failure to fulfill them resulted in severe punishment. For the payment of "workdays" remained miserable quantities of farm products, and even these were swallowed to a considerable extent by the privileged stratum of collective farm bureaucracy, all sorts of bookkeepers and brigade leaders. As a result of the terrible exploitation, stupid centralising laws, and low material interest, the collective farmer used to work sloppily, the pilfering of collective farm property became a common occurrence, productivity fell catastrophically or failed to rise appreciably, in particular animal farming remained on a primitive level. In addition, the state forbade the farmers to engage in any outside occupations or crafts, or even to organise subsidiary industrial enterprises belonging to the collective farms, in order not to distract the farmers from the compulsory work on the land. Moreover, the Bolshevist authorities made trade in agricultural produce difficult. Thus the initiative of the farmers was ruthlessly curtailed and tremendous opportunities for the development of agriculture remained unutilised. Purposely lowered state purchasing prices for agricultural products condemned the farming population to perpetual poverty. Rural youth made every effort to leave the village for the town where the conditions were somewhat better. There loomed the danger of a complete breakdown of agricultural economy.

KHRUSHCHEV'S REFORM

Stalin's death made it possible for his successors to save the collective farm system from collapse. "The collective leadership" with Khrushchev at its head began to introduce partial changes here and there in order to improve the sorry state of affairs and to encourage the farmers to produce more. On several occasions purchasing prices for agricultural produce were raised, but even today they remain low because the costs of production increased likewise in the meantime, in some cases at a more rapid rate than the purchasing prices.

In 1956 the Bolshevist authorities recognised that the existing Collective Farm Statute served as a brake for agriculture, but did not muster enough courage to admit it honestly and to abolish it. Instead, Moscow issued an order according to which the collective farms were authorised to make certain changes in the statute rules in order to adapt them to concrete situation. This concerned some questions of internal management of the collective farms, such as the setting up of internal collective farm funds, the system of remuneration of work in collective farms, the size of private plots of collective farm homesteads etc., but it failed to tackle the main root of the evil.

At the turn of the fifties and sixties, enraptured by his omniscience, Khrushchev began to carry out neck-breaking experiments with the reforms of the management of the economy of the Bolshevist empire, including agriculture. He abolished certain administrative organs and replaced them with others, "aggrandised" collective farms, district, regional and other territorial organs of management, divided regional Party organisations into rural and urban, ordered the collective farms to sow maize at one time, then switched over to spring wheat, clover, sugar beet for fodder etc. and thus created something of a chaos. New campaigns followed one another with kaleidoscopic speed. Khrushchev, and after him the entire Bolshevist propaganda machinery, painted rainbow-like prospects of the development of "chemisation" of agriculture, of a tremendous upsurge of the output of artificial fertilizers, watering and irrigation, development of virgin soil, etc., but the results were rather meager. In the end the USSR had to buy, cap in hand, wheat abroad, because the USSR faced the spectre of famine, especially in 1962.

THE POLICY OF THE BREZHNEV CLIQUE

The removal of Khrushchev and the accession to power of a new clique under the leadership of Brezhnev-Kosygin-Podgornyi took place under the tacit slogan of abandonment of radical reforms and instead of carrying through a well-thought-out ordering of the existing state of affairs. The new management decided to carry out all changes slowly and gradually in order to stabilise the shaken Bolshevist authority and to prevent by all means any incitement of the mood of the people and the danger of the collapse of the empire. As a result, for instance, a change of the Soviet Constitution, announced by Khrushchev, has not yet been carried out although a Constitutional Committee has been in existence for many years now. Instead of Khrushchev it is headed now by Brezhnev. Not a word transpires about any action in this respect. Likewise, we had to wait a whole decade before some of the changes in the Collective Farm Statute, announced by Khrushchev, still were formally introduced.

Soviet propaganda blared for many years about these changes that they would be of tremendous significance for the future development of the collective farms system.

Finally, the long awaited moment came, and in the spring of 1969 the press published a draft of the new collective farm statute which was, allegedly, to free the initiative of the collective farmers for increasing the agricultural output and improving their material position. This draft astonished all observers not by how much it differed from the Stalin statute, but how little it differed from the latter. As a matter of fact, with some small and secondary exceptions, which in fact were already in operation, it was the

same Stalin statute slightly polished and varnished. For several months the Soviet press conducted the so-called "nation-wide" discussion of the draft statute, which consisted usually in that individual correspondents praised the Party and government and occasionally, submitted some remarks of their own to this or that article of the statute, without touching, of course, the whole and the main principles of the collective farm system.

COMMUNIST "DEMOCRACY"

The Third All-Union Collective Farm Congress which took place in Moscow between November 25 and 27, 1969, was attended by over 4,500 delegates from the entire USSR—2,400 of them, or over 50 p. c., members of the CPSU. (It should be remarked at this point that out of about 60 million collective farm population in the USSR only 1,600,000 are Communists, i.e. 2.6 p. c.; and taking into account only the grown up population—about 5 p. c.) Thus a small number of Communists represented over 50 p. c. of the collective farmers, while the rest of the delegates were communist fellow travelers and intimidated "best workers" who were to give at least an appearance of democratic procedure. Moreover, many of the Communist delegates were far from collective farmers, because even statistically they are classed as "workers and employes," such as e.g. Brezhnev himself, the minister of agriculture Matskevich, all sorts of managers of regional and district departments of agriculture, bookkeepers, etc., all those parasitical elements that feed on the live body of the collective farmer and sap his forces for the "benefit of the Soviet motherland"—the Russian empire.

MISTAKES

The main speeches at the Congress were made by Brezhnev and Polyansky. They lauded the collective farm system and painted in rosy colours its present state and future prospects. Brezhnev praised in every way the "advantages of the collective farm system" and painted in black colours the allegedly miserable situation of the agricultural population in the capitalist countries. Nevertheless he could not fail to admit that there had also been some dark moments in the history of the collective farm system, only he saw them in a distant past, at the beginning of collectivisation, while by now, allegedly the Party had rectified everything. Literally he said the following: "In the process of the construction of the collective farm system we did not avoid certain mistakes. But these were the mistakes of a search, the mistakes due to inexperience. The Party itself bodly uncovered the mistakes, spoke about them openly to the people and rectified them. Unfortunately, even now one can find amateurs of exaggerating the shortcomings in the great revolutionary cause." This hazy admission does not explain what kind of "mistakes" are meant, who made them, what results they had, and gives no proof that they had indeed been rectified. Surely, the organised man-made famine and the death of seven million Ukrainian farming population is not simply an insignificant "mistake" which does not deserve to be mentioned? As, similarly, other such "mistakes", like e.g. the "de-kulakisation"—dispossession of ordinary farmers of their land, houses and property, their expulsion from their homes and villages in bitter cold, without the possibility of any help, their deportation together with their wives and small children into the wild primeval taiga to face certain death from exhaustion, the starvation of the farming population over several decades, dictatorship of various petty satraps of the Bolshevik Party in the rural areas and mockery of the peasantry—all this is simply a slight "mistake" or the "wise" party which carries out its policy in accordance with an allegedly scientific plan? Not a word was said about it by Brezhnev and other orators. At the same time, over the period of 35 years, there was many a policy move by the party with regard to the rural population, many a "mistake", which it would have been useful to discuss in greater detail, in order to prevent its occurrence in the future.

CHANGES

Polyansky reported about the new Statute and the changes which it brings in the situation of the collective farms. He stressed that the Statute, in the first place, has the aim of "strengthening and accumulating the collective farm property", a better utilisation of land, "widening of the economic independence and initiative of the collective farms", "the raising of the level of socialisation in agriculture", "concentration and specialisation of production." The statute permits the creation of inter-collective farm and collective farm—State owned specialised enterprises, organisations and associations, permits the collective farms to develop subsidiary enterprises and crafts, makes it incumbent on the collective farms to guarantee a certain wage to the collective farmer. At the same time collective farms have to increase every year the "socialised" collective farm funds. Polyansky admitted that the "interests of consumption had not been taken into account" previously, in other words that the collective farmers' remuneration had been insufficient to keep them reasonably well off. The new Statute allows the collective farms to set aside funds to make supplementary payments to the old age pensions of old collective farmers. Polyansky admitted that the individual farming plots of the collective farmers were still "necessary for the time being", but expressed the hope that in the future collective farmers themselves would give them up. He rejected the idea that the individual farming plots of the collective farmers should be abolished at present. This, of course, is motivated by the fear that such a move would provoke great dissatisfaction among the rural population, as well as result in shortages of some food produce, in particular vegetables, in the town market. Unlike in the previous Statute, the new Statute provides for the election of not only the chairman and members of the board of a collective farm by a general meeting of the collective farmers, but also of the managers of subdivisions of a collective farm, such as brigade leader and link leaders. Polyansky also discussed a number of proposals which had been submitted to the Statute commission, namely the creation of a system of collective farm organs from the bottom to the top, the method of voting at general meetings—open or secret—and other questions.

DUNG—"PROBLEM NO. ONE"

The debate on the draft Statute was, as usual in the USSR, well prepared beforehand and everything went on smoothly. One after another the delegates rose to praise Brezhnev's speech, related about the successes of this or that collective farm, district or region, rarely introduced some delicate hints about this or that second rate problem. One of the most interesting was the speech by O. H. Buznytskyi, chairman of a collective farm from Kiev region. Having boasted about some phenomenal successes in his collective farm where, allegedly, up to 40 quintals of grain had been collected per hectare of land, he expressed some critical remarks. *Inter alia* he spoke about the shortage of artificial fertilisers and the importance of dung for increasing the yields. He called it "problem number one." In shouting about artificial fertilisers the Bolshevik leaders forgot about the ordinary dung, and it needed a Buznytskyi to remind them of this simple fact. Further Buznytskyi drew the attention to the shortage of building materials which is acute in the villages. He explained to the Soviet economists the reason for the decline in the number of heads of pigs in the USSR, and, as a result, for the shortage of pork which is the basic meat product in the USSR. It is, it appears, a result of the introduction of different prices in different zones for grain. In the forest zone, e.g. in Polissia (as well, as in the greater part of the territory of the RSFSR, by the way—Ed.) grain prices are twice as high as those in the greater part of Ukraine. Therefore the collective farmers in the forest belt prefer to sell grain to the State rather than to raise pigs which is not as profitable. As a result there is a shortage of pork.

WHAT HAS CHANGED?

The Congress, of course, adopted the new Statute unanimously, as well as "elected" an All-Union Collective Farm Council consisting of 125 members, 25 of them from the Ukrainian SSR. Analogous councils are to be elected in all Republics, regions and districts. What will be their functions and powers has not been made very clear. The Statute notes that voting at general meetings can be either open or secret. The previous Statute provided only for open voting. Matters are not much improved thereby, however, because the Bolsheviks are past masters at intimidating people to vote "unanimously" by the show of hands for their "proposals." The new statute introduces the possibility to hold general meetings of collective farmers with the participation of delegates only where collective farms are large. The Statute speaks about the independence of the collective farms based, it appears, on the fact that since 1967 Moscow announces several years ahead quotas of food produce to be delivered compulsorily to the state at fixed prices. Thus the collective farms know beforehand what they can expect and can thus draw up more realistic plans of output and its utilisation after the delivery of their quotas. Collective farms themselves can now plan the sowings and field work in accordance with local conditions, and are not required to stick blindly to the directives from Moscow, as was usual in Stalin's time. Nevertheless the Statute states firmly several times that the collective farms must in the first place care for increasing the social (i.e. State-owned, or rather Moscow-owned) property, and only afterwards to show solicitude for the welfare of the ordinary collective farmer. The Statute confirms Stalin laws about increasing the so-called "indivisible" property of the collective farms and prohibits any refund of their part of the collective farm property to a collective farm member who might wish to leave the collective farm.

Thus, as we see, the Statute in the main leaves the basic principles of the collective farm system intact, the position of collective farmers remains not much different from that of the serfs in tsarist Russia. The existence of the collective farms is perpetuated, the trend to the greatest possible amassing of the collective farm "social" property is encouraged, because it is owned by the State, or rather Moscow, the individual property of the collective farmer is limited to a necessary minimum. For instance, a collective farm homestead can possess only up to 0.50 hectare of land, including the site of the house and other buildings, one cow, one sow, or two pigs for fattening, up to 10 sheep and goats altogether, and an unlimited number of bee hives, domestic fowl and rabbits.

SUCCESS OR FAILURE?

The widening of the initiative of the collective farm managements announced by the Statute, could, of course, be beneficial, but so far it is merely theory. What will happen in practice only the future will show, for many a reform and "democratisation" announced by the Bolsheviks turned sour in actual performance in the past. They often had opposite effects to those that had been hoped for. Collective farms are now being put more or less on a par with factory managements which received greater rights under Brezhnev than they had for a long time be-

fore. The results of this reform, however, are not yet sufficiently clear to make a definite judgment of its success or failure. Soviet bureaucracy is not used to think and act independently, it constantly expects directives from above, and this is the situation to a great extent in industry and trade at present. One may expect a similar situation in agriculture, as long as the USSR remains a dictatorship, and it cannot be any other system without a revolution or change of government. As long as the Russian empire exists it will remain a tyrannous dictatorship because otherwise it would collapse very soon under the pressure of the revolutionary liberation forces of the enslaved peoples. How is it possible for any democracy to exist even on a small scale in the collective farms when the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the allegedly highest "democratic" organ, and the supreme Soviets of the union Republics, are pitiable puppets who unanimously raise their hands at the jerk of a "magic wand" from the Kremlin? The entire hullabaloo around the new Statute appears to be a new propaganda campaign, a new change of decoration designed to pull the wool over the eyes of the rural population and all the peoples of the USSR, to deceive them and the rest of the world.

## THE IMPORTANCE OF CONSUMER PROTECTION

### HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the American consumer needs more protection against exploitation and loses billions of dollars a year because of deceptive practices by the seller. Unfair wrapping is only one example of such deception.

Many persons have told me they were cheated when they bought meat at supermarkets when it lacked clear wrapping on all sides. Because most meat is sold in cardboard containers covered on top by a clear plastic wrap, the buyer does not know the quality of the meat at the bottom of the container.

A frequent complaint by housewives is that good quality meat is invariably displayed on top, so it can be seen through the clear plastic wrapping, and that it often covers a poorer quality meat at the bottom of the cardboard container.

Such a practice is reprehensible and unfair. Federal legislation should be passed that would make it mandatory for markets to package fresh and frozen cuts of meat in clear wrapping on all sides and limit the label size to no more than 10 percent. Presently it often exceeds 10 percent.

I also believe that legislation is needed that would require the dating of packaged goods in markets. Numbers shown on items contain coded dates understood only by employees—but not the buyer. As any reasonable person will concede, the buyer not only has the right to know the quality of the product she is buying, but also whether it is fresh or not.

When I helped sponsor the Truth-in-Packaging Act several years ago, it was obvious that the consumer was being victimized in several areas. Some progress has been made in protecting the consumer, but so much remains to be done. Another bill I have helped sponsor—creation of a Department of Consumer Affairs at a Cabinet level—would be an important victory in the fight to give the consumers the protection they deserve.

## LATCH KEY CHILDREN—II

### HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, on April 8, 1970, I read into the RECORD two newspaper accounts of the brutal murder of a working mother's 11-year-old daughter who returned home from school an hour earlier than usual. The tragedy of Pamela Marshall's death might have been avoided had there been arrangements available for afterschool supervision of children who are at that inbetween stage—too old for a day-care center or a babysitter, but too young for complete independence.

My RECORD insertion came to the attention of Pamela's mother, Mrs. Carolyn Marshall. At this time I would like to share with my colleagues Mrs. Marshall's recent letter to me:

APRIL 16, 1970.

Hon. JOHN DELLENBACK,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. DELLENBACK: I have read your statements which appeared in the "Congressional Record" on April 8. Is there anything I can do to help you get such legislation passed? I plan to write my representatives in Tennessee and also those from Virginia. However, since no bill has been introduced, I will wait until I hear from you.

My Pammy was a beautiful girl—inside and out. Although she was almost 12, she was a petite girl, still wearing size 8 children's clothes. People who didn't know her age thought she was 8 or 9.

There are so many children in this neighborhood who come home as Pammy did. Her brother always got home first—she just happened to get out early on April 6. This was her first year of not having a baby sitter. She didn't want one—she babysat other children on weekends (only if it was nearby and I could be called). She was never afraid. Our neighborhood is quiet—never any trouble.

Is there anything at all that I can do?

Sincerely,

MRS. CAROLYN W. MARSHALL.

I believe Mrs. Marshall's moving letter stands as testimony to the need for federally assisted programs which will provide supervisory services for school-age children of working mothers. As the House Education and Labor Committee considers child development and child care legislation, I will make every effort to see that any bill reported includes provisions for supervisory services for these so-called "latch-key" children.

Contrary to general belief, the problem of supervising "latch key" children is very common. In 1967, 45 percent of working mothers had children aged 6 to 17 years, as compared with only 27 percent whose families included children younger than 6. Masked by this statistic, furthermore, is the fact that of the 27 percent of mothers with children younger than 6, many also have older children as well, meaning that easily over half of all working mothers have school-age children.

At this time, I would also like to add to the RECORD the following report on "Working Mothers and the Need for Child Care Services," published in 1968 by the Department of Labor. Although the figures are somewhat out of date, I believe this survey accurately summarizes the proportion of the problem:

WORKING MOTHERS AND THE NEED FOR CHILD CARE SERVICES

There were nearly 27.5 million working women 16 years of age and over in the United States in March 1967,[1] and their number is rising steadily. Among these workers were 10.6 million mothers with children under 18 years of age. About 2.2 million of these mothers had children under 3 years of age; 1.9 million had children 3 to 5 years of age (none under 3); and almost 6.5 million had children 6 to 17 years of age (none under 6). About 1.5 million (15 percent) of the working mothers were nonwhite.

The number of working mothers has increased more than sevenfold since 1940, when there were 1.5 million and has more than doubled since 1950, when there were 4.6 million.

The employment of mothers, like the employment of all women, is expected to continue to rise. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has estimated conservatively that the number of working mothers 20 to 44 years of age with preschool children will increase to 5.3 million by 1980. Moreover, the 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act require many of the mothers on the aid to families with dependent children rolls to be trained for employment.

To ascertain how the children of working mothers are cared for, in February 1965 the Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Women's Bureau cosponsored a national survey of the child care arrangements made by these mothers. The survey was limited to the 6.1 million mothers who worked 27 weeks or more in 1964, either full time or part time, and who had at least one child under 14 years of age living at home. These mothers had 12.3 million children under 14 years of age—3.8 million, under 6 years; 6.1 million, 6 to 11 years; and 2.4 million, 12 and 13 years. The survey disclosed that nearly half (46 percent) of these children were cared for in their own homes by their fathers or other relatives, or by babysitters or housekeepers; 28 percent were cared for by their mothers, who either worked only during their children's school hours or took care of them while working; 18 percent were cared for away from home (only 2 percent in group care); and 8 percent looked after themselves. Nearly half of the children who looked after themselves were 12 and 13 years of age, but about 4 percent were under 6 years of age.

Too many children have care which at best would be classified as questionable and all too frequently would be considered completely inadequate.

Child care services must be assured for welfare mothers scheduled for training for employment and should be available to every child who needs them. Good day care is especially important for younger children whose mothers must work for economic reasons, and for children who are economically and culturally deprived, those with physical or mental handicaps, and those whose mothers are incapacitated.

[1] This is the latest date for which data are available on the marital status of workers.

The following summary statements and charts document the rising number of working mothers in the United States and the increasing need for child care services. It is hoped that they will prove helpful in the intensified efforts now underway to provide, expand, and improve day care services throughout the country:

ALMOST TWO OUT OF FIVE MOTHERS ARE WORKERS

In March 1967 there were about 69.4 million women 16 years of age and over in the population. Of these, 27.7 million had children under 18 years of age. Almost two-fifths (10.6 million) of these mothers were in the labor force. They constituted 38 percent of all women workers. Most of these mothers were working to raise family income above poverty levels or to bring family income closer to standards of "modest adequacy," estimated as more than $7,000 a year for an urban family of four.

LABOR FORCE STATUS OF WOMEN IN THE POPULATION, BY MARITAL STATUS AND PRESENCE OF CHILDREN UNDER 18 YEARS OF AGE, MARCH 1967

[Women 16 years of age and over]

| Marital status | Number of women (in millions) | Percent in labor force | Percent not in labor force |
|---|---|---|---|
| Single | 11.7 | 51 | 49 |
| Ever married no children under 18 | 30.1 | 37 | 63 |
| Ever married children under 18 | 27.7 | 38 | 62 |

MOTHERS WITHOUT HUSBAND PRESENT ARE MUCH MORE LIKELY TO WORK

Of the nearly 28 million mothers with children under 18 years of age in the population in March 1967, about 3 million were raising their children in fatherless homes or in homes where the husband was absent. Nearly 2 out of 3 (64 percent) of these mothers were workers as compared with only slightly more than 1 out of 3 (35 percent) of the mothers with husband present. For mothers who must bring up their children alone, the compulsion to work is obviously great. Their earnings are not supplementary; they are basic to the maintenance of their families. In 29 percent of the two-parent families in which the mother was a worker in March 1967, the husband's income in 1966 was less than $5,000. These mothers also worked because of urgent economic need.

LABOR FORCE STATUS OF MOTHERS WITH CHILDREN UNDER 18 YEARS OF AGE, BY PRESENCE OF HUSBAND, MARCH 1967

[Mothers 16 years of age and over]

| | Number | Percent in labor force | Percent not in labor force |
|---|---|---|---|
| Number of women whose: | | | |
| Husbands are present | 24,819,000 | 35 | 65 |
| Husbands are not present | 2,864,000 | 64 | 36 |

MORE MOTHERS WORK TODAY THAN EVER BEFORE

About 10.6 million mothers with children under 18 years of age were workers in March 1967. This was the highest number ever recorded and was more than seven times the number who were workers in 1940 and more than twice the number who were workers in 1950.

Almost 2 out of 5 mothers in the labor force in March 1967 had children under 6 years of age. This is a slightly higher proportion (39 percent) than in 1960 (36 percent) or in 1950 (37 percent).

MOTHERS IN THE LABOR FORCE, BY AGE OF CHILDREN, 1940-67 [1]

[Mothers 14 years of age and over [2]]

| Year | Number of women in labor force (millions) | Age 6-17 in percent | Age under 6 [3] in percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1940 | 1.5 | (4) | (4) |
| 1950 | 4.6 | 63 | 37 |
| 1960 | 8.0 | 64 | 36 |
| 1967 | 10.6 | 61 | 39 |

[1] Data are for March of each year.
[2] Except 1967 (16 years of age and over).
[3] May also have older children.
[4] Ages not available.

THE NUMBER OF WORKING MOTHERS WITH YOUNG CHILDREN WILL CONTINUE TO RISE

The number of working mothers with young children is expected to increase rapidly in the next decade. It is conservatively estimated that by 1980, 5.3 million mothers 20 to 44 years of age with children under 5 years of age will be workers. This will constitute a 43-percent increase over the 3.7 million similar mothers who are expected to be in the labor force in 1970.

Labor force status of mothers 20 to 44 years of age, with children under 6 years, 1960-71 [1] and children under 5 years, projected to 1980 [2]:

NUMBER OF WOMEN IN LABOR FORCE

[In millions]

| | |
|---|---|
| Year: | |
| 1960 | 2.8 |
| 1963 | 3.3 |
| 1967 | 3.9 |
| Projected—children under 5: | |
| Year: | |
| 1970 | 3.7 |
| 1975 | 4.5 |
| 1980 | 5.3 |

MOTHERS WITH SCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN ARE MORE LIKELY TO WORK THAN MOTHERS WITH YOUNGER CHILDREN

This has been true for many years.

Among mothers with husband present, more than 2 out of 5 (45 percent) of those with children 6 to 17 years of age and none under 6 were workers in March 1967. This compares with only about 1 out of 4 (27 percent) for those with children under 6 years of age. In 1950 the rates were 28 and 12 percent, respectively.

Among mothers who are widowed, divorced, or separated, the likelihood of working is also greater for those who have school-age children only than for those who have younger children. In March 1967, 75 percent of these mothers with children 6 to 17 years of age only were working as compared with 51 percent of those with children under 6 years of age.

This is true at all income levels.

In March 1967 labor force participation of mothers with husband present was highest (52 percent) among those with children 6 to 17 years of age only and a family income of between $3,000 and $5,000 a year. It was lowest (16 percent) among those with children under 6 years of age and a family income of $10,000 or more. In a great majority of cases economic necessity prompts mothers of preschool children to work.

Information is not available on the family income of mothers who are widowed, divorced, or separated.

[1] Data are for March of each year.
[2] Projections for children under 6 years of age are not available.

LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION OF MOTHERS [1] WITH HUSBAND PRESENT, BY AGE OF CHILDREN, 1950-67 [2]

[This has been true for many years]

[In percent]

| Year | Children age 6 to 17 | Children age under 6 [3] | Total percent of mothers working |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1950 | 28 | 12 | 40 |
| 1954 | 33 | 15 | 48 |
| 1958 | 38 | 18 | 56 |
| 1962 | 42 | 21 | 63 |
| 1967 | 45 | 27 | 72 |

[1] Mothers 14 years of age and over except 1967 (16 years of age and over).
[2] Data are for March of each year except 1954 (April).
[3] May also have older children.

LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION OF MOTHERS WITH HUSBAND PRESENT, BY INCOME OF HUSBAND IN 1966 AND AGE OF CHILDREN, MARCH 1967

[This is true at all income levels]

[In percent]

| Income of husband | Children age 6 to 17 | Children age under 6 | Total percent of mothers working |
|---|---|---|---|
| Under $3,000 | 50 | 32 | 82 |
| $3,000 to $4,999 | 52 | 34 | 86 |
| $5,000 to $6,999 | 50 | 32 | 82 |
| $7,000 to $9,999 | 47 | 22 | 69 |
| $10,000 and over | 33 | 16 | 49 |

ONLY ONE OUT OF SIX MOTHERS—HUSBAND PRESENT—WITH VERY YOUNG CHILDREN WORKS YEAR ROUND FULL TIME

About 11.6 million mothers with husband present in March 1967 had worked at some time in 1966. Of the 3.2 million with children under 3 years of age, only 16 percent had been employed 35 hours or more a week for 50 to 52 weeks. The proportions who worked year round full time were considerably higher for the 2.1 million mothers with children 3 to 5 years of age and none younger (31 percent) and the 3.2 million mothers with children 6 to 17 years of age only (39 percent).

WORK EXPERIENCE IN 1966 OF MOTHERS WITH HUSBAND PRESENT, BY AGE OF CHILDREN, MARCH 1967

[Mothers 16 years of age and over]

| Age of children | Number of mothers in (millions) | Percent part year workers full and part time | Percent year-round full time workers [1] |
|---|---|---|---|
| 6 to 17 | 6.3 | 61 | 39 |
| 3 to 5 [2] | 2.1 | 69 | 31 |
| Under 3 [2] | 3.2 | 84 | 16 |

[1] 50 to 52 weeks, 35 hours or more a week.
[2] May also have older children.

A GREATER PROPORTION OF NONWHITE WORKING MOTHERS HAVE YOUNG CHILDREN

There were about 1.1 million nonwhite mothers (husband present) in the labor force in March 1967. More than half of these mothers had children under 6 years of age—29 percent had children under 3 years; 24 percent, 3 to 5 years. In contrast, only 38 percent of the 7.7 million working white mothers (husband present) had children under 6 years of age.

MOTHERS (HUSBAND PRESENT) IN THE LABOR FORCE, BY AGE OF CHILDREN AND COLOR, MARCH 1967

[Mothers 16 years of age and over]

| Race | Number of mothers in labor force | Children age 6 to 17 in percent | Children age 3 to 5[1] in percent | Children age under 3[1] in percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| White | 7,697,000 | 62 | 17 | 21 |
| Nonwhite | 1,053,000 | 47 | 24 | 29 |

[1] May also have older children.

MORE THAN 4 MILLION CHILDREN UNDER 6 YEARS OF AGE HAVE WORKING MOTHERS

The Children's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has estimated that more than 17 million children under 18 years of age had working mothers in March 1965. About 4.5 million, or more than one-fourth, of these children were under 6 years of age—2.0 million under 3 years and 2.5 million 3 to 5 years. Another 6.4 million of the children were 6 to 11 years of age.

Number of children of working mothers, by age, March 1965:

[Number of children, in millions]

| | |
|---|---|
| Under 3 | 2.0 |
| 3 to 5 | 2.5 |
| 6 to 11 | 6.4 |
| 12 to 17 | 6.4 |

NEARLY 2 MILLION CHILDREN WHOSE MOTHERS WORKED HALF A YEAR OR MORE IN 1964 WERE MEMBERS OF FAMILIES WITH INCOMES OF LESS THAN $3,000

A special survey of mothers who had worked 27 weeks or more in 1964 was made in February 1965. According to the report of this survey, there were nearly 2 million children under 14 years of age in families whose annual incomes in 1964 were less than $3,000, despite the fact that their mothers worked a half year or more. Nearly 4 million additional children under 14 years of age with working mothers were members of families whose incomes were between $3,000 and $6,000—still below the "modest but adequate" income level for an urban family of four.

NUMBER OF CHILDREN OF MOTHERS WHO WORKED 27 WEEKS OR MORE IN 1964, BY FAMILY INCOME IN 1964, AND AGE OF CHILDREN, FEBRUARY 1965

| Family income | Children age 6 to 14 (percent) | Children age under 6 (percent) | Number of children (millions) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Under $3,000 | 67 | 33 | 1.9 |
| $3,000 to $5,999 | 67 | 33 | 3.9 |
| $6,000 to $9,999 | 69 | 31 | 4.5 |
| $10,000 and over | 74 | 26 | 2.1 |

TOO MANY CHILDREN OF WORKING MOTHERS LACK GOOD CHILD CARE SERVICES

The child care arrangements of mothers who worked 27 weeks or more in 1964 were surveyed in February 1965. These mothers had 12.3 million children under 14 years of age. Of these children, 46 percent were cared for at home by a father, brother, sister, other relative, or by someone hired to look after them in the home. Another 28 percent were looked after by the mother, who either cared for her children while she worked or worked only during their school hours. About 18 percent were cared for away from home, with only 2 percent in group care centers. The remaining 8 percent looked after themselves. About 4 percent of the children who looked after themselves were under 6 years of age.

Child care arrangements of working mothers, February 1965, 12.3 million children under 14 years of age:

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| Group care | 2 |
| No care | 8 |
| Cared for by mother | 28 |
| Cared for at home by other than mother | 46 |
| Cared for away from home | 16 |

CHART SOURCES

Chart 1. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics: Special Labor Force Report No. 94.

Chart 2. Ibid.

Chart 3. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census: Current Population Reports, P–50, No. 29 for March 1950; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics: Special Labor Force Report No. 13 for March 1960 and No. 94 for March 1967; and Women's Bureau: "Women as Workers, A Statistical Guide" for March 1940.

Chart 4. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics: Special Labor Force Report No. 49 for March 1960, March 1963, and projections to 1980; No. 94 for March 1967.

Chart 5. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census: Current Population Reports, P–50, No. 29 for March 1950, No. 62 for April 1954, and No. 87 for March 1958; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics: Special Labor Force Report No. 26 for March 1962 and No. 94 for March 1967.

Chart 6. Same as Chart 1.

Chart 7. Ibid.

Chart 8. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Welfare Administration, Children's Bureau. Unpublished data.

Chart 9. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Welfare Administration, Children's Bureau; and U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau: "Child Care Arrangements of the Nation's Working Mothers." 1965.

Chart 10. Ibid.

## KEEP SPRING GREEN IN YEARS TO COME

### HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the message of Earth Week is the stark contrast between what our environment can be and what it is becoming as a result of man's uncontrolled fumes, exhausts, trash, and sludge. It is most appropriate that Earth Week is occurring in the spring of the year when this contrast is at its greatest.

I insert at this point in the RECORD a poem written by Miss Bette J. Ackerman, which dramatically depicts the message of Earth Week.

The text of the poem follows:

KEEP SPRING GREEN IN YEARS TO COME

(By Bette J. Ackerman)

Would it be fun if the sun were an existential mass?
Passing time in the sky, a gray glow,
Like a gypsies ball on a dark flowing carpet.

It might be new for a day or two—
But think of . . . Forever . . .

If the sky joined force with the grit in the air to fare war on the world,
All that's living and fresh and good would die, curling back to brown dust.

The matter of choice which all men must voice,
Is how far to go with our easy leisure ways . . .
At stake are lives! And our future mirth—
We play Russian Roulette with the Earth!

Do we want our wash clean,
And yet kill all the lakes?
Is the car really worth what it takes out on us,
In terms of the grit, the fumes and exhaust.
We're lost if we wait to combat this fear.
We can't be meek in Environment Week,
But must think of a way to prove Earth Day every last day in the year.

## WASHINGTON REPORT

### HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I periodically make a report to the people of the Second Congressional District of Nebraska, whom I have the honor to represent in the U.S. House of Representatives.

This is my seventh report for the 91st Congress:

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE

DEAR FRIENDS: One of the most moving experiences of my 14 years in Congress came earlier this month when President Nixon presented the Medal of Honor to the mother of Pfc. James W. Fous of Omaha.

Mrs. Stanley E. Fous, Jr., 533 South 27th Street, received the nation's highest military honor awarded her son who was killed in Vietnam May 14, 1968. Private Fous's sister, Sherry, also was present.

The citation accompanying the Medal of Honor stated that young Fous, a graduate of Omaha Central High School, gave his life to save three soldiers whom he had met only four days previously.

His unit was participating in a night action in the Mekong Delta when a Viet Cong tossed a grenade into their position. Fous warned the other men and then leaped on the grenade, suffering fatal wounds.

THAT BLAIR MAPLE IS GROWING FAST

It was just a year ago that I had the pleasure to represent Blair, Nebraska, at the planting of a Blair Maple on the Capitol grounds.

The tree was planted to commemorate Blair's 100th Birthday which was celebrated last August. A similar tree was planted in Rhoades Park on Highway 30.

A "time capsule" was buried at Blair during the Centennial Celebration and noted the planting of the two trees. It will be opened in the year 2069 and it is hoped a check can be made to see if the two trees still are living.

Just last week I had an opportunity to take a close look at the rapidly growing tree with Richard A. Hunt of Blair. Richard can attest to its health.

The Blair Maple—a descendant from a Silver Maple observed growing on the courthouse grounds in Blair in the 1930's—should soon be out in all its glory.

When you come to Washington, I will see that you get to view this tree and its spectacular location in relation to the Capitol.

MAJOR ROWE, APOLLO FILMS AVAILABLE

Two 30-minute films on the plight of a prisoner of war in Vietnam as told by Maj. James N. Rowe and the historic voyage of Apollo 11 to the moon are available at my

Omaha office. Reservations may be made by calling 221–4631.

OUTSIDE INCOME LIMIT MAY BE INCREASED

Early in the first session of the 91st Congress, I introduced a bill which would raise to $3,000 the amount Social Security recipients can earn without penalty.

This proposal would be an increase of 44 percent over the present limitation of $1,680 annually in outside income. Those now receiving more than this amount must forfeit part of their Social Security payments.

This bill also provides escalation in the amount of allowable outside earnings based upon increases in the Consumer Price Index.

I have spent many hours working on this approach in addition to increased Social Security benefits which are now a reality. House Ways and Means Committee hearings continue on Social Security amendments. It appears that the earnings ceiling will be lifted. While it may not go all the way to the $3,000 I sought, I am hopeful and I believe we can expect that the increase will be substantial.

IT'S ALWAYS NICE TO SEE FOLKS FROM HOME

VFW Officials Paul A. Harmon and Robert J. Mahoney, of Omaha; Frank H. Short of Lincoln; and Marion Whitaker of Sidney were in to discuss problems of Veterans Hospitals.

Charles McNeil, President of Omaha Building & Construction Trades Council, and John O'Hara visited during the recent Legislative Conference.

Omaha "Boy of the Year" Keith Lewis and North Omaha Boys Club Director Tom Davis were in Washington for the national finals.

And, of course, there's always an opportunity to discuss one's remarks in the Congressional Record with Minority Leader JERRY FORD and Whip LES ARENDS.

POSTAL AGREEMENT IS OUTSTANDING

The Postal Reform and Salary bill I introduced earlier this month is one of the most outstanding agreements ever negotiated between the Government and the seven exclusive postal unions.

This measure culminates many, many hours of work and I am hopeful we will have speedy action on this legislation in the House.

I was delighted to hear the Chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee say he was anxious to expedite this measure at the earliest possible opportunity in order that we might have true postal reform.

This legislation will provide improvement in the working conditions of our postal employees; an additional 8 percent in wages; and compression of postal workers' in-grade salary increases, enabling an individual to reach the top salary level in eight years instead of the present 21 years.

NANCE LEIGH HERMAN LOVELY PRINCESS

It was my pleasure to escort Nance Leigh Herman at the Cherry Blossom Luncheon and Fashion Show. And might I say that Nance, daughter of the Dale G. Hermans of Omaha, was one of the loveliest of the Cherry Blossom Princesses.

Sincerely,

GLENN CUNNINGHAM.

---

## APRIL 22, QUEEN ISABELLA DAY

### HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, April 22, marks the 519th anniversary of the birth of Queen Isabella of Spain, one of the truly great ladies of history.

The qualities of faith in the future, steadfast devotion to an idea, and a spirit of adventure are of special significance to us in these times when men travel to the moon.

Accordingly, the Governor of Louisiana, John J. McKeithen has issued the following proclamation, designating April 22, Queen Isabella Day:

PROCLAMATION OF STATE OF LOUISIANA

Whereas, April 22, 1970 marks the 519th anniversary of the birth of Queen Isabella, dynamic Castillian queen, who through her faith and confidence in Christopher Columbus, gave the civilized world a new dimension; and

Whereas, Queen Isabella, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon, by her support of Columbus in his plans for exploration, earned for herself a unique place in the history of Western civilization; and

Whereas, in her own time, Isabella was a queen noted for clear intellect, energy, virtue and patriotism; and

Whereas, The qualities of confidence in the future, spirit of adventure with a purpose and sacrifice in the cause of human progress exhibited by Queen Isabella are characteristics worthy of emulation in our twentieth century era of exploration.

Now, therefore, I, John J. McKeithen, Governor of the State of Louisiana, do hereby proclaim Wednesday, April 22, 1970, as Queen Isabella Day in Louisiana, and urge all citizens, schools, historical and other interested organizations suitably observe this significant event in the history of the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to have the Great Seal of the State of Louisiana affixed. Done and signed at the Capitol in the City of Baton Rouge on this the 24th day of March, A.D., 1970.

JOHN J. MCKEITHEN,
*Governor of Louisiana.*

Attest by the Governor:

WADE O. MARTIN, Jr.,
*Secretary of State.*

---

## MEDICAL BENEFITS OF SPACE RESEARCH

### HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the flight of Apollo 13 has ended and the astronauts are safely back on earth. The astronauts' families and the American public have reason to rejoice at their safe return. We must try to insure that such mishaps do not happen again.

Many people believe that our space program is taking unnecessary risks with human life. I believe that this is an unnecessarily limited view of the situation. Spinoffs from the primary space research have resulted in new breakthroughs in the area of medical research—breakthroughs which save, rather than sacrifice, human life.

If we look at but one specific area of medical research—the area of heart treatment—it is obvious that developments have been crucial.

Cardiac sensors which can measure blood pressure without interfering with blood circulation have been devised. NASA research has produced miniature pressure transducers which can monitor blood flows in cardiac patients with coronary occlusions. Thus far this treatment has had substantial success in laboratory experiments on animals. A heart monitor, now in use, was developed under a NASA grant, and a circulatory assist pump for use in the emergency treatment of heart attack patients is also a direct outcome of aerospace research and development programs.

In still other medical areas, innovations devised from the space program requirements are in use. One of the early requirements established by NASA was the development of miniature, lightweight yet highly precise equipment. Since there is no way to do repair work millions of miles in space, the reliability of the instrumentation and small devices must be very high.

One of the methods that evolved was a development called "clean room technology." This primarily means that airborne contaminant particles are nearly eliminated. Equipment constructed in such a room is free from particulate contamination. The correlation between this technology and that of the operating room was not lost on the individuals in the medical profession. Now, some of the techniques have been adapted to operating rooms and other medical uses.

The National Institutes of Health cooperated with NASA experts to test a so-called laminar flow operating room. In this type of room, the flow of air is from one side to the other, but it is carefully controlled in horizontal layers. There is no tendency for the floor dust to be picked up in the air and transmitted to the patient. In routine air sampling during conventional neurosurgical procedures, typical levels range from 10 to 200 microorganisms per 100 cubic feet of air. The average was 60 organisms per 100 cubic feet. With the use of laminar crossflow ventilation, the levels of airborne contamination were held at less than 5 organisms per 100 cubic feet. Yet, there is no need to alter any of the typical routines and procedures of the neurosurgical team.

An additional advantage is the reduction of the extensive gowning and draping of the operating team, without in any way interfering with the reduction of the organism counts.

The advantages of the laminar flow system do not stop at surgical procedures. One of the contractors of the NIH has designed a laminar flow room that can be torn down and rebuilt where necessary. The purpose is to provide carefully controlled environmental conditions for patients with cancer. Some of the drugs that are used to fight cancer may also cause a form of leukemia. In the past, the dangers of the cure were often worse than the disease. In the laminar flow room, the patient is protected from what, for him, is now a hostile environment. He thus stands a much better chance of complete rehabilitation.

I might mention here a problem arises from the use of the new technology: the patient, while protected from contamination, has to withstand the noise of the power and filter fan system used in the laminar flow equipment. Other NASA technology that is concerned with acous-

tic or noise propagation will hopefully succeed in ameliorating this condition.

Another field in which NASA and the medical profession are allied is in the problem of sterilization. After investigating the possibility of dry-heat sterilization, NASA found that this could be a satisfactory procedure. There is considerable experimentation now being conducted on the methodology to increase the understanding of the dry heat technique.

A technique for clarifying spacecraft photos of Mars and the Moon by putting TV signals through a computer is being used by hospitals to provide much sharper X-rays.

A space program device is being used in a San Francisco children's hospital to trigger an alarm when infants with implanted tracheostomy tubes or comatose patients experience breathing difficulties.

These are but a few of the more practical benefits of the space program. NASA space programs have made major contributions to the area of medical research. The return can not be calculated merely in dollars and cents terms; rather we must look at the number of lives that have been saved.

## CONGRATULATIONS TO MR. SAMUEL C. VANNEMAN

### HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, Friday, April 17, marked the end of the line for a splendid dedicated, public servant.

He is Samuel C. Vanneman, who retired after more than 30 years of service with the Federal Government, most of it with the school lunch program of the Department of Agriculture. His last assignment was an Assistant Deputy Administrator for Programs, Food and Nutrition Service.

Sam has been of great assistance to the Committee on Education and Labor as we have striven to bring child nutrition programs to more and more needy youngsters. I am sure that other committees have found him equally as cooperative.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks a letter of congratulations which I have sent to Sam:

APRIL 6, 1970.

Mr. SAMUEL C. VANNEMAN,
*Assistant Deputy Administrator,*
*U.S. Department of Agriculture,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SAM: Your forthcoming retirement has been brought to my attention. This Committee will miss you.

I shall miss you.

Hungry school kids will miss you.

I do wish you an enjoyable and successful retirement. I know that you will be able to enjoy the years ahead more because you will have the satisfying and fulfilling knowledge that because of your work a great many youngsters will be eating lunch who would not otherwise be eating lunch.

My very best wishes.

Sincerely,

CARL D. PERKINS,
*Chairman.*

## CALL OF THE ROAD

### HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently an outstanding journalist from my congressional district was honored by the American Trucking Association for an editorial he wrote concerning a motorcycle accident.

Because of the ever-increasing use of these two-wheelers throughout the Nation, I would like to encourage my colleagues to take the time to read the following editorial by Mr. Alann B. Steen of the Arcata Union, Arcata, Calif., the second-place winner in the national competition.

In my judgment, Mr. Steen has made an excellent case for the need for laws requiring the use of certain protective equipment by motorcycle riders. Improper clothing worn by cyclists can lead to tragedy or serious personal injury.

I should also like to take this opportunity to publicly congratulate Mr. Steen for this outstanding piece of writing. He is a credit to his profession, his community, and our Nation. Also, I am proud to relate to my colleagues that he is a close personal friend.

Alann's personal concern and this award-winning effort can and will save many lives throughout the Nation—if his warning is properly adhered to.

The editorial follows:

CALL OF THE ROAD

They made a mighty fine looking picture as they sped down Highway 101 on his stripped-down motorcycle. His long hair blowing in her face; her hair flaired out a foot behind the roll-over bar. Wearing only a pair of jeans and moccasins, his body was lean, muscular and tanned from many days on the road; her body was about the same. His face was masked in confidence.

Yet, as he zoomed down the highway toward Eureka, his front wheel momentarily dropped off the road onto the shoulder. He quickly compensated to the left, swerved to the center strip of the south-bound lane, the cycle's front wheel gyrating to the left and right as he fought for control. A moment later he had control and he continued on his way, not even slowing down for a fraction of a second.

It was difficult to tell whether his smirk of confidence left his face; perhaps it didn't, there wasn't that much time. However, there was nothing left to the imagination if he had completely lost control; what their bodies would have looked like if they hit the pavement at 70 miles per hour.

But rarely does anything happen to the "winged cyclists" who travel most all the roads of California, at least newspapers rarely distinguish between that breed and the weekend rider. All newspapers will do is reconstruct the accident, and report the names of the victims and the extent of their injuries. And readers will only think, "Another cycle injury accident on Highway 101."

Or somewhere else. Yet the California Highway Patrol keeps a tally of such accidents, and according to CHP records there has been a rash of 13 accidents during the month of July in Humboldt County. Of this number, 16 cyclists were hurt, including two fatalities, eight major, three moderate and five minor injuries. In comparing this with July of last year, these 13 accidents compose a 333 per cent increase when there were two accidents that injured two cyclists and one accident that involved just property damage.

Captain K. O. Camendish, commander, Humboldt County CHP, said a possible reason for the cycle accident rate increase is that more and more people are buying motorcycles. He also explained that many agencies rent cycles without knowing first whether the renter knows how to operate them or not. To this end a law was passed last year that made it mandatory for a person to have a special license for motorcycle operation.

But there is no law governing the clothing worn by cyclists, the reason being that such protection was up to the individual rider. Camendish, on the other hand, said that many a patrol officer's life was saved because of the protection he wore. Such officers have walked away from terrible accidents because an item such as a helmet, dented and cracked, cushioned the impact.

"No, there is no law regulating clothing," explained the captain, "but common sense and self preservation should tell a person to wear them." He listed items such as a helmet, gloves, heavy clothing and sturdy shoes. Helmets will protect the head, while gloves and heavy clothing will guard against "gravel rash" in case of a fall. Putting one's foot down can help stabilize a bike on the verge of going out of control, but who will put down a bare foot at 60 mph? Thus the need for sturdy shoes.

The motorcyclist should also practice defensive driving. According to Camendish, the bike is a small unit to be seen by a motorist, especially on shady roads such as the Avenue of the Giants. Often a bike can be masked by a post or even by a dusty windshield. Thus the CHP suggests that cycles always be ridden with headlights on, for an extra margin of safety.

In looking over last month's accident record, cyclist's ages ranged from 14 to 45 years, with most of the injuries occurring in the younger range bracket. But the highway patrol has a saying that encompasses all ages: "There are two kinds of cycle riders—old riders and bold riders, but there are no old, bold riders."

## COMBATING AIR POLLUTION

### HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today, in the aftermath of Earth Day, I am privileged to join with my colleagues from New York, Mr. FARBSTEIN and Mr. MURPHY, in introducing legislation to combat air pollution by adopting emission-free alternatives to the internal combustion engine and toughening the enforcement procedures of the Clean Air Act.

These bills call for eliminating auto pollution by adopting the cleanest feasible propulsion system which can be built with today's technology—steam and gas turbines; and giving the Federal Government the power to stringently enforce and set penalties for those polluting the air in violation of law.

Automobiles are responsible for 92 percent of the air pollution in our cities. The only way that we will be able to eliminate automobile air pollution in this country is by setting pollution standards, not based upon what the in-

herently dirty internal combustion engine can achieve, but on the basis of the cleanest propulsion systems, steam and gas turbine engines. Such standards would be several times cleaner than those recently suggested for 1975.

Studies indicate that steam propulsion produces one-sixteenth the level of hydrocarbons of the unregulated internal combustion engine, one eighty-third of the carbon monoxide and one-tenth the oxides of nitrogen. These levels are far lower than those the internal combustion engine is believed capable of achieving. Similar results have also been found for the gas turbine engine.

If either of these alternatives were in operation, the air pollution problem would be virtually eliminated.

Using a steam or gas engine is not only technologically and economically feasible, but capable of being mass produced in the next few years and may well be less expensive to manufacture and operate.

If we look at the enforcement problems concerning the Clean Air Act, it is evident that Federal agencies do not have the authority that local law-enforcement officials have to enforce antipollution statutes.

For instance, officials of the Federal Air Pollution Control Administration are powerless to enter or inspect any property or plant where an air-contaminant source is located or suspected of being located.

The legislation introduced today provides for inspection and enforcement procedures, establish national emission control standards, authorize classification of air-contaminant sources and set stringent penalties for violators.

I also believe that lead in gasoline should be banned and stringent Federal controls imposed on fuel additives.

Until a new engine could be put into use, banning leaded gasoline would significantly reduce emissions. Current engines would not have to be modified to use unleaded gas, and we would be cutting almost half of the pollution from cars.

What I am saying then, is that the longer we wait, the harder it will be to curb air pollution and our children may not know what clean or fresh air is. Enforcement procedures must be toughened and while we must continue grappling with the emissions from cars, the time has come to eliminate the sources of pollution.

## MAYOR LINDSAY AND H.R. 14864

### HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have always held John Lindsay in the highest regard as a man dedicated to the best interests of individual liberties.

It is thus shocking for me to read that he views our approval of legislation vital to the security of this Nation and thus vital to the protection of those freedoms he so cherishes as representing "a new period of repression more dangerous than at any time in years." That he said this recently before the Association of the Bar of New York City is even more disconcerting.

The fact that the Defense Facilities and Industrial Security Act of 1970 actually provides for the very protection of individual rights—precisely what the mayor of New York insists it does not do—demonstrates to me that the mayor of New York either was tragically uninformed about the bill he so pointedly attacked or adopted a newspaper slogan once attributed to the late William Randolph Hearst—"never let the facts interfere with a good story."

Regardless of his motives or reasons, the mayor has totally misrepresented the legislation passed by this House so recently and now pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee. It is distressing that such misrepresentation should occur with respect to any measure in the Congress but it is partially regrettable that it has occurred in connection with a legislative proposal that is so important to our national security and drafted to meet the very criticism the Supreme Court and critics of security legislation such as Mayor Lindsay have raised in the past.

I would hope that our former colleague from New York would at least do us the honor of acknowledging his mistakes and take time from his busy schedule to read H.R. 14864 before he speaks again on the subject.

## FREDERICK ARMY CAPTAIN KILLED IN VIET COPTER CRASH

### HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Capt. James M. Atchison, a fine young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

FREDERICK ARMY CAPTAIN KILLED IN VIET COPTER CRASH

FREDERICK, MD., April 16.—The Department of Defense announced today the death of Capt. James M. Atchison, 25, of Frederick, on a combat mission in South Vietnam.

He was a copilot of a helicopter that was shot down Sunday, the Pentagon said.

Captain Atchison was the only son of Charles M. Atchison and the former Helen Head, of Frederick. His father is a retired road engineer.

Captain Atchison was born in Paintsville, Ky., but his family moved to Maryland 20 years ago.

He was a 1963 graduate of Frederick High School.

He earned an associate degree in 1965 from Potomac State College in Keyser, W. Va. Two years later he received his bachelor's degree from West Virginia University.

He had been a Boy Scout in Frederick and played in the high school band. He was also a member of the West Virginia University Band.

He served in the ROTC in college and upon graduation was commissioned in the Army as a second lieutenant. His first Army tour was at Fort Knox, Kentucky.

EARNED WINGS IN 1969

On October 4, 1969, he was sent to Vietnam, where he served with the 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment as a helicopter pilot. He earned his wings in August, 1969.

In addition to his parents, he is survived by his wife, the former Treva Hengst and two daughters, Danielle, 3, and Brooke Estelle, 11 weeks, all of Frederick.

## EARTH DAY 1970

### HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the committee which has been actively involved in enhancing the quality of our environment through the development and management of our water resources and the national highway program since the very inception of these programs, and in the origin of the national water pollution control program since 1948, I am delighted by the many interested and responsible citizens across the country who have chosen to make their voices heard on this vital matter. It is for this reason that I welcome Earth Day and what I understand its purpose to be—the urgent need to save the environment.

The Public Works Committee is basically concerned with environment and development. In the minds of some people these two areas are diametrically opposed. We know, however, that to provide the food, water, transportation, and economic well-being necessary for our growing population that development is necessary. We take as our approach that reasoned development is essential—development which considers environmental values in relationship with public need.

Our long history as a guardian of the environment is evidenced by our pioneering work in water pollution control. It was this committee which first recognized that the problems of water pollution control were of sufficient seriousness to call for national attention.

However, we did not stop at mere oration, we recommended and the Congress enacted the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948, the Water Pollution Control Act Extension of 1952, the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1956, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961, the Water Quality Act of 1965, the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966, and recently the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1970. Through these acts we have established the framework for constructing the necessary local waste treatment plants, enforcing the prevention of pollution of our waters, and the cleaning up of our waters defiled by oil, hazardous substances and other waste materials.

Earlier this year the Congress enacted, at our recommendation, the Environ-

mental Quality Improvement of 1970, to authorize the hiring of staff support for the Council of Environmental Quality. This staff will be in the forefront and monitor the national Federal effort to preserve our environment.

We are no less proud of our achievements in the Federal-aid highway program and the water resources development program of the Corps of Engineers.

The Federal-Aid Highway Acts since 1956 have included important provisions to protect and enhance our environment. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968, for example, included a provision for the preservation of parklands. The Secretary of Transportation is forbidden to approve the use of publicly owned park lands for highway projects unless there is "no feasible and prudent alternative," and if such lands must be used, all possible planning must be instituted to minimize harm to such lands.

Section 24 of that act requires the State highway departments before submitting proposals for highway locations, to consider the social effects, environmental impact, and consistency with the goals and objectives of urban planning promulgated by the community of such locations, in addition to consideration of the economic impact of such locations.

The Committee on Public Works—and its predecessor Committees on Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control—has had jurisdiction over the civil works program of the Army Corps of Engineers since the earliest involvement in the development and maintenance of the Nation's waterways for navigation and related purposes in 1824.

As in the highway program, this committee has insisted on consideration of environmental values in water resource development programs for many, many years. A healthy environment and natural beauty are values which require proper consideration in any action program for water resource development. The well-being of all of the people is the primary determinant in planning the best use of water and related land resources. The committee has insisted that in preauthorization studies and subsequent preconstruction planning, full consideration be given to the impact of engineering works upon their habitat, and to measure for protection and improvement of environmental resources. Provision is required to be made for development of the recreation potential of water projects by construction and maintenance of facilities for recreational use of, and public access to, the water areas.

Other programs under the jurisdiction of the committee which enhance our existence on this earth include the small watershed program of the Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Department of Transportation's Highway Safety Act of 1966, the highway beautification program, economic development programs of the Appalachian Regional Commission, the six Economic Development Regional Commissions, and the Department of Commerce's Economic Development Administration. The mere enumeration of these programs discloses the fact that these are "people programs"—programs concerned with the well-being of people and their environment.

We have held hearings or will hold hearings shortly on additional environmental legislation this year—legislation which we have or will recommend to the Congress for enactment. This legislation involves the need for coastal zone management, shoreline protection, disaster relief, uniform policy for acquisition of land and relocation, economic development highway safety, air space use for housing purposes and a restructuring of the financial provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Furthermore, we have examined environmental problems in the Chesapeake Bay area and in the Potomac River Basin.

However, we do not limit our concern merely to the programs which are within our committee jurisdiction. I am proud to have recently sponsored H.R. 15848, the Clean Air Enforcement Act Amendments of 1970, as well as other bills which will result in achieving the goals of a better life on a better earth.

---

## SBA'S "OPERATION BUSINESS MAINSTREAM" IN NEWARK

### HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has many times expressed his support of minority capitalism—an on-going program to help people of minority capitalism—an on-going program to help people of minority groups become owners and successful operators of their own small businesses.

The Small Business Administration, under the leaderhip of Administrator Hilary Sandoval, Jr., has inaugurated just such a program, which it calls "Operation Business Mainstream."

This program is now operating throughout the country and reports of its success are encouraging.

I have been pleased to learn that under the new program, the Newark, N.J. SBA office, under the able leadership of Andrew P. Lynch, has compiled an enviable record in providing assistance to minority group persons desiring to enter the business world as owners and operators of their own establishments.

A unique feature of the Newark minority enterprise program is called "Operation Multiply." It provides a cadre of volunteers from the private sector—some 900 in number—who help furnish a wide variety of management and technical assistance to minority-owned small businesses.

Because of the general interest in providing business help to minorities, I include as a part of my remarks in the RECORD the following article from the North Jersey Business Review describing the Newark SBA minority enterprise activities:

[From the North Jersey Business Review, Mar. 1–31, 1970]

SBA ANSWERS BACK HELPS SMALL BUSINESS—PROGRESS IN MINORITY CAPITALISM SBA MAKES IT WORK IN NEW JERSEY

(By Andrew P. Lynch)

Recently, President Nixon said, "It is not enough simply to see that all people in this country have an equal opportunity to get a job—but that it is necessary for every individual in America to be able not only to get a job, but to have a chance to become an owner or a manager.

The President has been the target of criticism related to the government's actual efforts to promote the economic growth of minority groups, but with this statement to the Advisory Council for Minority Enterprise the Nixon Administration reaffirmed its commitment to the cause of Minority Capitalism. President Nixon has often stated that government alone can't do the job. Private resources and private commitments are necessary if the programs are to be effective and far reaching. Many questions have been raised as to the workability of existing programs even though most federal agencies involved in minority enterprise have increased their efforts to offer equal opportunity to America's minorities.

One such Agency, the Small Business Administration (SBA), under its Administrator, Hilary Sandoval, Jr., has inaugurated a bold, new, innovative program dubbed Operation Business Mainstream. The objective of this Agency's program is to close the gap in business ownership between minority individuals and other Americans.

Andrew P. Lynch, Regional Director of Newark's SBA office said, "It is a sad fact that although recognized minorities constitute 15 percent of the country's population, only three percent of the nation's more than 5,000,000 small businesses are owned by these minority groups". This means that although one white American in 43 owns his own business, there is only one minority owned business for every 200 minority individuals. The need for Minority Capitalism programs is evident. If a program so designed is to succeed, it must depend heavily on the dedication of those charged with its execution. SBA's program is geared to local needs, and in accordance with this aim, Minority Enterprise (ME) Teams were established to operate in the urban centers heavily populated by minority groups. These ME Teams are charged with bringing SBA's program to the people, seeking out potential minority entrepreneurs and coordinating the Agency's efforts to establish minority owned businesses.

Operation Business Mainstream has two basic functions. The first is to provide financial assistance, through relaxed lending criteria, to enable the establishment of the business. The second is to provide the management and technical assistance necessary to assure a reasonable chance of success. SBA has set for itself a goal of 8,000 new minority loans in this fiscal year. It is a goal Administrator Sandoval believes can be attained. In accordance with the new program, eligibility for ME loans has been substantially eased. Emphasis is now placed on the applicant's character and reasonable assurance the loan could be repaid from business profits. The Agency also seeks to involve the private sector in these ventures by offering a guarantee to lending institutions willing to grant loans to minority entrepreneurs. Operation Business Mainstream is young, but thus far the results are promising. The Newark Regional Office of SBA, under Mr. Lynch's direction has been especially successful.

In the first six months of this fiscal year, this office approved 154 ME loans in New Jersey for a total of $3,415,000. Seventy-five of the loans amounted to $2,087,550 were granted by local lending institutions with SBA's guarantee. Thus, 61 percent of the

funds lent to minority businessmen in fiscal year 1970 were advanced by the private sector.

Loans were granted to a wide variety of business, ranging from a service station to an Area Directorship for a new national franchise. The largest loan, $170,000 was granted by the Prudential Insurance Company with a 90 percent SBA guarantee. The loan, made to Market Selection and Development Company of Newark, enabled this negro-owned and operated firm to acquire an Area Directorship of the All-Pro Chicken franchise for the state of New Jersey. As a result of the loan, Market Selection will open four All-Pro outlets in Northern New Jersey in the coming year. The company anticipates the establishment of 20 such outlets within the next five years. The purpose of All-Pro Chicken, founded by former football star, Brady Keyes, Jr., is to establish black-owned franchised outlets in center city locations.

Financing is necessarily a prime requirement for Minority Capitalism. However, statistics reveal that 93 percent of all business failures result from managerial weaknesses and deficiencies. Money alone can't do the job. Thus, SBA's Managerial Assistance programs play an equally important role in Operation Business Mainstream. If any Minority Capitalism program is to succeed, the businesses established must be viable.

To effectively provide capable management assistance requires manpower. Operating under a tight operating budget due to the current federal fiscal restraints it was readily apparent that the manpower necessary couldn't be provided by SBA personnel alone, regardless of their competence.

Faced with this situation, the Newark Regional Office developed a program designed to vastly increase management services by involving the private sector. The plan, Operation Multiply, received Washington's approval for a pilot project to recruit volunteers throughout New Jersey. The Newark Management Assistance staff began contacting trade associations, professional organizations, educational institutions, service clubs and industry asking their participation.

As a result of these efforts, more than 900 volunteers with a wide variety of managerial and technical skills have been recruited to provide assistance to minority owned small businesses. With these new volunteers and Newark's ten chapters of the Service Corps of Retired Executives with their 150 volunteers, Newark's SBA office hopes to provide the most comprehensive management assistance program possible.

The President remains committed to Minority Capitalism. There is much to be done, but if New Jersey's SBA office is any example, progress is being made. The commitment is factual.

## WDAF ANTIPOLLUTION CAMPAIGN

### HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, April 15, 1970*

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, WDAF radio and WDAF television in Kansas City have initiated an extensive 4-week education campaign on the problems of pollution in the Kansas City area. To my knowledge this is the first such saturation campaign to be inaugurated by radio and television stations strictly on the local level.

For 1 month all available broadcast facilities will be aimed toward the purpose of public involvement in the pollution problem in Kansas City. Newscasts, public affairs reports, public service announcements, promotional spots, editorials, radio talk shows, regular smog-count broadcasts, interviews with national, State and local ecology experts, and a direct mail campaign to grade schools and interested civic groups—all will be utilized to define the pollution problem, what is being done about it, what further needs to be done, and how each individual citizen can participate.

I am bringing this commendable effort to the attention of my colleagues with the thought that you may wish to alert your radio and TV stations to what WDAF is doing and suggest that they initiate similar antipollution campaigns.

## THE COSTS OF WAR

### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the costs of war are phenomenal both in terms of lives and dollars.

What is most disturbing is that there seems to be no end in sight to our involvement. When the pressure begins to ease in one area, another trouble spot comes to the surface. Thus the toll continues.

Our annual financial outlay for defense is staggering and the cry is loud and clear for a substantial cutback.

The toll of lives in the Vietnam war has totaled 41,274 Americans killed—equivalent to the population of a medium-sized city such as Jamestown, N.Y. The South Vietnamese dead number 104,708, slightly in excess of the population of Niagara Falls, N.Y.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington correspondent for the Buffalo, N.Y., Courier-Express, Peter C. Andrews, has compiled some very interesting statistics along this line in a recent news story. The following day, his paper published a related editorial. Both follow:

WAR COSTS HIGH IN DOLLARS, LIVES

(By Peter C. Andrews)

WASHINGTON.—Today, April 15, 1970, peace demonstrators in America are holding their third moratorium day in the past six months. Approximately 5,000 Americans have been killed in Vietnam since the first moratorium day was held, Oct. 15, 1969. Although more than 100,000 American troops have been withdrawn from Vietnam in the past year, peace appears farther away than it did when America became involved in the war nine years ago.

What has been the cost of the war? In terms of manpower, it has cost the United States 41,274 killed (as of April 4, 1970—the latest figures), 137,395 wounded requiring hospitalization and 134,886 wounded but not requiring hospitalization. The South Vietnamese have suffered 104,708 killed and 245,324 wounded. There have been 618,061 enemy killed, according to the Department of Defense.

In terms of money, the war has cost approximately $105-billion according to the Pentagon, although the figures are subject to some question because of difference in accounting procedures in different years and variations in what has been considered expenditures attributable to the Vietnam war effort.

DROP EXPECTED

Last Oct. 22, Defense Secretary Melvin Laird said that by mid-1970 the annual rate of expenditure on the Vietnam war would drop from approximately $30-billion to $17-billion. In the past five years the expenditures, as computed by the Pentagon, have been: $5.8-billion in 1966; $20.1-billion in 1967; $26.5-billion in 1968; $28.8-billion in 1969, and $23.2-billion in fiscal 1970.

The escalation of the United States war effort is seen in this tabulation of the number of Americans killed and wounded:

1961—11 killed; 2 wounded (hospitalized); 1 wounded (not hospitalized).

1962—31 killed; 41 wounded (hospitalized); 37 wounded (not hospitalized).

1963—78 killed; 218 wounded (hospitalized); 193 wounded (not hospitalized).

1964—147 killed; 522 wounded (hospitalized); 517 wounded (not hospitalized).

1965—1,369 killed; 3,308 wounded (hospitalized); 2,806 wounded (not hospitalized).

1966—5,008 killed; 16,526 wounded (hospitalized); 13,657 wounded (not hospitalized).

1967—9,378 killed; 32,371 wounded (hospitalized); 29,654 wounded (not hospitalized).

1968—14,592 killed; 46,799 wounded (hospitalized); 46,021 wounded (not hospitalized).

1969—9,414 killed; 32,940 wounded (hospitalized); 37,276 wounded (not hospitalized).

During the period the number of enemy killed is reported as follows:

1961—12,133.
1962—21,158.
1963—20,575.
1964—16,785.
1965—35,436.
1966—55,524.
1967—88,104.
1968—181,149.
1969—156,954.

Although the expenditures to kill each enemy soldier are not rightfully a measure of the effectiveness of military operations, it is an interesting fact that dividing the number of enemy killed into the cost to kill them amounts to about $170,000 per man.

Moratorium day speakers will have much to say about how the $105-billion the war has already cost could have been spent. With domestic problems of a monumental size facing the United States, it is a little hard to conceive how this nation *justifies* an expenditure of this magnitude which far outstrips even the most expensive of our domestic programs.

What this money could have accomplished in a foreign aid program in Southeast Asia is another interesting topic of conjecture. Speculating what each enemy soldier killed could have done with the money is an exercise in futility.

SETTLEMENT DIM

Although the American position now is to "Vietnamize" the war, the effectiveness of this effort remains to be seen. With the Viet Cong attitude at the Paris peace talks still the same hard line they have maintained for so long, there appears little real hope of a settlement in the near future.

The aim of American Vietnam policy, at present, appears to be a withdrawal of our own forces and a stalemate in the fighting between the opposing forces remaining.

This is a modest goal, but even this limited objective seems difficult to achieve in view of this generally depressing situation, and in the light of the appealing casualty and cost figures of the war so far, it might be a good thing if every American gave some thought today toward the solution of our Vietnam problem.

Unless we find a solution, we may find ourselves in a perpetual state of semi-war, draining our resources and our manpower until, at the end, we collapse of our own inability to find peace.

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express, Apr. 16, 1970]

IS UNITED STATES BECOMING "WARFARE STATE"?

Now that the military "salvation" government of Cambodia, led by Gen. Lon Nol, has asked, formally, for military aid from outside nations—obviously meaning the United States—it seems to us that all Americans should pause to reconsider what the cost has been to this nation since it got sucked into the deadly quicksands of a Southeast Asia land war—at the supposed invitation of a "friendly" military regime in Saigon back in the late 1950s.

Although Gen. Nol did not specifically name the United States as the likely supplier of weapons, his bid came just before President Nixon's speech on Vietnam and after several weeks of unofficial hints that such aid would be requested. With reports of Cambodian massacres of South Vietnamese refugees rife, there is even more of a question about granting military aid than before. Of course, the Nixon administration has said it had no plans to get involved in Cambodia, and if the lesson of the Vietnam entanglement is ever to be learned, it should have been learned by Mr. Nixon who, after all, was vice president when the State Department and the Pentagon sought to rush in where the French military had failed, against the communist-led Vietminh rebels.

As pointed out in a recent analysis by Peter C. Andrews, chief of the Washington Bureau of The Courier-Express, U.S. intervention in the Vietnamese war has taken a frightful toll upon our national life and purpose. It has cost the lives of 41,274 young American men and surely these are our most precious asset. According to the Pentagon statistics, at least 277,275 Americans have been wounded; hundreds are either missing or are prisoners of a war which is not an "official" war because war was never declared by Congress as the Constitution requires.

Since 1965, when the financial facts were first ferreted out, the war has cost $105-billion in direct military expenditures alone. Who knows how much it cost the economy before that? Clearly, the federal government is not eager to say, even as it does claim to be budgeting the war down to around $17-billion for the new fiscal year. The President has staked his hopes, apparently, on the "Vietnamization" policy which has meant, up to April 15, reduction of our troop strength in South Vietnam to about 454,000—or about the same number we had there in 1967.

Although the troop-withdrawal plan has been hailed as the best way to end the war, as the South Vietnamese have become stronger and militarily more aggressive, the fighting has escalated into Laos and Cambodia—an ironic negation of the so-called domino theory. *Unless* the slow troop withdrawal is accompanied by some progress in the peace talks—perhaps expansion of them to include extrication seem dismal indeed. Neither Hanoi nor the Viet Cong show signs of yielding on the big issue, and it seems folly to keep appealing to Moscow for help in persuading them. The United States must take its own initiatives.

The civil disorders at home have much of their roots in the war issue and, consequently, so do the repressions which have followed. Meanwhile, the economy is in a limbo of half-inflation and half-recession. It seems to us that the state of crisis at home overrides any kind of argument to the effect that we have some fundamental "national interest" in being at war in the Indochinese peninsula.

## CONSERVATION OF OUR YOUTH

### HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from Mr. John D. Warnick, Scout executive of the Ore-Ida Council of the Boy Scouts of America, which I include in the RECORD at this point:

MARCH 27, 1970.

Congressman JAMES MCCLURE,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCLURE: The Ore-Ida Council would like to inform you of our declaration of war on litter so that everybody of Scout age, and we hope everyone throughout Idaho, will realize the problem of litter in our State and join Scouting in doing something about it.

We have asked every mayor and top citizens in every community in our Council to declare April 20 through 25 as "War on Litter Week". Our Governor Don Samuelson will also declare this week as "Litter Week" for the State.

Every Cub, Scout, Explorer, Scout Leader, and we hope many hundreds of parents and interested citizens will, on Saturday, April 25, help clean our streets. And, in doing this, learn a great lesson on the problem of litter.

We plan this to be a part of a new four-point program of our Council called, "Conservation of Our Youth":

1. Conservation of our Natural Resources.
2. War on Litter.
3. Highway Safety.
4. Harmful Use of Drugs.

We feel, here in the Ore-Ida Council, that to start with our young men, who are already being taught character, citizenship, and most of all duty to God and County, we can do something about these four problems that face America today.

Scouting has the leaders and institutions who can, and will, strengthen America through our youth and Scouting. I am asking for your help in giving your endorsement and backing of this program by submitting a statement to our news media. And, perhaps we could get our other Idaho National Congressional leaders to join with us.

There will be questions, undoubtedly, that you will like to have answered. If you could give me a call or write, I would be very happy to fill you in on what we have done to date and where you could help.

We are putting much effort in making this "War on Litter" a real campaign, one that we hope will remain with our youth for years to come.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. WARNICK,
*Scout Executive.*

I think that you will all agree with me that the activities planned by this organization are outstanding. We often complain about the young people of today, and we often deplore their involvement in the many problems that beset the United States. It has not been their interest which concerned us, but the manner in which they express their opinions.

Mr. Warnick's letter clearly demonstrates that our young people can and are becoming involved in a most constructive way. They are approaching the problem of environment, one problem which weighs heavily upon the minds of all of us. Highway safety has persisted in the United States for many years as a No. 1 killer. These Boy Scouts are helping to work out a solution. Drugs, of course, are becoming a problem associated with the young, and who but the young can be most effective among their peers in combating this menace?

The program of these young people can well serve as an example to every youth group in the country who wish to be a part of their community and who wish to work on the same problems we face in the Congress today. I sincerely hope that my colleagues will communicate the suggestions of Mr. Warnick to the youth leaders in their own areas.

## A YOUNG AMERICAN IS CONCERNED ABOUT HER COUNTRY

### HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, more and more young men and women of this Nation are becoming increasingly concerned about their future and the future of the United States.

These are not militant, radical youths who seek only to destroy in the name of change, but rather intelligent, constructive, positive-thinking young Americans who seek responsibility in the formulation of the future of this Nation.

Of particular concern to these young people is the devastation of our environment and the effect this has had on our lives. Of concern too, is man's relationship with his fellowman and the constant problem mankind has had with war.

I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues a letter I have received from Miss Lea Van Landingham of West Palm Beach, Fla., which expresses her feelings on these matters:

Mr. PAUL ROGERS,
*Congressman,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SIR: In the beginning when God created the earth it was full of peace and joy. The valleys were green and the rest of the land was covered with bright, colorful flowers in bloom and trees.

The air was fresh and clean, and all the birds sang happily, and the other animals ran around happily in this lovely world.

God meant it to be a paradise, and in the beginning it was. But now everywhere you look there are buildings, factories, cars, etc. and the air's all polluted and theirs hardly anything left of the land.

All our rivers, oceans, streams, and lakes are polluted with garbage, but most of all there's hardly any love, peace, or joy in the world. People don't get along together. Everyone's always fighting, and our lovely paradise has become a place of war and hatred. And our lovely valleys of green with colorful flowers have become a bloody battlefield.

Sometimes I wonder how God feels about the way people have changed his world. Yes it's His world, he created it and the mankind that God also created has destroyed it.

Believe it or not there are a few people who still think of God's world and way of living without hatred, war, and sin, but only a very few.

Yes, I'm a teenager and I like the mini skirts and the music that we play now but I still have room in my heart for God and his world of peace and joy.

Please think about this won't you?

Sincerely yours,

LEA VAN HANDINGHAM.

## NEW BLOW TO NIXON

### HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the rejections by the Senate of Judges Haynsworth and Carswell, many southerners feel a personal letdown—they feel that, in effect, the Senate was rejecting any southerner. And, frankly, I agree with this analysis. The Senate changed the ground rules on these two Court nominations. All of a sudden "advise and consent" means "I advise you to appoint a man whose views coincide with mine and I'll consent only if his views match mine." It is interesting to note that four recent Justices having no previous judicial experience were confirmed without a single vote cast against them.

A sampling of this feeling can be found in the editorials and columns of some of the major Texas papers. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to insert excerpts of these writings in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Houston Chronicle, Apr. 9, 1970]

NEW BLOW TO NIXON

The Senate's rejection of Judge G. Harrold Carswell for the Supreme Court is another serious political blow to President Nixon. More importantly, it is a blow to the proper operation of the highest court in the land. For almost a year, ever since Abe Fortas resigned last May, the nine-member court has been short one justice. Reportedly the court has passed some cases because of the possibility of a 4–4 deadlock.

As we have said previously, we think the Senate should have confirmed Judge Carswell—an experienced, intelligent federal judge who has received Senate approval on three previous occasions. If the Senate found him competent to sit as a judge of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, we wonder how it now finds him unqualified to sit on the Supreme Court. The same can be said of Judge Clement Haynsworth whose nomination the Senate also rejected.

We don't blame Carswell's defeat entirely on politics. Some statesman-like senators who voted against him obviously were concerned about his past racial attitudes and about the lack of distinction of his judicial record.

But many other senators were motivated by politics pure and simple. They wanted to embarrass Mr. Nixon again and to get a little more political mileage out of snubbing the South.

It is interesting to note how similar were the votes on Carswell and Haynsworth. Carswell was defeated 51–45, Haynsworth 55 to 45.

Mr. Nixon set out to nominate a Southerner, an experienced judge, and one who believed in strict construction of the Constitution. Both Haynsworth and Carswell met these qualifications.

Their rejection by the Senate gives the erroneous impression that the South is lacking in competent judges and attorneys. This is not the case. The South has as many excellent legal minds as any other section of the United States. Here in Houston there are a number of men who are highly qualified to sit on the Supreme Court. The same can be said for other parts of the South.

Unfortunately, Mr. Nixon has been unable to satisfy the super-critics of the Senate who have shown considerable hypocrisy in this matter. We wonder how many senators could have withstood the close scrutiny and personal attacks to which Carswell and Haynsworth were subjected. Not many, we suspect.

Mr. Nixon must return to the business of picking a nominee. This time, he will be well advised to choose a man of absolutely unimpeachable integrity and demonstrated experience and distinction. The highest court in the land certainly deserves such a man. The problem is: Does the man exist who will satisfy the Senate?

In an editorial the morning of April 11, 1970, the Dallas Morning News commented:

Nixon made the most of that press conference. He was entitled to. Politics beat his nominees—both of them; politics and a malignant sectionalism. He turned the guns around and laid down a political barrage of his own whose shock ripples will be a long time dying.

"It is their philosophy (Carswell's and Haynsworth's) and the accident of their birth which caused their defeat," he told newsmen. "I understand the bitter feeling of millions of Americans who live in the South about the act of regional discrimination that took place in the Senate yesterday."

Liberals will say that he has magnified the issue out of spite—distorted their motives to accommodate his Southern strategy. They will say that they declined to give their consent out of regard for the high calling of justice. They will repeat that Haynsworth was "insensitive" and Carswell undistinguished.

But the sum total of their objections to the nominees is so slight as to magnify instead of mask the real motive behind the hostility: They don't like Southerners and they like Southern conservatives less.

Political implications of that message are clear as summer lightning. What might have been Nixon's "Southern strategy" has been unwittingly abetted by the liberals. They accused him of having it before, but their own strategy of poisonous, mindless prejudice has not only strenthened his appeal with Southeners—but done their own cause grave harm in the South without servicing their main objectives: Keeping the high court liberal.

Nixon will ultimately get a conservative justice. And by acknowledging to the South that he was attempting the impossible in nominating two of its own, he will pile up points there and also blunt some of the dismal analyses that describe him as losing on all sides of the political ledger.

If this is to say the selection of Supreme Court justices has been all but completely politicalized, it is also to say that the liberals—by shifting from their constitutional role of scrutinizing competence rather than the nominees' philosophy—are to blame. They have made a political football field of what was meant to be a constitutional inner sanctum remote from partisan brawls.

They have diminished the dignity of the court in the public eye. In pretending to uphold its status, they have dragged it down to their own level of sectional spite.

A day later Felix R. McKnight, editor, Dallas Times Herald, wrote in his column:

DID CARSWELL ACTION SEND US BACKWARD?

(By Felix R. McKnight)

It is possible, as we send men through the stars to infinity in the quest for human greatness, that down below we are creating new and volatile schisms among our own.

In recent days, even as we prepared more astronauts for a flight to the moon, we inched backwards in human progress. We moved backwards into a history we have tried to erase.

The case of G. Harrold Carswell is prime material for thought and evaluation.

It has been done, and he will not be named to the U.S. Supreme Court, but what of this new, emerging system that not only destroys the individual but builds barriers between people?

Have we, after the great surges of the past century, come the full cycle to the old dangers of sectionalism? Have we managed ourselves into a throwback of 100 years in pitting one American neighborhood against another?

Are we breeding new factions actually based on geographical lines? It is, in the eyes of others removed, at least a political sin to be a Southerner?

President Nixon reluctantly conceded Thursday that the Senate, as presently constituted, would never confirm a Southern nominee. And that is a tragic concession from the President of the United States.

"Judges Carswell and Haynsworth have endured with admirable dignity vicious assaults on their intelligence, their honesty and their character. They have been falsely charged with being racist.

"But when all hyprocrisy is stripped away, the real issue was their philosophy of strict construction of the Constitution—a philosophy that I share—and the fact that they had the misfortune of being born in the South. . . ."

Others in the congressional branch are concerned with present abrasive, divisive tactics. Two men have been rejected by the Senate. The Southern men now branded around the country with the charge that they are "racists" not yet over the sensitive issues of Civil War days.

Ridiculous; far-fetched? No—just very sad.

Sad because new-thinking liberals who feed on the vote of the restless minority chose to revive and balloon old scars for pure political gain. It can mean nothing but deeper cleavage and new wounds for a nation already beset by ills brought on by this very kind of thinking.

It is not to defend Judges Haynsworth and Carswell because they are Southerners, nor to suggest that they should have been confirmed for that, or any reason other than competency.

It is to suggest that the means employed to deny confirmation could lead to enormously greater problems than just a fleeting political victory.

When the vote was counted on Wednesday and Judge Carswell had been minimized to ineffectiveness as a circuit judge and cast to living in doubt from his fellow Americans, Sen. Howard Baker of Tennessee, a young and able man, reflected:

"This nation might relive the tragedy of 100 years ago . . ."

On the opposite side of the aisle, venerable Sen. Aiken of Vermont, dean of Senate Republicans and a man of the North, observed:

"We will never get one who will be good enough for the North . . ."

Reams will be written and tens of thousands of words will be spilled by commentators on the reasons for defeat of Judges Haynsworth and Carswell. But the deep issue will be only lightly touched. There will be the followup cry of "get rid of Attorney General Mitchell," already started. There will be

the redundancy of pundit-inspired charges that neither actually had the stature.

But few will get around to admitting, as did Senators Aiken and Baker and many men on the streets, that there is suspicion and distrust of Southern nominees. Or, more positively, that there should be only new and "progressive" liberals entrusted with interpretation of the laws of this land.

In its zeal to embarrass President Nixon and his administration during a political year, the opposition did not take the distant look at all consequences. Senator Ted Kennedy and his Senate buddy, Birch Bayh of Indiana, have further driven the Supreme Court into controversy and disrepute. Its aura of total respect as guardian of the citizen has dimmed. And it must function without the imperative ninth, or tie-breaking, Justice. Important cases have been delayed because of this fact.

## JAMES H. "JIMMY" QUILLEN

### HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague and friend from the First Congressional District of Tennessee, the Honorable JAMES H. "JIMMY" QUILLEN, has won the respect of both political parties in our State. He has served so faithfully that it is difficult for one to oppose him in elections.

I would like to place in the RECORD two most interesting editorial statements—one from the Bristol Herald Courier of April 13 and one from the Bristol Virginia-Tennessean of April 10:

[From the Bristol Herald Courier, Apr. 13, 1970]

UNCERTAIN CANDIDATE

Dan M. Laws Jr. of Elizabethton seems to be a bit uncertain in his quest for the First District Republican congressional nomination.

He has challenged incumbent GOP Rep. James H. Quillen to a debate, perhaps hoping something will develop.

He will raise some questions concerning Rep. Quillen's voting record, his personal finances, his political effectiveness, but "I make no charges against Congressman Quillen of using his office for personal gain or in any way reflect on him or the high honor of the office."

He is not going to hold Rep. Quillen responsible for problems of inflation, higher interest rates, the congressional pay raise, the complaints of letter carriers and postal system problems, or, even, of major increases in costs for consumers.

But he will, however, "consider Congressman Quillen's voting record" and leave it up to the voters to decide the qualifications of the two primary candidates.

Just where all of this will lead is uncertain, though it's not likely it will culminate in Rep. Quillen's defeat.

Ostensibly, Mr. Laws is seeking election primarily to give Republicans a choice in their primary next August. As a demonstration of civic responsibility, this is commendable.

However, we can't shake off the feeling that internal Republican politics are as much responsible for Mr. Laws' candidacy as anything else. As he, himself, should know, the work which Rep. Quillen has done for the First District, for both Democrats and Republicans, has been noteworthy. The incumbent congressman is an able representative who takes his responsibilities seriously—and, more important, who realizes that he represents people as individuals, with individual problems requiring the kind of personal attention Rep. Quillen gives them.

Mr. Laws' candidacy should serve to enliven the summer campaign a bit and, we suppose, this will be welcome to most observers. But we just can't believe he seriously thinks he can unseat Rep. Quillen—not unless the Republicans of the First District undergo a major spasm which robs them of their reason.

Come next January, we fully expect Rep. Quillen to be back in his Washington office serving the First District, which is where he should be.

[From the Bristol, Virginia-Tennessean, Apr. 10, 1970]

A GOOD CONGRESSMAN

First Tennessee District Congressman James H. (Jimmy) Quillen probably isn't too worried about the Aug. 6 primary opposition he faces from Elizabethton lawyer Dan M. Laws Jr.

After all, Rep. Quillen was reelected to Congress in 1966 and 1968 by the greatest vote margin of any Republican in the land.

It isn't likely that those thousands of East Tennesseans—Republicans and Democrats alike—are going to flock to a virtual unkown in the primary. And it isn't likely that they will leave Mr. Quillen in the November general election to vote for a Democrat long identified with Estes Kefauver, Hubert Humphrey, Albert Gore and other liberals in the National Democratic party.

Mr. Quillen will not go down in history books as a legislative trailblazer. He hasn't tried to be. But he is a good congressman for the First District because he cares about his people, makes himself available to them, and works untiringly in their behalf in bucking the red tape of Washington.

That in the long run is what counts. To a widowed mother in Carter County, getting her full Social Security benefits on time through Congressman Quillen's help means much more to her than if he was the author of the United Nations charter.

## POSTAL REORGANIZATION

### HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the postal reorganization and salary adjustment plan negotiated by the Postmaster General and the postal unions is a dramatic step forward for the 750,000 postal employees and for the country.

For the first time, postal employees and their management have bargained and reasoned together. The result is a proposal for a major change in the structure of the postal system which would enable the Post Office to achieve better working conditions for employees and improve the quality of postal service to the American people. It would remove the Post Office permanently from politics so that it can be operated in a business-like fashion, and in time, become self-supporting.

I would point out that this reorganization plan is a bipartisan issue. The concept upon which this plan is based was first set forth by Larry O'Brien, and it has been endorsed by President Johnson, the blue-ribbon Kappel Commission, as well as the present administration.

We cannot afford to wait any longer. Congress must act now, if we are to bring the Post Office into the 20th century.

## THE BRONX HOME NEWS

### HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, when those of us from New York City get up on the floor to discuss newspapers, too often we speak either of the death of some great newspaper or of a crippling strike.

Today, however, I wish to inform Members of the House about a new newspaper in my district, the Bronx Home News, which will celebrate on May 9 its third anniversary.

Happily, Mr. Speaker, the Bronx Home News is flourishing, and I and all the constituents of the 22d Congressional District wish it many long years of prosperity.

But I would like to say a word about why the Bronx Home News is doing so well. If editor and publisher Joseph E. Donohue and managing editor Frank Feighery have done any one thing well, it is to stay abreast of news developments within the Bronx and to bring those reports to our citizens fairly, objectively and comprehensively.

That is a lesson that others in the news media might do well to emulate in the days ahead. We have a tradition here in this Nation of speaking out freely when we feel the need, and all of us depend greatly on the news media to provide the opportunity for everyone's opinion on important subjects to be heard.

No means of communication in a rapidly changing world is quite so vital to the public at large as the newspaper. And I cannot place enough importance in large urban areas upon the newspaper which specializes in a particular section of sprawling metropolitan areas.

Without the Bronx Home News, many events of importance to our citizens would go unreported in the huge citywide dailies of our city. And at a time when the very size of cities dehumanizes life, the Bronx Home News provides all of us with a continuity of community involvement.

To the staff of this fine, new and energetic newspaper, I say: "Congratulations on a job well done." As to the future, I can only add that we in the 22d Congressional District are depending on you to maintain the same high standards you have exhibited in these, your formative years. As long as good, independent newspapers exist, I, for one, have no worries about our Nation's ability to survive as the citadel of democracy.

## THE INVESTIGATION OF JUSTICE DOUGLAS

### HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, William F. Buckley's column in yesterday's Washington Star expresses the sentiments of many people who are concerned about the extrajudicial activities of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court William O. Douglas.

While some of the media continually refer to criticisms of these activities as relating to the Justice's alleged "writing about dissent," the fact of the matter is that the content of his writing specifically affords encouragement if not incitement to continuing civil disobedience and even violence in the United States.

Many Members of Congress and millions of Americans are concerned that this type of activity by a Supreme Court Justice constitutes judicial misbehavior of a most serious character, independent and aside from other reported activities of Justice Douglas that are alleged to involve substantial conflicts of interest with judicial ethical standards and bar association requirements that judges shall not be of counsel nor practice law.

Mr. Buckley's column follows:

THE CASE AGAINST JUSTICE DOUGLAS

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

The Democratic congressman who had demanded of Republican Leader Gerald Ford that he be specific on the matter of why Justice William O. Douglas should be impeached, makes a good point—although it is as much his responsibility as Mr. Ford's to concern himself with whether Mr. Douglas has destroyed his usefulness, and Mr. Douglas' book is as easily available to Democrats as to Republicans. And anyway, a precis of Mr. Douglas' book appears in the current issue of a pornographic monthly readily available.

There, nestled among the pudenda, is an article by Justice Douglas entitled "Redress the Revolution," an excerpt from his book, "Points of Rebellion." Mr. Douglas begins by talking about the generally unsatisfactory state of affairs in America today, including the recent elimination of his favorite trout stream.

Then suddenly he finds himself talking about violence, which he concedes "has no constitutional sanctions." This he would appear to regret, because he adds immediately, "but where grievances pile high and most of the elected spokesmen represent the establishment, violence may be the only effective response."

Mr. Douglas reaches abroad for illustrations. He recites tales of horror about life in Guatemala as related by two priests and a nun—ex-nun and ex-priests being perhaps more accurate, since post-Guatemala, they got married.

Anyway, Mr. Douglas, who is supposed to be expert on the rules of evidence, passes along the extraordinary news that the Maryknoll priests, "between 1966 and 1967, . . . saw more than 2,800 intellectuals, students, labor leaders, and peasants assassinated by right-wing groups because they were trying to combat the ills of Guatemalan society."

An altogether astounding story, as I say. First, that there should have been 2,800 assassinations in tiny Guatemala over a one-year period without anybody knowing about it, second that the assassinations should have been directed against those who sought to combat rather than promote evil; but most extraordinary of all, that Guatemalan authorities should have summoned two priests and one nun to witness each and every one of said assassinations.

Mr. Douglas has at this point picked up a lot of steam, and he reports gleefully that the priests advised Guatemalan peasants who approached them, that under the circumstances, it is okay by God to use violence. Under the circumstances. . . .

Mr. Douglas moves now to America. Here, he concedes, we do not turn so readily to violence. However, we do run the risk of violence—because the young generation doesn't like the way things are run in America, believing that the entire governing class is run by the special interests.

Now, he explains, the situation was very similar back in 1776. Then, Americans demanded a restructuring of our institutions. "That restructuring was not forthcoming and there was revolution."

And then, explicitly, the climax. "You must realize that today's establishment is the new King George III. Whether it will continue"—note that Mr. Douglas would have us believe that the establishment does now exercise the tyrannical practices of George III—"we do not know. If it does, the redress, honored in tradition, is also revolution."

Now what Mr. Douglas has said very simply is that such conditions as legitimized revolution in 1776 now exist in America. He seems to be saying that George III—the establishment—might well be given, for a little longer, a chance to reverse itself. But that is one man's judgment.

Those who—for instance the Chicago Seven—believe America has been given long enough to change its way, and therefore advocate instant revolution, disagree with Mr. Douglas only on a matter of timing. What they advocate—violent revolution—is in Mr. Douglas's view, very simply, honored by tradition.

If that is not sufficient cause for impeaching an official of the government who has sworn to defend the Constitution and the execution of its laws, then nothing justifies impeachment. It is quite extraordinary that Congress should have got lathered up over the nickel and dime malversations of Justice Fortas, while sleeping on this one.

If Mr. Douglas is not impeached, he may have proven by other means than he intended that indeed American society is irretrievably corrupt.

## SHASTA DAISY BILL

### HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to name the Shasta daisy as this country's national flower.

Historically, this is an issue that Congress has been unable to resolve. I believe that the time has come to settle this issue once, and for all. Surely in this, the "Environmental Quality Decade," we should join forces to give America a flower it can call its very own.

Since there is only one flower that grows well in all 50 States, and the creator of this flower was America's greatest horicultural genius, Luther Burbank, it is obvious to me that the Shasta daisy should have the distinction of being America's national flower.

It is my intention to make this effort a nationwide campaign. I will be asking schoolchildren throughout the United States to get involved by writing their Congressman urging support of the Shasta daisy as America's national flower.

## MR. NIXON, THE SST, AND THE ENVIRONMENT

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Minneapolis Tribune printed an editorial Monday, March 30, 1970, "Mr. Nixon, the SST, and the Environment."

Yesterday, Earth Day was celebrated throughout the Nation. The Tribune comment, I believe, is a worthy addendum to the concerns expressed yesterday and to those that will be expressed during the remainder of the week about our environment. I insert the editorial into the RECORD at this point:

MR. NIXON, THE SST AND THE ENVIRONMENT

The case against the supersonic transport (SST) has been stated many times by many groups. The plane will be too expensive, too noisy; it probably will not pay for itself; it will present technical dangers; it will pose many environmental problems.

But somehow the SST—with its 90-percent federal funding—keeps taxiing ahead. More than $600 million already has been spent, much of it wasted because early designs were scrapped. Mr. Nixon wants to spend $662 million more over five years, including $275 million next fiscal year.

Two Cabinet-level task forces have recommended against the SST—one in 1967 to then President Johnson, one to Mr. Nixon last year. The President's chief science adviser, the Environmental Quality Council, the Council of Economic Advisers and representatives of five federal departments all have signed in against the SST.

The administration's response to criticism has been to say that the SST and its thunderous wake of sonic boom will be banned over "populated areas" of the country. That is no answer. The President can't speak for authorities 10 years hence. If the SST proves unprofitable without high-speed overland routes (a distinct possibility), what will be scrapped—the overflight ban or planes costing perhaps $50 million each?

But sonic booms in populated areas are only part of the SST threat to the environment. No one knows the effect of sonic booms on sea life. The SST is expected to be noisier at subsonic speeds and on the ground than present planes. And, perhaps worst, some scientists fear that the SST will pollute the upper atmosphere in a way that will cause significant alterations in weather.

A militant new organization, Friends of the Earth, recently took a full-page advertisement in the New York Times to point out some of the SST's drawbacks and to ask that citizens write the President, senators and representatives in opposition to the project. That is good advice; Mr. Nixon's $275-million request will be heard in the

Senate Appropriations Committee next month. Congress should have little trouble, it seems to us, in finding better uses for the money.

## TVA BOND RESTRICTIONS SHOULD BE ABOLISHED

### HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Knoxville News-Sentinel recently reprinted an editorial from the Nashville Tennessean in support of an increase in the bonding authority of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

This editorial points out that TVA needs this additional authority to make long-range plans for expansion of power-producing facilities.

The editorial follows:

[From the Knoxville News-Sentinel, Apr. 15, 1970]

OUR NEIGHBORS SPEAK: "TVA BOND RESTRICTIONS SHOULD BE ABOLISHED"

The Tennessee delegation in Congress is expecting a hard struggle against the Nixon administration's latest attempt to cripple TVA by putting unrealistic limits on its funding authority.

The state's House delegation is sponsoring a bill that would raise TVA's bond-selling authority from the present $1.75 billion to $5 billion.

Raising the limit to this extent at the present time is necessary to enable TVA to make long-range plans for expansion of power-producing facilities that are expected to be required in the valley during this decade.

None of the money that would be involved in the bond sales would be tax money. TVA's power facilities are financed through the sale of bonds through the private sector of the economy, and the bonds are paid off from power revenues.

However, under the law, TVA is limited in the amount of bonds it can sell and must have approval by Congress before a new limit can be established.

This unnecessary restriction on TVA's financing is a product of the previous Republican administration. And now, Mr. Nixon is carrying on the GOP tradition of handicapping TVA by trying to keep the proposed new limit on bond sales to a restrictively low figure.

The Budget Bureau, which is an arm of the executive branch, wants to set the limit at only $3.5 billion, forcing TVA to go back to Congress in 1973 with a new evaluation of its power demands and bonding authority.

The main objection to this proposal is that it does not take into consideration the long periods required for construction of TVA's power facilities. Since financing must be assured before a project is started, there is a long lapse between the authorization of bonds and completion of a needed project. This could lead to serious crippling of TVA's power-producing capacity toward the latter part of this decade.

Since no public funds are involved, it is strange that the administration should take such a keen interest in seeing that TVA's bonding limit is kept low. The purpose couldn't be to protect the taxpayers' interest, since no tax funds are involved. And as the bonds won't be sold until needed, it doesn't make any sense to keep the limit perilously low—or even to have a limit at all.

The bonding limit is a relic of the same anti-TVA period which spawned the notorious Dixon-Yates deal and other efforts to turn TVA over to private power interests. The only reason for existence of the limit is the hope of private power to make it possible—under a friendly administration—to cripple TVA's development and raise the cost of electric power in the valley.

There is no sound fiscal reason for the bonding limit to exist and it should be abolished. The valley delegation should aim for this goal while it is attempting to raise the limit to $5 billion.

## SOUTHERN VOICES ON INTEGRATION

### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned with the apparent weakness of this administration's commitment to the right of every child to an integrated quality education. In the past few months the administration's lenient stands regarding school desegregation in Florida and other Southern States leads me to believe that we are not doing everything to insure this type of education. It is the right of every child in America to receive the best education possible, which I believe can only be achieved through integrated schools. It is our responsibility to see that they are provided with this.

I include in the RECORD two articles written by southerners and forwarded to my attention by the American Friends Service Committee.

The first by Charles Morgan, director, Southern Region American Civil Liberties Union, concerns the reasons behind recently introduced legislation and approaches to Federal desegregation cases.

The other by M. Hayes Mizell, director of the South Carolina Community Relations Program of the American Friends Service Committee, concerns the "southern strategy" and the current integration policies of the Nixon administration.

The articles follow:

SCHOOLS: BICKEL'S "NEW PATERNALISM" MASKS A NATIONAL RETREAT

(By Charles Morgan)

Professor Alexander M. Bickel's article is The Article of national retreat: a convenient, if gossamer, cover under which bona fide racists, black and white, and the merely mistaken men of South and North might respectably gather prior to an all-out and undisguised attack on desegregation.

The Article cited no new facts nor were new facts even assumed; the few factual statements made were for the most part wrong and at best half-right. The professor thought today as he thought and wrote yesterday; but in an altered national context. The Article was more than a scholarly dissertation.

THE ARTICLE WAS A TRIGGER

Professor Bickel may not have understood the use to which his thesis would be put. He does not seem to understand much about the South. The South is not a land of cultural pluralism. The South may be a microcosm of the country and it does have internal variances, but its characteristics are not those of New York or Chicago or Los Angeles or San Francisco. There is and has been no large Southern population of Catholics, Jews, Italians, Irishmen, Puerto Ricans, or voluntary black immigrants. The South is an area of simple racial dualism. But the Article seeks application of a national racial solution, and an ineffective non-working solution at that, to areas that are essentially different.

The South had slavery by law. The South had segregation, *apartheid*, by law. This is why the South has been treated differently by the Supreme Court. The South is different. That is why it should be treated differently. That is why the Northern "solution"—if that be what *de facto* segregation is—will not work in the South. Nor, if it were uniformly applied across the land, would it result in much other than at best the ultimate disfranchisement and at worst the dispatch of the nation's black population.

A graduate of New York's City College, and the Harvard Law School, Professor Alexander M. Bickel was the ideal man to write The Article and the *New Republic* the perfect place for it to appear. He is well known in "liberal" circles, is not a bigot, teaches at the Yale Law School, and has been consistently critical of the Warren Court's major rulings (for school desegregation and one-man-one-vote state legislatures).

Criticism of the Warren Court seems a necessary ingredient of demostrable scholarship among some law professors who feel that if they are not brighter than the court—which is, of course, the true teacher as well as maker of constitutional law—then they are either not bright enough to teach or, alternatively, to be appointed to the court if fortuitously asked.

BLESSING TO SEGREGATIONISTS

To white segregationist Southerners The Article was a blessing. That it was primarily extracted from a series of lectures delivered at the Harvard Law School and published as The Supreme Court and the Idea of Progress and that Mr. Bickel's primary life concern often seems to be analysis of the scope of the power of the Supreme Court mattered little. For if a Yale professor writing in the *New Republic* questioned the limit of that power, so did the white South, and if he coincidentally believed in racial justice and they did not then that was all the better for him and them.

White Southern politicians, although caricatured and stereotyped by many non-southern liberals, have learned to deal with educated Northerners on the basis of the Compromise of 1877. They simply struggle along for years losing battle after battle, fighting as guerrillas until they finally but very politely win. As they turn America away from its stated goals they mind their manners, as did even Ross R. Barnett, who felt compelled to say when turning James H. Meredith away from the University of Mississippi, "I do so politely."

Coupled with this sense of politeness—the brightest of them deplore ax handles, tactically at least, and assaults on children—there is the certain knowledge that Northerners have their own mythology. This they recognize and manipulate.

PERPETUATING MYTHS

For example: Mythologically, the article assumes that the legislative (which Southern-controlled committee of Congress?), executive (which agency?) and judicial (which Southern federal district judges?) branches of government for years favored a policy of school desegregation. The article argues that integration (as though we had tried it and consequently someone knew) "creates as many problems as it purports to solve." The professor (of legal history, who teaches a course on public schools) mentions only one of the "many problems": the moving of whites to the suburbs.

Both the professor and his Connecticut senator, Abraham Ribicoff, place some reliance on the premise that "everybody seeks in the schools some sense of social, economic, cultural group identity." This premise is, of course, a product of Northern big-city Americans and white minority ethnic-group thinking. Relying on "cultural pluralism," as Stokely Carmichael did in proposing Black Power and citing Jewish Power and Irish Power as their models, is a common failure of many of those who deal with the South on the basis of non-Southern experience. They forget that in the South there was no melting pot and there is little pluralism of any kind, be it ethnic or religious. Racial problems are as different from those included in the Bickel-Ribicoff experience as the Negro's heritage of illiteracy is different from the Jewish immigrant's literate, if foreign-language, heritage. There can be little parallel between the urban experience of white ethnic Americans and the experience of American blacks. Although Hitler required armbands to identify the Jews, blacks have a sure knowledge that their armbands are worn on their faces.

A POLITICAL TOOL

Professor Bickel frets over "the tipping point of resegregation" and "what the Nixon Administration has been trying to tell us." What President Nixon has been trying to tell us is simply: "White folks, vote Republican; we can do it better than Wallace can—and we can do it more politely." The "tipping point of resegregation" occurs when members of the professor's and my race are in a minority.

Since the professor does not approve of one-man-one-vote reapportionment cases he does not propose (or even acknowledge) that school district lines, like county and electoral district lines, are merely creatures of the state and some day may be ignored by courts seeking to integrate urban and suburban school populations.

Rationally and wrongly the article adopts the sweetly reasonable approach of the new paternalism. It notes that "leading" (what? who? where? why?) elements in urban communities" would not accept "large-scale efforts at integration." (What Northern liberal even thought of giving "leading white elements" in Southern communities a choice?) The white and New Paternalism seems to implicitly assume that blacks because of skin color have good sense. As white Southern housewives relied on their maids the New Paternalists rely only upon "militant" blacks. The new paternalism refuses to grant blacks an equal right with whites to be damned fools and to be told they are damned fools.

The new paternalist calls for the upgrading of slums and slum schools as though that goal were somehow shown to be attainable either by our history or our present inclination. . . .

The article says "no one is certain that it (massive integration) is worth the cost" as though "no one" were "certain" when, in fact, some are quite certain that it is worth almost any cost. Strangely, although "the cost" of upgrading slum schools is incalculable, the professor does not even consider the question of whether or not white taxpayers will pay that cost.

The professor does not believe or does not understand the simple lesson of history culminating in *Brown v. Board of Education:* In this country racially separate schools simply cannot be equal. To put this in more common terms:

"White folks ain't going to pay for schools where white children don't go."

"Kids learn more from kids than they do from teachers;" and

"White folks have the money and the government and the police and the troops and there is no way for black folks to get the money for all-black schools from white folks."

The article and the book from which it was drawn became simultaneously available. In *The Supreme Court and the Idea of Progress* the professor, who like many well educated and rational men is dedicated to the "restraints of reason," rationalizes reason into every event. For example, he somehow finds that the presidential "election of 1960 was a vote of ratification of the court's holding in *Brown v. Board of Education* as then understood." But that is not quite the way those who lived in the South and worked in the 1960 campaign recall it. Sen. John F. Kennedy's then problem nationally was to cut the black vote away from Mr. Nixon. This was accomplished by, among other acts, a telephone call from his brother Robert to a DeKalb County, Georgia, judge seeking the release of the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. from jail.

The white South voted for a Democratic, Catholic it believed not committed to civil rights against a Republican Protestant it believed favored *Brown!* That the white South was wrong about both men does little to restore confidence in Professor Bickel's aproach to fact and opinion. Indeed, the Professor's presumed national ratification of *Brown* "as then understood" resulted in the receipt of 15 electoral votes by Virginia's late apostle of "massive resistance" Sen. Harry F. Byrd—and he, Sen. Byrd, didn't even make a speech.

FACTS WILL NOT GO AWAY

The book also contends that "(w)hat the *Brown* opinion ultimately envisioned seems for the moment unobtainable and is becoming unwanted" (again, professor, by whom? and, even if so, so what? and didn't we stop asking what was wanted when Orval Faubus said "no"?). Continuing the book says that "little is known to support the assumption of *Brown* v. *Board of Education* that a segregated education hurts the Negro child." Nothing supports "the assumption of *Brown* v. *Board of Education*" other than the reasoning and evidence of the pre-*Brown* v. *Board of Education* teacher pay, graduate and law school, and undergraduate school decisions, including *Sweatt* v. *Painter* (the Texas Law School case) and more obviously the millions of uneducated black men and women in the North's urban ghettoes, two-thirds of whom were born *and reared* below the Mason and Dixon Line.

As a legal historian dedicated to "the restraints of reason," the professor needs, as Mr. Justice Holmes put it, "education in the obvious more than investigation of the obscure."

RACISM ENCOURAGED

There are, of course, other assumptions that may soon be made rather than "the assumption of *Brown* v. *Board of Education.*" The primary assumption waiting in the wings is that the Negro child is inferior to white children and that this inferiority is genetic. That might be a shocking assumption to Mr. Bickel but, unfortunately, it is an assumption to which some "rational" scientists will no doubt devote their "rational minds." As in other times of rising racism, these opinions will be based upon "research" and accepted by many.

In his Harvard Law School lectures (the book) the professor unemotionally referred to "crowds" outside the Ocean Hill-Brownsville decentralized experimental school district and "crowds" outside the schools of Little Rock. That paragraph was lifted from the book and included word for word in the article. But there was one change. In the article—as may be the case in a more formally and legally segregated America—the "crowds" have become "*mobs.*"

Tragically, the professor follows his mentor, Mr. Justice Frankfurter whom he served as law clerk in his desire that the Supreme Court not declare promises it cannot keep and then fall back from them. As he puts it in the book, "the Court . . . is not a place for the half-loaf that is better than none."

SOME WILLING EXPLOITERS

The tragedy is that the article was more damaging to the prestige of law, as opposed to the original desegregation order and to the judiciary, than the collected speeches of George Corley Wallace, including those in which he referred to federal judges as "dirty, carpet-baggin', scallywaggin', integratin', bald-faced, race mixin' liars." The article provided "learned" liberal justification for the withdrawal of federal desegregation pressures and primary support for, at most, "the half a loaf which is better than none."

Within a week after the article appeared, it began to receive the praise it deserved. *Human Events,* the organ of right-wing Republicanism, said it was "of particular interest to supporters of the anti-busing amendment." The professor was a "Northern liberal," said *Human Events,* and the article "buttressed (Stennis and his fellow Southerners) antibusing arguments." "According to Stennis and Co.," *Human Events* continued, "this is all the South is really asking—and this 'Southern formula' was not from George Wallace, but Yale University and the liberal *New Republic.*"

There followed a gaggle of columnists and others: Stewart Alsop, who based his *Newsweek* views in part on those of "leading Negroes" Ben Holman, Dan Watts, and Julius Hobson (to *Newsweek* it was merely "Requiem for a Liberal Dream?"); Vermont Royster of the *Wall Street Journal,* "Forced Integration: Suffer the Little Children"; and Roscoe and Geoffrey Drummond, "Emphasis on Quality Education."

By Feb. 14, 1970, the President who had remained aloof (allowing Spiro T. Agnew to enter the risky field of racial politics) openly joined the "separate but quality" chorus.

THE STRUGGLE MUST GO ON

On Feb. 21, 1970, *Human Events* returned to the article, noting that ". . . Bickel appears to lean toward a position that would end legal segregation but permit *de facto* segregation, even in the South." The article contained "guidelines," said *Human Events* which "some quarters" "suggested" that the President propose in order to meet the school crisis and the threat of Mr. Wallace.

February, 1970, was to have been the month of final compliance with *Brown* v. *Board of Education.* But by Feb. 28, 1970, Connecticut's (and the professor's) Sen. Ribicoff had become so deeply involved in the article's aftermath that to an Atlanta *Constitution* reporter "parts" of his "rhetoric" "had the ring of a Southern politician's oratory."

*Our most effective voices have been stilled by assassins' bullets. We are in a minority not merely in the South but in the nation.* Friends from the more easy and glamorous days of risk—a day or a week or a month or a march in the South—left us long ago and now, partly in frustration at their own inability to effect change, partly in rebellion against the system (a system rejected by too many and in large measure never tried) have become advocates of old solutions.

The enemy is no longer the racism of the statehouse. The opponents are now those who occupy the White House and in tragicomedy enter a field of politics in which they, too, are destined to lose if simply because they lack the hatred required to effect a successful Southern strategy. (To white Southern segregationists they will soon seem but "an effete corps of impudent snobs.")

But most of us, white and black alike, who joined in the 1950s and 1960s will stick it out. We know that men have warred for

thousands of years over questions of religion. And we know that race, unlike religion, can be seen. We know that separation means defeat. We have seen those separated from our society. We know that the old have moved from the county poor house to the urban nursing home or the central state hospital; the alcoholic failures to their Bowery, or off the streets to the city jail; the mentally ill to asylums now known as mental hospitals; lawbreakers to jails and prisons; non-conformist juveniles to reform schools; Indians to reservations; Japanese Americans to detention camps; and Negroes to urban ghettos. In each instance we term the confinement that which it is not. We offer minimum service, get the offensive person out of sight, and give a dole that salves our conscience but that binds the outcast to the benefit.

But we shall not surrender merely because there is a new President on the block, an old idea in town, a new slavery in the wings, a new generation of despair.

We will win not because of rationality For what was there rational in a young Negro minister's hopeless boycott of a bus company? What was rational in students ordering a cup of coffee in a five and dime store? What chance was there in the streets of Birmingham? What rationality was there in those raised clubs at Selma's Edmund Pettus Bridge? We will win simply because we must.

---

THE SOUTHERNERS' STRATEGY

(By M. Hayes Mizell)

Thirty years ago W. J. Cash analyzed the character and culture of our region in his classic work, *The Mind of the South*. Writing of the North's failure to "make over the South in the prevailing American image and to sweep it into the main current of the nation," Cash observed that "far from having reconstructed the Southern mind in the large and in its essential character, it was this Yankee's fate to have strengthened it almost beyond reckoning, and to have made it one of the most solidly established, one of the least reconstructible ever developed."

Subsequent attempts at reconstruction by the North have met with similar frustrations, for while each succeeding effort has tended to nudge the South away from its archaic social attitudes and violent past, it has left much of the South's essential character unchanged. The Southerners' perception of the North—not a geographical place but a mentality that might be found in the Northeast, the Midwest, the West; a mentality produced by detachment from involvement in the Southern experience—this perception has not been appreciably altered in the years since the middle period of this nation's history. This perception of the North has revealed that for the past century the South has been the regional object of the nation's guilt and self anger generated by a history of racism. Just as black people have been in a position to observe the hypocrisy of allegedly superior white morality because the white man underestimated the intelligence and character of blacks, so has the South been privy to the hypocrisy of Northern racial attitudes because the North has been quick to cling to stereotypes of white Southerners as inhumane and immoral in matters of race.

Because the South has historically been the national "mud-sill" the Southerners' current strategy on school desegregation is all the more baffling to the Yankee mind. What the Southerners are now doing is forsaking the stereotype behavior and rhetoric in favor of a more sophisticated and subtle approach which does not challenge but rather exploits the hypocrisy of the North.

SOUTH USING THE NORTH

The Southerners' strategy is multiple rather than singular. It consists of a series of feints and razzle dazzle maneuvers that are the last resources available to a region that has virtually exhausted what once seemed to be an endless reserve of legal innovations designed to thwart compliance with the law of the land. But in the final analysis these shadowy strategic maneuvers may prove to be more productive than the substantive attempts to preserve segregation by law. For now the South is no longer depending solely on its own resources to build the bulwark against Constitutional mandates, it is soliciting and encouraging the Yankee mentality to come to its aid. This is the logical extension of the strategy pioneered by George Wallace in his Northern tour of 1964 and which reached near fruition in 1968. The strategy is dependent upon the retreat and ambivalence of a national administration which gained power with the assistance of the South, and it likewise relies upon the confused majority of Americans for whom mortality has removed Ho Chi Minh as the adversary but who now see yellow school buses as the real enemy. The strategy is also predicated on an understanding that the so called "Southern strategy" of the Nixon administration is not really the product of shrewd Yankee manipulation of the South, but rather it is the result of the nouveau Dixiecrats having craftily made the administration and the party dependent upon the South. Here again, the servant has become the master.

STENNIS AMENDMENT

The most prominent cornerstone of the Southerners' strategy has been the Stennis amendment which provides that it shall be the policy of the United States for the school desegregation law and guidelines established by the 1964 Civil Rights Act and by the 1966 Elementary and Secondary Education Act amendments to "be applied uniformly to all regions of the United States in dealing with conditions of segregation by race, whether *de jure* or *de facto* in the schools of the local educational agencies of any State without regard to origin or cause of such segregation."

The Stennis amendment's power is perhaps more psychological than real but it is the kind of warfare in which the South is particularly adept. With the assistance of Senator Ribicoff—who correctly defined the hypocrisy of the North but in the process became an unwitting liberal accomplice to the Southerners' strategy based on a more cynical reading of the country's reluctance to turn away from hypocrisy—the Southerners have found new comrades in the struggle against the federal leviathan.

Though we can only speculate as to what the real impact of the Stennis amendment will be on school desegregation its intent is clearly to establish freedom of choice as a national policy and to maintain the *status quo* in the schools of the South. It would seem that for most districts this amendment alone would not be sufficient to thwart compliance with HEW's requirements, but of course the problem is that this amendment has set off a chain of events so that it is not a single force but a piece of the larger picture of retrenchment by this administration.

Advocates of the Stennis amendment assert that all the South wants is "equality of treatment," a phrase that has become the new sacred talisman of Southern politicians and editorialists replacing the more tattered and discredited "all deliberate speed." The Southerners' strategy is to plead for "reasonable" and "fair" treatment and to depart from the kind of openly racist rhetoric which has historically been associated with the South. Here, for example, is a sample of the new rhetoric, carefully couched in the same kind of pious wordmanship that gave us our current president:

"We have integrated our state, and we are proud of it, not just because it is the law, but because it is the American way. We recognized long ago that segregation was dead forever, that integration is the law of the land. We have implemented that belief not only in our public schools and in our systems of higher education but throughout every aspect of life in our state."

That, of course, is Louisiana's Governor McKeithen speaking through a full page ad in *The New York Times* and other Northern newspapers. He goes on to assert that, "We believe in civil rights," and concludes with the plea that "All we ask is equal treatment under the law; all we expect is full partnership in this great Union of ours." The intent behind such language is only slightly removed from that used by the citizens of Lamar, South Carolina, just two weeks prior to the tragic incidents of March 3. It recognizes that it is no longer fashionable for Southerners to admit that they are racists.

This rhetoric is gaining new allies for the Southerners. The allies want, just as the South wants, to make freedom of choice a national policy in a nation where both freedom and choice have been anachronisms for so many of our people.

DESIGN FOR CONFUSION

Another key component of the Stennis amendment is the effort to blur the distinction between *de jure* and *de facto* segregation. The Southerners have chosen an opportune moment to initiate such a strategy. As the urban South has begun to be confronted with the possibility of having to achieve meaningful integration the Southerners have seized upon the complexities of such a task to point out that there is really no difference between such situations in the North and South. This strategy has been strengthened by a convenient nexus with the frustration and disillusionment of citizens of the urban North who have fought for integration but have failed to find any help in the courts because of the *de jacto-de jure* distinction.

But in the South at least there can be no question that the segregated school systems of urban areas *are* deliberate rather than fortuitous and that they *are* the result of state action. The South is clearly trying to evade its Constitutional obligations by calling attention to the Supreme Court's failure to deal with the problem of *de facto* segregation. By saying that the Court has not done its job and that urban segregation in the North and the South are essentially the same, the South removes the focus of attention from its failure to comply with the law and places the burden for the lack of progress on the Court.

A similar part of the strategy is for the Southerners to gain wide dissemination of their definition of what the Court has said. Southern congressmen are able to utilize the public forum which is constantly available to them to redefine or to distort the meaning of the law. Such a forum is obviously not available to the Courts and they must rely on the opportunities provided by individual cases to explain and to clarify. Even then, the Court makes the news for only a day while the politicians can make it every day. The Southerners have been nitpicking at the language of the courts for nearly two decades, interpreting judicial dictums in their own way, and causing public misunderstanding and confusion so as to make the implementation of the court's orders more difficult. Congressman Albert Watson used these tactics in Lamar just a week before the tragic incident. The nation witnessed the result.

Because the Southerners believe that the Court has not detailed what constitutes a unitary school system they declare that they don't know what is required of a school district. Yet, I believe that if the Court provides a detailed roadmap for achieving a unitary system the South will be the first to cry that the Court has overstepped the boundaries of judicial property. The South

knows full well the Constitutional requirements for disestablishing a dual school system and the plea for a satisfactory definition of a unitary system is nothing more than a spurious issue designed to produce more evasion and delay.

LEGISLATIVE MANEUVERS

Another part of the Southerners' strategy has taken the form of a kind of neo-interposition. Missing is some of the strident rhetoric of the late fifties but the purpose of the laws is much the same. The laws are designed to do one of three things: (1) They will have little effect at the state level but they buttress the "equality of treatment" argument, (2) They provide some districts with a convenient excuse to seek delay for another year, and (3) They undercut those districts which might be moving towards establishing a unitary system.

The most popular approach towards shoring up the "equality of treatment" argument is for a state legislature to adopt almost verbatim the New York State law which provides that:

"No student shall be assigned or compelled to attend any school on account of race, creed, color or national origin, or for the purpose of achieving equality of attendance or increased attendance or reduced attendance at any school, of persons of one or more particular races, creeds, colors, or national origin."

The ploy is to adopt New York's law and then declare, as Governor McKeithen has done in his full page ads, "That is the law in New York; it is now also the law of Louisiana. We ask no special treatment; we demand no concessions. But we do seek, and expect to be treated as any other state in the nation."

Louisiana and Alabama passed the law in special legislative sessions and South Carolina, Georgia, and Mississippi passed it in regular session. The Georgia assistant attorney general said that the law means transferring students or teachers to achieve integration is illegal as is the busing of students, the pairing of schools, and the changing of school districts or zones for the same purpose. However, a federal district court judge has ruled that the Georgia law is unconstitutional. But in Mobile, Alabama, the school board delayed implementing a U.S. District Court desegregation order on the grounds that the Alabama law makes it illegal to force any student to attend any school against his wishes or against the wishes of his parents or guardians. As the school board attorney said, "There may be some question as to the constitutionality of that law, but in my view, until it has been challenged and tested and declared unconstitutional, it is valid—it is the law." This is a posture reminiscent of massive resistance and it is one which draws on the lethargy of the judicial process to seek further delay.

Tennessee and North Carolina have passed anti-busing laws which deny the use of state school buses for desegregation plans which will achieve a racial balance. Governor McKeithen has suggested that in the May session of the legislature he will veto any legislation that allocates funds to school districts where busing is being used to achieve racial balance. While we hear a lot about local control of education in the South some legislatures and state political leaders are obviously taking steps to prevent local districts from utilizing busing for desegregation even though the districts themselves might have determined that this method is the most appropriate for establishing a unitary system.

CO-OPTING ADMINISTRATIVE MACHINERY

As always the Southerners' strategy is to master and then manipulate the administrative machinery for the enforcement of the law. Soon after the creation of HEW's Office of Civil Rights the southern politicians and school officials figured out the weakness of that office's administrative enforcement procedure, and the advent of the Nixon administration made those procedures more vulnerable to political influence. In Columbia, South Carolina, the school district has been involved in the HEW compliance procedure for nearly three years and during that time it has continued to operate under a freedom of choice plan. Now the school district is appealing its case directly to Secretary Finch who has been counseled in this instance by Senator Strom Thurmond and Representative Albert Watson. Finch has said that, "I am sure that an appropriate settlement can be developed in the near future." The school district is proceeding to implement its freedom of choice plan for yet another year in anticipation that Finch will either overrule the HEW Reviewing Authority's decision against the school district or that he will negotiate a plan with the district that will require only nominal adjustments in the freedom of choice procedure.

HELP FOR THE SOUTHERN STRATEGY

Finally, the Southerners' strategy is being facilitated by those blacks who are quick to cite the need for "bi-racialism" and who point out that integration has become "the end instead of the means." While I do not believe that such a coalition is intentional, the effect is nevertheless to give hope and credibility to all of the purveyors of resistance whose calls for "fair treatment" and so-called "rational" approaches are rooted in the humus of racism and beliefs in black inferiority.

Perhaps we would do well to remember that white control comes in many colors and to reflect on those districts in the South which are run by whites but which have nevertheless offered neither quality education nor meaningful control for the mass of their white constituents.

So in spite of the cries that we "get back to education," the Southern strategists understand that when we abandon the struggle to fulfill the obligations of the law we will have merely participated in the erosion of Constitutional guarantees. We will have stripped the statute books and the judicial precedents of a body of law that has been laboriously developed over the past fifteen years. In truth, we *won't* return to the business of education because we have never seriously been about that business. The Southerners understand these things. They also understand that the verbal gymnastics of highly placed lieutenants and the forthcoming "clarifications" by the mediocre commander are only deceptions which seek to avoid embarrassment rather than to promote justice.

Isolated and alone the Southerners' strategy cannot succeed, but what brings us here today is the specter that the Southerners are no longer alone. This administration has seen to that.

## A BREAKTHROUGH IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we stand today on the brink of a breakthrough, the likes of which we have never seen in the Post Office Department.

The administration and the unions have agreed on a plan that would completely overhaul the current archaic postal system, and provide a better deal for postal employees as well as better mail service for the American people.

For the first time, employees could bargain directly with postal management.

For the first time, the system would be isolated from partisan politics.

For the first time, businesslike methods could be brought to bear on key decisions facing the Post Office Department.

This is an idea whose time has come. Both sides of the aisle should support this package, which is one of the most important proposals of the Nixon administration.

## THE CASE AGAINST JUSTICE DOUGLAS

### HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, liberal appointments to the highest court of last resort in our country, the U.S. Supreme Court, have altered the course of American history.

I am one of those who believe that the Court has swung so far to the left that it is off balance.

Mr. Speaker, the much publicized antics of Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas brings to light the fact that nobody on the Bench could be further or more consistently to the left.

As a member of the Committee on Rules, I support the move to impeach Douglas. I signed the resolution authorizing a preimpeachment investigation and I hope this matter is brought before the Rules Committee in the very near future.

An editorial column in the Washington Evening Star on April 22, by William F. Buckley, Jr., is a splendid piece of material. In my opinion, his article deserves to be made available to readers of the RECORD:

THE CASE AGAINST JUSTICE DOUGLAS

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

The Democratic congressman who had demanded of Republican Leader Gerald Ford that he be specific on the matter of why Justice William O. Douglas should be impeached, makes a good point—although it is as much his responsibility as Mr. Ford's to concern himself with whether Mr. Douglas has destroyed his usefulness, and Mr. Douglas's book is as easily available to Democrats as to Republicans. And anyway, a precis of Mr. Douglas' book appears in the current issue of a pornographic monthly readily available.

There, nestled among the pudenda, is an article by Justice Douglas entitled "Redress the Revolution," an excerpt from his book, "Points of Rebellion." Mr. Douglas begins by talking about the generally unsatisfactory state of affairs in America today, including the recent elimination of his favorite trout stream.

Then suddenly he finds himself talking about violence, which he concedes "has no constitutional sanctions." This he would appear to regret, because he adds immediately, "but where grievances pile high and most of the elected spokesmen represent the establishment, violence may be the only effective response."

Mr. Douglas reaches abroad for illustrations. He recites tales of horror about life in Guatemala as related by two priests and a nun—ex-nun and ex-priests being perhaps

more accurate, since post-Guatemala, they got married.

Anyway, Mr. Douglas, who is supposed to be expert on the rules of evidence, passes along the extraordinary news that the Maryknoll priests, "between 1966 and 1967, . . . saw more than 2,800 intellectuals, students, labor leaders, and peasants assassinated by right-wing groups because they were trying to combat the *ills of* Guatemalan society."

An altogether astounding story, as I say. First, that there should have been 2,800 assassinations in tiny Guatemala over a one-year period without anybody knowing about it, second that the assassinations should have been directed against those who sought to combat rather than promote evil; but most extraordinary of all that Guatemalan authorities should have summoned two priests and one nun to witness each and every one of said assassinations.

Mr. Douglas has at this point picked up a lot of steam, and he reports gleefully that the priests advised Guatemalan peasants who approached them, that under the circumstances, it is okay by God to use violence. Under the circumstances. . . .

Mr. Douglas moves now to America. Here, he concedes, we do not turn so readily to violence. However, we do run the risk of violence—because the young generation doesn't like the way things are run in America, believing that the entire governing class is run by the special interests.

Now, he explains, the situation was very similar back in 1776. Then, Americans demanded a restructuring of our institutions. "That restructuring was not forthcoming and there was revolution."

And then, explicitly, the climax. "You must realize that today's establishment is the new King George III. Whether it will continue"—note that Mr. Douglas would have us believe that the establishment does now exercise the tyrannical practices of George III—"we do not know. If it does, the redress, honored in tradition, is also revolution."

Now what Mr. Douglas has said very simply is that such conditions as legitimized revolution in 1776 now exist in America. He seems to be saying that George III—the establishment—might well be given, for a little longer, a chance to reverse itself. But that is one man's judgment.

Those who—for instance the Chicago Seven—believe America has been given long enough to change its way, and therefor advocate instant revolution, disagree with Mr. Douglas only on a matter of timing. What they advocate—violent revolution—is in Mr. Douglas's view, very simply, honored by tradition.

If that is not sufficient cause for impeaching an official of the government who has sworn to defend the Constitution and the execution of its laws, then nothing justifies impeachment. It is quite extraordinary that Congress should have got lathered up over the nickel and dime malversations of Justice Fortas, while sleeping on this one.

If Mr. Douglas is not impeached, he may have proven by other means than he intended that indeed American society is irretrievably corrupt.

## CHAIRMAN OF FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION ADDRESSES GRADUATING CLASS OF CALHOON-MEBA ENGINEERING SCHOOL IN BALTIMORE

### HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, for several years the Calhoon-MEBA Engineering School in Baltimore has been preparing young men for careers in our merchant marine and they are doing an excellent job in teaching them the necessary skills to operate today's complex vessels.

The 15th graduating class at its exercises on March 26, heard an address by Mrs. Helen Bentley, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, which I believe is of equal importance, in preparing them for their role as ambassadors of the United States to the various countries they will visit, and to the people they meet there, when their ships take them to the many foreign ports. I believe her remarks should be "must reading" for every citizen, and therefore include them in the RECORD for careful perusal:

REMARKS OF HELEN DELICH BENTLEY, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION, BEFORE 15TH GRADUATING CLASS, CALHOON-M.E.B.A. ENGINEERING SCHOOL, BALTIMORE, MD., MARCH 26, 1970

It is an honor to join with you today to share in this important occasion. Indeed, I take great personal pleasure in participating at the graduation of those who have just completed the rigorous course of training and study in Marine Engineering under the auspices of the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association. This is particularly so since I have taken a very personal interest in the school since its inception, when Congressman Garmatz first succeeded in persuading the President of MEBA, Jesse Calhoon, to locate it in the Port of Baltimore.

To those graduating, I offer my sincere congratulations. You have been through a thorough and difficult period of preparation for your future career at sea, both of a technical nature in the classroom and of a practical nature aboard ship. Now come the rewards for your efforts and perseverance. As a result of these, you will join the ranks of those who made it possible, becoming in your turn the members of a highly respected profession, that of Marine Engineer aboard American Merchant ships.

You join the still greater number of ship's officers and merchant seamen from every department and in every category who are as essentially a part of the American Merchant Marine as are the ships they sail. Working together, you will literally bring life to an inanimate object, to thousands of tons of steel fashioned by the skilled craftsmen of the nation's shipyards into a thing of beauty, of purpose, of use to man—a ship.

In turning it to its purpose, you will not only be performing the job for which you have been trained, but you and your ship will be serving the nation, as do the other ships that fly our flag—and those who man them. Together you will carry the products of America across the oceans of the world to foreign markets. Returning, you will bring back raw materials or the finished products of our trading partners from around the globe. In so doing, you will advance our peacetime trade, drawing us closer to others of the Free World, aiding both their economies and our own.

You will be doing even more, for in foreign ports you will represent this nation to people whose friendship and goodwill we not only value, but recognize as vital to our own future. As such, you may well consider yourselves America's ambassadors to the Free World. On your attitudes and actions, all Americans will be judged.

Much has been said about "people to people" communication. You will, in truth, be America's "people to people" representatives.

In similar fashion you will bring back from your voyages knowledge gained of other people and other lands, and set the pattern of the thinking of your family, friends and acquaintances. In this you will have a great advantage over most of your fellow Americans, for your knowledge of other people will be based on personal experience and observation.

As a result of what you will see with your own eyes, hear with your own ears, assess in your own mind, you will be able to judge the advantages Americans enjoy over the citizens of the countries you visit. It is because of their personal judgments in this regard that American seamen are among the strongest advocates of our democratic form of government, and the American way of life. Yes, you will appreciate our American way more and more as you see the rest of the world and realize the establishment has done a great job with the United States of America.

You have chosen well in determining to make a career of the sea, and in working hard to achieve your entrance into that career. What is more, you enter upon it at a propitious period of time.

That could not have been said at any other time during the last decade, for while this country allowed its merchant fleet to deteriorate and grow older, the fleets of other nations were being upgraded with new and modern ships. Indeed, in comparison with others, our engine room telegraph was set on "Slow Astern."

It is for this reason that Congressman Garmatz and others in the Congress labored unceasingly in repeated attempts to reverse the process of our deterioration at sea, and inject new life into our Merchant Marine. I know personally of Chairman Garmatz' concern and frustration in attempting to overcome the negative thinking on shipping that permeated the former Executive Branch over the past several years.

But today he stands as sponsor in the House of Representatives of the Nixon Administration's proposed legislation to revitalize the American Merchant Marine in a magnificent bipartisan effort to achieve this nation's rightful place on the trade lane of the world.

As a result, there will be ships—new, modern productive ships—to be built, and to be manned by American seamen such as yourselves. Indeed, the appropriation request for ship construction funds in Fiscal '71 stands at $199,500,000 by far the largest amount requested since the end of World War II.

You are indeed fortunate—for the good fortune of the American Merchant Marine in its future outlook is your good fortune as well.

But nothing is all one way—there is a guid pro quo built into life itself—and in return for the opportunity you have received and which you have grasped for a career at sea, you in turn owe an obligation to the industry of which you now become a part. Or let me put it another way, an obligation to the American Merchant Marine, and to the nation it serves.

As I have said earlier, only the crew that mans it can change a ship from an inanimate object into a viable, valuable asset to the economy. Ships without crews are as economically wasteful as seamen without ships to sail. Give your best to the American Merchant Marine as essential not only to the prosperity but the very life of the Nation, for it is not only an industry, it is a means by which the nation's peacetime economy—and the economies of its trading partners—is maintained strong through trade, and an essential adjunct to our defense in times of national need.

And ships require cargoes, and shippers place their cargoes where they are certain service will be maintained. With the future of American shipping now bright at long last, with the support now evidenced by the Administration and the Congress, let us now look to stability within the industry itself. Without industry stability, support could vanish and those who for so long have both openly and surreptitiously opposed its re-

building could redouble their efforts against the programs intended to revitalize our merchant fleet.

It is a time to work together, both now and in the future. It is a time for stability on the part of management and labor alike. It is a time for us to be Americans first, and all other things second, whether we are government officials, steamship company presidents, labor leaders, or union members.

Let me say for the Government that we have entered a phase in history where defense and security and world trade are being rounded into a new and more meaningful concept.

We face stiff competition on the trade lanes of the globe where a growing aggressive Soviet fleet seeks totalitarian penetration into the mercantile sphere so important to Free World growth and survival.

In the advanced concepts of today and tomorrow, American and Free World shipping is being allotted a more important role than ever before in the world history.

As you sail the seven seas and dock in foreign lands you will come to realize first hand that the American form of government—the establishment, if you will—is really a great form of government.

These are the material advantages that form of government has brought to you, its citizens. This is one of the reasons why those in the maritime world, in my opinion, should be fully concerned about what is happening in this country today.

You young people are the ones who should be interested in seeing to it that not only does our merchant shipping remain free and in the foreground, but that our country always shall.

This is why I, as a government official, today feel a responsibility of discussing a subject very close to my heart because I am concerned about what is happening in our country today.

I am concerned about the moves to split the peoples of this country apart through turmoil and dissension. All true Americans desire the bringing of us together as a people. This I sincerely believe. I believe it with the same certainty I hold that there is not one of us here today who is not long past the point of crying "enough" to rioting on our campuses, disruptions of our courts, mob violence on the streets of our cities, with looting and burning, and outright anarchy.

In a land such as ours, blessed with a freedom and an equality under the law that few if any others enjoy, there is no excuse for seeking redress for real or imagined injustices except by legal means through the courts, or through the ballot box. Nor are the violent actions of a relatively few a true representation of the nation as it is, or its people as they are.

Instead, it represents the work of a comparative few who mouth meaningless phrases, shout senseless slogans, and seek to destroy the very liberty that gives them the freedom to seek its destruction. They are the malcontents, the misled, or the intentionally misleading. They are the ones who seek to separate us as a people. They are the ones who would pit us one against the other, group against group, generation against generation. These practitioners of disruption are in truth the apostles of destruction.

Is it possible to believe that the riots, the lootings, the burnings, the mob violence and now the bombings were all separate and spontaneous actions? Or is it more within the realm of reason and sheer logic to believe the vast majority of such incidents to have been planned and instigated by those who openly avow their revolutionary intent, and carried out by their gullible dupes?

If you doubt this, think back over the period of the last several years, with its growing attempts at disruption; think of the bombings in New York City and in Pittsburgh and elsewhere in the past month; think of the flower children, the hippies and the yippies; think of the growing drug addiction among the young; think of the disruption of the courts in Chicago and elsewhere; think of the term "pig", used to insult the law enforcement officers of the nation; think of the attacks upon the military and of the attempts to coerce our legally elected representatives in the variety of "marches"; think of all these while I read this reprint from a 1968 issue of the "Bartlesville, Okla., Examiner Enterprise", of a 1919 document. I repeat the document's date as being 1919. The heading of the reprint is as follows:

"Is It Too Late To Think?"

The sub-head reads: "There is something extremely familiar in this document captured in Dusseldorf, Germany, in 1919."

The body reads: "Communist Rules for Revolution:

"A. Corrupt the young, get them away from religion, get them interested in sex. Make them superficial, destroy their ruggedness.

"B. Get control of all means of publicity and thereby:

1. Get people's minds off their government by focusing attention on athletics, sexy books and plays, and other trivialities.

2. Divide the people into hostile groups by constantly harping on controversial matters of no importance.

3. Destroy the people's faith in their natural leaders by holding the latter up to contempt, ridicule and obloquy.

4. Always preach true democracy but seize power as fast and ruthlessly as possible.

5. By encouraging government extravagance, destroy its credit, produce fear of inflation with rising prices and general discontent.

6. Foment unnecessary strikes in vital industries, encourage civil disorders, and foster a lenient and soft attitude on the part of government toward such disorders.

7. By specious argument cause the breakdown of the old moral virtues: honesty, sobriety, continence, faith in the pledged word, ruggedness.

"C. Cause the registration of all firearms on some pretext with the view of confiscation of them and leaving the population helpless."

That is the end of the quote, which seems to require no further comment.

As for those in this country who cry "revolution", let me ask: "Against whom can you revolt?"

A people can revolt against a foreign occupying power. They can revolt against a dictatorship made up of a small powerholding clique. They can revolt against a foreign power of which they are a possession, as did this Nation's founders.

But a people cannot "revolt" against themselves or their own representative government—a government such as ours, "of the people, by the people and for the people."

The time has come when all of those in a position to do so should speak out against current disruptions. More, we of the vast majority must stand up and be counted for what we are, Americans with a firm belief in our form of government, its Constitution and institutions.

To those who incite the young and malcontents to riot by calls of "To the streets!", who raise their clenched fists—as in the case of the chief defense counsel of the so-called Chicago Seven—for the benefit of the TV cameras and newspaper photographers, who shout "All power to the people!", I say this—you would not dare raise one finger or shout your slogans where "All power to the people!" would be meaning.

On the contrary, your slogans and your cries ignore the very fact that in America all power resides with the people. It is guaranteed us by our Constitution, a Constitution that we can even change should we choose to do so by referendum, as has been done in the past.

Nor did it take mobs in the street to achieve these changes, only the expressed will of the people through their vote. This is the same Constitution behind which you hide and which defends your rights through the guarantee of free speech when you lie your lies and defame the nation.

Again, I say to such as these, go shout your slogans to those who know no freedom—if you dare!

As for America, all power is with the people and the majority rules the exercise of that power through the ballot box.

It is on this proud day that each of you steps forward to become a participant in the writing of the future history of American shipping and of the Nation.

May the winds and the tides favor you.

---

## SAUL STILLMAN, "REPUBLICAN MAN OF THE YEAR"

### HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the Ripon Club of Cleveland will honor Saul G. Stillman as its Republican "Man of the Year" next Thursday night, April 30.

As far as many of us are concerned, our good friend Saul is Republican Man of Every Year. For more than half his life he has been the man behind the scenes, never losing his cool even under pressure, a genuine brain-truster who is always considerate and polite, a man you can always depend upon, and it is great to know that he will be center stage at the Ripon banquet receiving the kudos and taking the bows.

Saul has a distinguished background. Born in Cleveland on January 27, 1910, he attended Cleveland public schools, was graduated from Glenville High School, and received the Harvard Club of Cleveland scholarship and successive scholarships. He was Phi Beta Kappa at Harvard, where he received his B.A. degree cum laude in 1930. In 1931, Saul was awarded the Rutherford B. Hayes Law School Scholarship, and received his LL.B degree from Harvard Law School in 1933.

Our friend was admitted to the Ohio Bar in 1934. He has been a member of the Cuyahoga County Board of Elections from 1962 to the present and has served since 1962 as Ohio Republican Central Committee from the 22d Congressional District. After serving as vice chairman of the Cuyahoga County Republican Central Committee, he has been chairman since 1968. He is treasurer of the Cuyahoga County Republican Executive Committee.

Saul Stillman is vice president of Park Synagogue of Cleveland Heights, president of the Hebrew Free Loan Association of Cleveland, a teacher in the high school department of Park Synagogue since 1934. He has served as social and welfare department worker for the Cuyahoga County Relief Administration and Federal Emergency Relief Administration. He was former secretary and assistant to the late U.S. Senator George H. Bender and was formerly associated in law practice with Court of Appeals

Judge Daniel H. Wasserman of Cleveland.

Saul and his lovely wife, Cecelia, whom he married in 1933, are parents of three children, all college graduates. Their daughters, Barbara Meister of Ventura and Jean Wolff of Encino, are teachers in California, and their late son, Arthur Stillman, was director of International Voluntary Services of the Agency for International Development at the time of his tragic death in Vientiane, Laos. In the tradition of this remarkable family's dedication to public service, Mrs. Stillman teaches social studies at Euclid Senior High School. The Stillmans have seven grandchildren.

This record of service, not only to his party, but to the community and Nation, mark Saul Stillman as a man of whom any group could be tremendously proud. We Republicans are delighted with this tribute to a great and selfless American and to a dear friend.

Milt Widder, another Cleveland stalwart and the most widely read columnist of the Cleveland Press, on March 28 bestowed his much-coveted "Halo of the Week" award on Saul with the following editorial comments:

With rare perception the Ripon Club chose Saul Stillman for its annual "Republican Man of the Year" award. It will be presented to him April 30. This "Halo of the Week" to the Republican cochairman who is an unusual combination of a fine gentleman and a practical politican. Stillman is a student, a lawyer with judicial temperament and one of those personalities who is revered by party workers beyond the call of duty. A Harvard Law School graduate, Stillman (with Bob Hughes) has run the County Republican Party with a steady hand for two years. He is a distinguished member of the Election Board; he is a prime debater and even coached a basketball team.

Milt has summed up the Saul Stillman story succinctly, the story of a warmhearted, coolheaded, brilliant personality, truly a man for all seasons. It is an honor to know him and to work with him.

## A CLEANER SAN DIEGO BAY

### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, Earth Day yesterday clearly demonstrated that Americans want a better and cleaner environment. In San Diego, a group of pollution fighters are translating their concern into action and, as a result, our city has a cleaner and healthier bay. These clean water warriers are headed by Kelly Spalding, a scuba diver who, with other volunteers, has cleared tons of debris from the floor of San Diego Bay. Their tireless efforts were reported in the San Diego Evening Tribune recently and I am pleased to share with my colleagues this report, as follows:

REFORMED LITTERBUGS LEADS DRIVE TO CLEAN AREA WATERS

(By John Farina)

If you've ever been guilty of throwing trash into the bay, Kelly Spalding won't hold it against you, providing you've reformed.

He's looking for one-time litter bugs who now know better, and anyone else to help him in a new enterprise that keeps him busy night and day, both in the water and out of it.

Spalding, 4831 Del Monte Ave., and a small group of other concerned pollution-fighters, have formed the nonprofit Clean Water, Inc., whose purpose is to give future generations a chance to know what a clean body of water looks like.

WAS GUILTY ONE

The reason Spalding can be so understanding about people who dump refrigerators, cans, paper cups and whatever else into the bay is that once he also polluted the bay.

"Sure," he admitted, "I contributed to the litter. But at the time, I didn't think that as an individual I was creating any problems. I felt that the stuff I threw into the water really couldn't make that much difference.

"But when you multiply that, when you realize that a lot of people are doing the same thing, then you know better and you start to get scared. You hear reports of what air and all other kinds of pollution are doing to the country and you understand how bad it's getting."

LAYER OF LITTER

Spalding has first-hand knowledge of water pollution. He has made his living in boat maintenance at Shelter Island and he is a Scuba diver who has seen "the layer of litter spread across the floor of the bay."

So the Clean Water corporation came into being with Spalding as one of the incorporators. The others are Richard Rogers, a San Diego photographer; Mesa College student John Seelig, who wants to become a marine biologist, his father, Hal Seelig; Kenneth Gilman, a professional diver, and F. James Bear, an attorney.

Since incorporation a short time ago, Clean Water has been fortunate in getting welcome assistance and financial aid from a number of business and governmental sources.

The San Diego Unified Port District promises to help Spalding haul off the trash he collects from the bay, and the port permits him use of a slip at the end of Shelter Island for docking a 35-foot work boat donated by the Bissett-Berman Corp.

U.S. Divers Corp. has turned over $10,000 worth of underwater diving equipment, at no charge, to Clean Water.

Numerous diving clubs in San Diego County have promised their cooperation, and some have already put word into action in dropping down to the bottom of the bay and cleaning up what refuse they find there.

Why the big concern about underwater pollution that you can't even see?

"Look, man," answers Spalding, "if we keep dumping this junk into the water, it's going to get to the point where we can see it. We're already disturbing the ecology of marine life down there.

OCEAN CALLED DELICATE

"The trouble is that people are using the water like a rug to sweep things under. They think they're hiding the dirt. But it's there. The ocean is big, but it's delicate."

And there is the peripheral problem, the accumulation of junk, trash and litter on the beaches to consider, Spalding says. The beaches will have to be cleaned up too.

"If we don't start now, the situation is going to get out of hand. San Diego is growing. We're the number two city in the state. We are having a population explosion, and that means maybe a pollution explosion as well.

"We want to prevent future pollution and we want to clean up the pollution we already have."

CHILDREN INVITED TO HELP

Clean water will be strong on community publicity and educational programs to get people, especially children, to understand the need for an unpolluted ocean.

"We want to go into the schools with slides and presentations to teach the children the necessity of clean water, as well as clean air, for healthy living," Spalding said.

"We will be working with the city and Chamber of Commerce in clean-up programs, and we'd like to enlist the Little Leaguers and Boy Scouts and other kids to go out during the summer and help clean the beaches. They don't have to be involved just with the water to get in on the clean-up effort."

OTHER POLLUTION A TARGET

Hard-core pollution also is a target: industrial wastes and oil spillages. If Clean Water detects these forms of pollution, firms responsible will be contacted and invited to make corrections.

"We would give the companies a chance to rectify the condition before reporting it to the public agencies concerned about pollution," Spalding said. "Sometimes the company isn't aware of the problem their operations may be producing."

Spalding has already appeared before county supervisors and city councilmen for financial assistance. And he is applying for state and federal grants to carry on the work.

LOOKING FOR HELPERS

Those who want to do a part can contact him at his office, 2100 Fourth Ave.

In addition to governmental and business leaders, children and the general public, Spalding hopes to enlist the support of scientists in the form of an advisory board of sanitarians, marine ecologists, pollution chemists and marine biologists.

"We are grateful," he said, "for the support of the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board and Dennis A. O'Leary, its executive officer, who believes in what we are doing and who has helped pave the way for us."

Spalding said his organization will not limit itself to cleaning up offshore waters. The 30,000 or so divers in the county are being encouraged to volunteer to also clean up the county's lakes and reservoirs.

## QUEEN ISABELLA DAY

### HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of Delaware, Russell W. Peterson, did declare Tuesday, April 22, "Queen Isabella Day" in our State, and I would like to take this opportunity to commemorate this anniversary of her birth.

At this point in our history, America—and the world—could use a few more leaders with the qualities exhibited by both Queen Isabella and Columbus. For it was that great woman's dedication to progress and the betterment of mankind which led directly to Columbus' great adventure and the discovery of the New World. In 1492, Christopher Columbus and his men set foot on dry, rocky land; less than 1 year ago, Neil Armstrong and Edwin Aldrin took the first dusty walk on the moon. Each first step symbolized man's yearning to conquer the unknown; each first step, indeed, opened new worlds.

Our Nation is now aiming for many goals "just over the horizon." If we look to the future, as Queen Isabella did, we can succeed. If we press onward, endure hardships, counsel, as Columbus did,

against those who would end the journey now, we, too, can someday reach a new land.

I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD the text of Governor Peterson's proclamation designating Tuesday, April 22, as Queen Isabella Day:

STATEMENT BY GOV. RUSSELL W. PETERSON IN OBSERVANCE OF QUEEN ISABELLA DAY

Queen Isabella, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon and Queen of Castile, was instrumental in facilitating the voyage of Christopher Columbus during which he discovered America, thus adding a new dimension to the civilized world.

Her Majesty's confidence in Columbus as well as the financial risks she undertook on behalf of Spain has indeed earned Queen Isabella a unique place in the history of Western civilization.

The qualities of confidence in the future, spirit of adventure with a purpose, and sacrifice in the cause of human progress exhibited by this dynamic woman are characteristics worthy of emulation in this, the twentieth century.

Because the history of America has direct linkage to the birth of Queen Isabella on April 22, 1451, it is a pleasure for me, as Governor of the State of Delaware, to designate Wednesday, April 22, 1970 as "Queen Isabella Day" in Delaware, and urge all Delawareans to reacquaint themselves with the earliest history of our Nation.

## EARTH DAY

## HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Earth Day observances in Stark County, Ohio, were highlighted by special programs at our four college campuses, Malone, Mount Union, Walsh, and Kent State, Canton, and by the activities of the Stark County Wilderness Center. In addition, all of the city schools and many civic organizations carried on conservation activities and programs during the day.

The Mount Union College activities, under the chairmanship of Richard Button, actually amount to an "Earth Week," with events scheduled on several days. Mr. Button has outlined the activity in a letter which I would like to include at this point in my remarks:

MOUNT UNION COLLEGE,
*Alliance, Ohio, April 6, 1970.*

Hon. FRANK T. BOW,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOW: We are happy to announce that Mount Union College will be taking an active part in Earth Day, April 22. Students for Environmental Action, sponsored by Phi Sigma, National Biology Society, have planned a week of events involving the college and the community of Alliance. S.E.A. is at present rather small, but hopes to grow in the future. The original members are Richard Button, chairman, Sara Holbrook, publicity, Sue DuChanois, Whyllis Hudson, Phil Orwick, David Toda and Roger Bartley. Dr. Charles Brueske is the advisor.

The events for Earth Day actually start on Monday, April 6 when the fifth and sixth grade grade children of Alliance will begin to design and make anti-pollution posters. The winner will be presented a trophy by Ohio State Senator Ralph Regula at the morning convocation of April 22.

April 18 will find Alliance Boy Scouts cleaning up the picnic grounds at Deer Creek, a stream running into the Alliance Reservoir.

Sunday morning, April 19th Alliance area ministers will participate in Earth Day with their morning messages. Also environment and ecology displays will be set up in the windows of the business district that day.

On the morning of April 22, besides presenting the trophy, Sen. Regula, alumnus and trustee of Mount Union, will be the keynote speaker for the day. His message is entitled "Give Earth a Chance."

That afternoon in the Hoover-Price Campus Center, we will be showing a film "America and the Americans." It is a conservation film adopted from a book by Ernest Hemingway of the same name.

Later in the afternoon, Ohio State Representative Jim Thorpe of Alliance and Dr. Debow Freed, Dean of the College will participate in a tree planting ceremony at the campus lakes.

In the evening Mr. W. C. Lang of General Tire and Rubber in Akron will speak on what industry has and is doing in the area of environmental control. He is a member of the water committee of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers.

The week of activities will close on Saturday, April 25, when Mount students and members of the Dr. Roach Outdoor League Inc. and the American Fisherman's Protection Association will circulate petitions urging the major bottling companies to discontinue no-deposit bottles and to offer money for returned aluminum cans.

Mayor Dale Walborn has cooperated with us by declaring April 22 Earth Day in Alliance.

Thank you very much for your assistance.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. BUTTON.

Malone College at Canton also had an extensive program under the chairmanship of Gary Rummel, with the assistance of Dr. Charles C. King, professor of biology. The program was as follows:

EARTH DAY: AN EXERCISE IN ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS, APRIL 22, 1970, MALONE COLLEGE, CANTON, OHIO

MORNING SESSION—OSBORNE HALL

Mark Timmons, Presiding.

9:00 A.M.: Introductory Remarks, Gary Rummel.

9:05 A.M.: Leave Them a Flower, Woody Reed.

9:15 A.M.: Governmental Responsibilities in Environmental Problems, Honorable Donald E. (Buz) Lukens, Representative, Ohio 24th Congressional District, and Republican Candidate for Governor.

10:15 A.M.: Break.

10:20 A.M.: The Way It is.

10:30 A.M.: The Crisis in Our Environment, Dale E. Whitesell, Executive Vice President, Ducks Unlimited and former Chief, Ohio Division of Wildlife.

11:30 A.M.: Break for Lunch.

11:45 A.M. to 12:45 P.M.: Luncheon for Speakers, Malone College Dining Hall.

AFTERNOON SESSION—OSBORNE HALL

Walt Wozniak, Presiding.

1:00 P.M.: Leave Them a Flower, Woody Reed.

1:10 P.M.: Bryce C. Browning, retired executive of the Muskingum Watershed Conservancy District.

1:15 P.M.: Problems of Environment and Legislative Methods of Solution, Honorable Ralph S. Regula, State Senator, Ohio 29th District.

1:55 P.M.: Introduction of Teach-in personnel.

2:10 to 3:00 P.M.: Teach-in Session I.

3:10 to 4:00 P.M.: Teach-in Session II.

4:30 P.M.: Interment Ceremony, Osborne Lobby.

Evening Session Tentative.

TEACH-IN TOPICS

1. Over-Population and Birth Control, Morris Dixon, M.D., Wooster, Ohio.

2. Landfills and Solid Waste Disposal, Eddie Kohl, New Phila., Ohio, Ohio Reclamation Association.

3. Saving Our Soil and Water, Herman Mowls, Canton, Ohio, Conservationist, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture.

4. Pollution and the Urban Environment, Virgil Musser, Massillon, Ohio, City Solicitor of Massillon.

5. Air Pollution and Human Disease, L. L. Taylor, Canton, Ohio, Executive Director, Stark County T.B. and Respiratory Disease Association.

6. Current Trends in Strip Mine Reclamation, Art Wallace, Cadiz, Ohio, Director, Land Use Program, Hanna Coal Company.

7. Air Pollution as It Affects the Weather, Terry A. Ritter, N. Canton, Ohio, Chief Meteorologist, Environmental Science Services Admn.—Akron-Canton Regional Airport.

8. Theology's Responsibility to Human and Natural Ecology, Eugene L. Collins, Canton, Ohio, Asst. Prof. of Religion, Malone College.

9. The Crisis in Our Environment, elaboration on morning session, Dale E. Whitesell.

10. Problem of Environment and Legislative Methods of Solution, elaboration on afternoon session, Ralph S. Regula.

I regretted that I was not able to attend either of these college programs because of engagements here in Washington. However, it is quite obvious from the interest shown throughout the community that we have a widespread desire for personal involvement in programs for improving the environment. I hope that all concerned will keep that interest alive and move forward on practical programs to make Stark County a healthier and more beautiful region. For my part, I will do whatever I can in the Federal Government to attain the same objectives.

In conclusion, I would like to include with my remarks the Canton Repository article announcing all of the various events in the county, and an excellent editorial from the Alliance Review having particular reference to the Mount Union program:

OBSERVANCE SET WEDNESDAY: COLLEGES, WILDERNESS CENTER SPEARHEAD EARTH DAY EFFORT

(By William V. Merriman)

The Canton area was alive today with plans to highlight the environmental crisis with Earth Day programs Wednesday.

In fact, Malone College students began the observance Monday, picking up litter along the Route 62 expressway bank on the north side of the campus.

The students, mostly from ecology and general biology classes, worked a specific distance to see how the amount of litter in that stretch compares with a national average sample.

Wednesday, the junk they collected will be displayed prominently on campus.

Tonight, Stewart Udall, former U.S. Secretary of the Interior, will speak in Kent, addressing a session of Kent State University's annual Think Week. This year's theme is, "Environment Is a Dirty Word."

Wednesday's local Earth Day activities will focus on the county's four college campuses, at KSU and at Stark Wilderness Center. Here's the schedule:

Malone—U.S. Rep. Donald E. Lukens will speak at 9:15 a.m., State Sen. Ralph S. Regula, R–Navarre, will appear in the afternoon and several lectures will be given on urban pollution, problems of ecological pollution and pollution abatement legislation.

Walsh—John H. Glenn, ex-astronaut running for the U.S. Senate, is slated to appear in the afternoon, with several classroom teach-ins planned during the day.

Mount Union—Sen. Regula will speak at 10:10 a.m. on "Give Earth a Chance," with continuous showing during the day of the film, "America and the Americans."

A tree planting ceremony, symbolic of the college's landscaping project, will be held in the morning near college lakes. Dean DeBow Freed and Alliance Mayor Dale Walborn will participate.

Kent Stark—Biology students involved in antipollution projects will share their findings with other students. No single speaker has been scheduled.

Kent State University—Ralph Nader is scheduled to speak Wednesday night.

Stark Wilderness Center—Some 140 will participate in an all-day teach-out in the center at Wilmot, with a 10 a.m. keynote address to be given by J. Arthur Herrick, biology professor at KSU, and an 11 a.m. talk on state legislation affecting the environment to be made by Robert Paton, executive director of Buckeye Trail Association.

After a noon sack lunch, those attending will be split into two groups.

Group A will hear John T. Halsall, Canton air pollution control engineer, discuss "Air Pollution in Northeast Ohio" at 12:25 p.m. A film strip "Man's Natural Environment: Crisis Through Abuse," will be shown and finally nature walks will be conducted by Mrs. John Andrews, Mrs. Robert Angerman and Mrs. Samuel West of the center's women's auxiliary.

Group B will take nature walks first, guided by Mrs. Ray Cowker, Mrs. Arthur Christenson and Mrs. Jeremy Felland. Then it will hear a talk on Northeast Ohio air pollution by Joseph Paumier, assistant Canton air pollution control engineer, and view the film strip.

Environmental hobbies will be displayed during the day by Harold A. Boerner, Mrs. G. M. Hatch, Mrs. William C. Bender and Mrs. Judson M. Case.

KSU students Monday heard one of President's aides contend the environmental crisis was not as serious as many claim it to be.

Christopher DeMuth, staff assistant to the President for urban affairs, said at the outset of Think Week that on the whole the environment "is not deteriorating that much."

"Serious problems of the environment are not unconquerable," Mr. DeMuth said, noting "We could add thousands to the population and still improve the environment at the same time."

He said the real public commitment to cleaning up the environment will be discovered when persons have to begin paying the cost as businesses raise their prices to pay for pollution controls.

---

MOUNT UNION PROGRAM TO STIR INTEREST IN ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE

The national momentum for improved environment will reach home base with emphasis in the next few days—particularly on Wednesday when "Environmental Action Day" is observed on the Mount Union College campus and in the community.

The community received a bit of an introduction during the last weekend when preliminary steps were taken under Dr. John A. Roach Outdoor League auspices, for a summer cleanup along the banks of the Mahoning River. The Upper Mahoning Watershed Association also is cooperating in this venture which would reach community-wide proportions because thousands of volunteers would be needed to clear the river area of trash and litter.

For the instant, however, the concentration will be at Mount Union, where plans have been made for a comprehensive program handled by the students and under the direction of Richard Button, a Greentown sophomore, with Dr. Charles H. Brueske, assistant professor of biology, as adviser.

Mayor Dale Walborn has proclaimed the event as a move to tackle the pollution problem, and to clean and beautify the surroundings that "are important to every citizen of our community."

On Wednesday, State Senator Ralph Regula, himself a Mount alumnus, will speak at the 10:10 a.m. convocation on the appealing topic, "Give Earth a Chance."

During the afternoon on Wednesday, a movie on "America and Americans" will be seen at the Hoover-Price Campus Center and the climax of the day will come at 7:30 p.m. when W. C. Lang of the General Tire Co., Akron, will tell of industry's efforts against pollution. This public presentation will be at the Rodman Playhouse.

A series of other events also is scheduled over a period of days in an effort to focus campus and community attention on "Earth Day." There will be tree planting, also Wednesday, at the college lakes, and on Saturday, April 25, petitions will be circulated for signatures of persons asking bottling companies to refrain from using non-returnable containers. The Dr. Roach Outdoor League and American Fishermen's Protective Association will assist with the petition.

The League of Women Voters will assist in a poster contest and downtown window display. Today, Boy Scouts are assisting the Mount Union Business Association in a cleanup and tomorrow a WFAH panel will turn its attention to the problems of the 72's. Dr. Brueske, Button, Roger Bartley and Phillip Orwick will participate.

What is happening here is part of a national program coordinated by the student-run Environmental Teach In Inc. in Washington.

There is no doubt that environment has become a big issue. Politicians and businessmen are recording themselves in favor of a cleaner environment, but actual achievements are just now taking shape.

There has been much rhetoric but little understanding of ecological problems—while the problem has worsened.

Many areas apparently are in much worse shape than here, but admittedly there is a problem to be coped with.

In the nation, there is smog in Yosemite Valley, sewage in the Hudson River area, DDT in food, and decay in the cities. We put a man on the moon, but we still put our garbage into drinking water in some places.

The countryside is suffering as witness the Mahoning River situation.

For these reasons, April 22 has been designated a day of nationwide action. Through activities, including teach-ins, on campuses, in high schools, and in local communities, people will have a chance to examine the facts about the environmental crises. They can find out what, if anything, is being done, and what should be done.

Pollutants from fossil fuel are expected to double in usage by 1980. Property damage from air pollution in this country is estimated at $13 billion a year and 700,000,000 pounds of pesticides are used each year.

This is the background for "Environmental Action Day," such as is taking shape at the college under guidance of Button and Dr. Brueske.

Button, Mount's student leader in the program, is really putting into practice an interest in conservation and environmental activities born when he was a Boy Scout.

Button, a graduate of North Canton High School, is majoring in political science and anticipates college admissions work. He was an Eagle scout while in high school and served as vice president of the Canton District United Methodist Youth Fellowship. He is a member of the college Dynamo staff and the Dynamo Association. He is rush chairman for the Sigma Alpha Epsilon Fraternity, a member of the Student Senate and the Mount Marchers musical group.

Dr. Brueske, who has been assistant professor of biology since 1964, formerly was a graduate assistant at Arizona State University. He is a member of various professional societies in the biological field and has presented a number of academic papers.

The plans are made and the leadership provided for "Environmental Action." This inaugural program should provide a gauge as to the concern which the general public has in the matter.

---

## THE GENERATION GAP

## HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest fears of this country today seems to be its own young people. The generation gap, so called, is so massive that it creates division and strife and often prohibits a rational relationship between young and old. The youth of this Nation are for the most part decent, concerned, active, better informed, more caring, and better educated than any in our history. The fact that they do not dress to make the "over 30's" comfortable makes them automatically suspect by many. This problem and the irrationality of the reaction from the establishment is well described in an article written by Howard Iverson which appeared in the Salem Evening News, Salem, Mass., on March 25, 1970.

Mr. Iverson has put the generation gap in its proper perspective and has done all of us a service through this thoughtful and sensitive article. In the belief that this column will be of interest to my colleagues, I include it in the RECORD at this time:

YOUNG PEOPLE WON'T "SHUT UP" ANYMORE

(By Howard Iverson)

The mayor of Beverly says it "hurts him to see a lot of kids congregated in the center of town."

Well, Mr. Mayor, it hurts me me a lot more to think that the people of Beverly have elected a man of such obviously shallow thinking to so sensitive a position.

I live in Beverly. During the course of last summer I probably drove past the First Baptist Church an average of 3 times a day. The young people were always there.

They sat on the steps or leaned against the building. More often than not, they spilled down the steps and out onto the sidewalk.

Often, I walked past the church. The young people were all about, to be sure, but they were quiet and well behaved.

There was no profanity. No obscene gestures. Nothing improper ever occurred.

Nobody ever tried to sell me heroin, or even marijuana.

There were lots of long hair and heards and dirty feet, and I am sure that offended the sensibilities of the over 30s.

It bothered me. I haven't got enough hair left to let it grow, my wife doesn't like beards and my feet hurt when I go without shoes.

For a long time there were stories that the young people sitting on the church steps were an economic detriment to the downtown business district. Don Ingraham, who was representing the businessmen, admitted last week that they were not.

The police kept the church under surveillance all summer. There was not one arrest

for drug abuse. There was not one arrest for disturbing the peace.

Everyone was waiting for trouble, so they would have an excuse to chase the young people from the steps. There was none.

The mayor wishes that the young people would patronize the MacPherson Youth Center, which is nice if you want to play checkers, or basketball or ping-pong, or whatver it is that they do there.

Fun and games are fine for some teenagers, but the young men and women who gather on the church steps are not drawn to such pastimes.

They are more serious minded; more concerned with the war in Vietnam than with the score of the Red Sox game, more interested in integration than recreation, more tuned in on the games people play than people who play games.

And this is all to the good.

The average high school student today is a thousand percent better informed than his counterpart of even 10 years ago. Instead of hot rods, beach parties and drive-ins, the young people of the 70s concern themselves with social protest, from grapes to Vietnam, and a concern for the future of humanity.

They think and they speak out, which bothers the hell out of their elders, who would rather not answer tough questions about ghettos, foreign policy and environmental and moral pollution.

And young people today have a thing about hypocrisy, in the government, in the church and in their elders, which means most anyone over 30.

The drugs and the protests make the headlines, causing parents and politicians to shake their heads and talk of irresponsibility. Take a look around at the explosions, nuclear and population; at the hunger and the wars and the people that profit from both. Look around and you wonder who it is that is irresponsible.

Young people are accused of dropping out rather than seek solutions to the situations they protest against, and this is often true. But, in our own little worlds we all sort of cop out rather than face the truth. It's just that we do it quietly, so that everyone can pretend that it isn't happening to them.

What the Mayor Grimeses of this world would like is for the long hair and the bare feet to go away. Where doesn't matter, just away so that nobody has to look at them, to be reminded that there are questions without answers.

But this isn't 20 years ago, or even 10. The young people won't "shut up and sit down" anymore. And to think that they will—or should—is a mistake.

Move them off the church steps, if you will, but you won't get rid of today's young adults that easily. You can hide them, but you cannot blindfold them; you cannot gag them; you cannot erase their impact on tomorrow's world.

Someday, Mr. Mayor, they will be in your shoes. There will be step-sitters, or their equivalent, to test their patience. I hope that they will have more compassion and understanding for their young people than you have for them.

They could not have much less.

---

## OUR RAVAGED ENVIRONMENT

## HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a far-reaching anti-air-pollution package. However, our problem of environmental deterioration needs a new redefinition in terms of the cost of a ravaged environment. My friend Kenneth Boulding, noted economist and educator, has been pressing for such a redefinition for many years.

Herbert Rowan of the Washington Post has written a perceptive analysis of this issue in which he poses the question: Should our affluent and highly productive society assume, without question or criticism, that all economic growth is beneficial to society and environment? Should we not also question the offshoots of annual gross national product growth, and the negative aspects of gross national product growth?

Mr. Rowan aptly describes the dangers of our naive economic assumption regarding gross national product and our environment, and outlines some interesting suggestions concerning creating a new set of indicators that will give us some notion as to the effects of gross national product on the quality of life.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this article to all my colleagues and readers of this RECORD. At the same time I would like to submit two other articles of interest on environmental pollution that appeared in yesterday's Post and New York Times.

The material follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post]

QUESTIONING GNP: IS GROWTH WORTH IT?

(By Hobart Rowen)

When John Kenneth Galbraith wrote his influential "Affluent Society" 12 years ago, he was concerned mostly that our national production goals were indiscriminate and much of our output an accumulation of trivia. Thus Galbraith was contemptuous of a society that stressed—and even counted—the big tail fins on Cadillac cars as part of the Gross National Product.

Today, there is a new concern. It is not just the question of how much of our vaunted GNP consists of relatively worthless appendages, like tail fins or gaudy chrome decortaions, but how much of our product is actually destructive to life and health. Slowly, but surely, we have come to realize that *more* is not necessarily *better*, and this has even given rise to a far-out new school of "zero growth" advocates who suggest that the only thing we can do to help the environment is to stop future growth.

This is an emotional response or backlash to the idea that as a nation, we have for too long made a fetish of growth. It reflects the new left distaste for material things, not just the fact of growth. But the problem has long been on the mind of probing analysts. Former Economic Council Chairman Walter W. Heller, for example, wrote in 1966 in his "New Dimensions of Economic Policy":

". . . the economic growth we measure is not everything . . . First claim on the *products* of growth should be to repair the ravages of the growth process."

Robert Lekachman, in a brilliant essay in the March issue of Commentary, observes that if a new pulp mill pollutes a clean stream, "the GNP will go up, not only cause of the mill's valuable output, but also because other enterprises and municipalities located downstream from the polluter will be compelled to invest in cleansing devices required to return the water to usable condition. Similarly, the GNP rises both with automobile sales and with the increased consumer expenditure for the cleaning of clothes, lungs, and bodies, necessitated by such purchases."

Such a naive evaluation of how prosperous we are—the general rejoicing in the establishment of meaningless quantitative new "records"—tricks us into thinking that we are better off than we really are.

Heller now thinks it is feasible to develop a set of indicators (as a supplement to economic indicators) that would give us an index to social amenities; and then to provide some sort of "deflator" or adjustment to the GNP that might roughly estimate any deterioration in the quality of life.

At hearings earlier this year on the Economic Report, Rep. Henry S. Reuss (D-Wis.) suggested that the Employment Act of 1946, which sets general economic goals, might be amended.

The Employment Act, Reuss pointed out, requires the government to consider production, employment, and purchasing power as the basic criteria for national economic policy. How about environment? Reuss asked.

Key Nixon administration officials acknowledged that the environment had been neglected. "Simply producing more . . . if it means putting more smoke in the atmosphere . . ." is not an adequate goal, Economic Council Chairman Paul W. McCracken agreed. And Federal Reserve Chairman Arthur Burns suggested that statistics might take depreciation into account for the environment, as they do in the case of investment in plant or machinery.

But precious little has been done either to control the pollution of the environment, or to make a meaningful record of it. And failure to make more progress along such lines will merely strengthen the argument that the only way to leading to improvement of the environment is to stop growth itself.

If we slip into this self-defeating posture, we will, at the same time, stop production of the means for controlling pollution; stop the growth of jobs; and eliminate hopes for helping 20 per cent of the population here, or helping underdeveloped peoples elsewhere escape from poverty.

It would seem that a more fruitful area to pursue at this time is responsibility of the American business establishment to guarantee a dramatic reduction in the industrial pollution of air and water. To this end, the government must provide the necessary laws and be prepared to enforce them.

In a series of major corporation annual meetings in the next few weeks, climaxing in Detroit on May 22 when General Motors stockholders get together, business will be asked to put its money where the mouth is.

On an individual level, important businessmen have been demonstrating an increasing sense of social responsibility in recent times. For example, the Urban Coalition Action Council was influential in assembling a most impressive list of "establishment" business leaders in support of President Nixon's Family Assistance program.

Other businessmen have been breaking away from a monolithic devotion to profit margins to speak out against the war in Vietnam, on pollution problems, consumer protection, and other issues. But the important point is that the business commitment has been on an individual, not a company or industry basis.

The initiative must come from the companies themselves, and that's why the stockholder meetings this month and next are so important. We should hear from the companies; we should hear from the influential business organizations, like the Business Council and the National Association of Manufacturers. Where do they stand, and what do they propose?

If they have nothing to say, then they make more logical ideas like Lekachman's that perhaps—to take one example—airlines should be compelled to purchase over-flight rights from property-owners in the path of their traffic.

If polluters, stripped from the protection of friendly regulating agencies, had to pay the cost—instead of consumers—attitudes might change quickly and dramatically.

---

[From the New York Times]

"COSMIC OUTLAW" . . .

A Marine company camped on a South Pacific island hilltop during World War II

was startled by sounds of wailing and the mournful beating of drums rising day and night from a tribal village in a valley below. After a few days, the valley fell silent. A passing patrol discovered that the village had been burned and abandoned because of an attack of crop pestilence and human disease. The survivors had moved on to build new homes in an unspoiled portion of the vast, thinly populated jungle.

The Earth Day observances across the United States today are akin to the lamentations of those primitive people, and of other stricken human communities down through the ages, for a ravaged land that has become unfruitful and for a society that has shriveled because it failed to remain in harmony with the nature that gave it birth and sustenance.

If the present predicament of modern Americans is not so acute as that of the South Pacific primitives, it is in the long run more ominous. For having overrun and wasted an abundant continent, today's American has no p'ace to turn but inward We must heal ourselves or perish in our own pollution of land, sea and air.

A principal target of today's teach-ins will be the technology which has made of this country at once the envy and the scourge of mankind, producing along with unparalleled abundance on unprecedented threat to the balance of nature, not only in this hemisphere but throughout the planet. The fault lies, however, not with the use of science, which might have saved the South Pacific villagers and may yet save us all, but with its abuse.

Man, especially American man, has employed science arrogantly and ignorantly, disregarding the humility of the Psalmist who sang, "The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof"; forgetting the sound precept set forth by Sir Francis Bacon, a father of modern science, who warned, "Nature is not governed except by obeying her."

Today's teach-ins will be a step toward salvation only if the hundreds of thousands of enthusiastic participants are able to inspire the people of this country to turn, not away from science, but toward a more humble and wise application of the rich intellectual heritage and endowments of this nation and this age. Man's place in the natural world must be rediscovered; the reverence for nature that has been the mark of wise men throughout the ages must be rekindled. As Henry Beston has written:

"Nature is a part of our humanity, and without some awareness and experience of that divine mystery man . . . becomes, as it were, a kind of cosmic outlaw, having neither the completeness and integrity of the animal nor the birthright of a true humanity."

---

. . . In an Urban Wasteland?

Probably the most potent and certainly the most poignant of the nation's Earth Day observances today will be those in New York City, a megalopolis where the technological era has reached the heights of triumph and tragedy.

Here on one small island an energetic people has erected a city that is in many ways a towering tribute to the creative genius of man. In doing so, however, New Yorkers have heedlessly destroyed the natural endowments of a once-favored region, polluting the waters, fouling the air and obliterating the good green earth with ruthless extravagance. The end toward which this is all dangerously tending is a technological monstrosity, a sterile monument of concrete and steel unfit for human habitation.

Earth Day offers an opportunity for that embattled minority of New Yorkers who are willing to stand up for human values against the dehumanizing demands of development for development's sake. The new national concern for the environment creates one more chance for local reformers, like the Regional Plan Association and the Parks Council, to rally effective public support behind their perennial pleas for human-centered urban redevelopment.

Unless New Yorkers at last heed these pleas, there is not much hope for increasingly urbanized man anywhere. The creative genius that has made this city great can also make it a good place to live. What is required is the civil will to do so, and determined leadership from City Hall to enforce that will against the myriad vested interests that would block it.

---

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post]

Hard Facts About Dirty Facts

(By Colman McCarthy)

After tons of adjectives and the legwork of a thousand advance men, today sees the arrival of Earth Day—so named because a few earth people are beginning to worry. The basic dread is simple: the dirt and waste is everywhere, we are running low on—if not out of—clean land, air and water, and nobody gets a transfer when the planet stalls in mid-air. Naturalists, lecturers and the inevitable me-too politicians speaking at hundreds of colleges and high schools will tell the young what most of them know and have heard a hundred times already.

The purpose of Earth Day is to prod each group to work out a strategy for earth-improvement—or what is now called strenuously *ecotactics*. Many will organize to change local pro-pollution laws, or perhaps unite behind an earth-minded politician, or boycott the one-way cans and bottles, or—hardest of all—begin taking personal responsibility for conserving things like water, fossil fuels and life itself.

Trying to end the evil of pollution may meet many of the frustrations found earlier in the civil rights and antiwar movements: first, like racism and war, pollution has been going on unquestioned so long that suddenly putting on the brakes is more an act of alarm than actual stopping—the way a speeding car needs over 400 feet of braking before forward motion is killed. Second, ending pollution means that somebody will get hurt: profits must be cut, comforts reduced, sacrifices endured. As in all human struggles, the powerful and monied will fight the hardest to be hurt the least.

Few politicians, and certainly not a Republican President with re-election already on his mind, are talking up these hard facts about the dirty facts. Instead, anti-pollution is often presented as a warm puppy issue, assuring happiness to anyone opposing a befouled environment. If we pass enough laws, says the delusion, spend some money and have a good heart, well, it will soon be America the Beautiful again.

Just how fast the pollution wheels have been speeding along, and how many decades if not centuries will be needed before they may stop, is shown by the almost countless laws on the books forbidding pollution: the Water Quality Act, the Clean Air Act, the Water Pollution Control Act, the Environmental Policy Act, to name a few. Yet, the air, land and water continue to blacken. The "laws" have been ignored by large corporations and small companies, many of them cheered on, if not whipped on, by the stockholders. But the industries were only committing the kind of ecological murder the federal and state agencies let them get away with. It is almost as if the Interior Department, Agriculture, the FTC, the FDA and the many state and local conservation bureaus were listening to Ford Motor Company president Arjay Miller, who warned in 1967 of the "threat of over-regulation by government" regarding pollution. That remark was made when pollution was still a quiet issue.

A second reason why destruction of the earth will not stop instantly is that the needs of the public will not instantly slacken. The opposite seems true. American homes are now so filled to the roof with appliances, machines, devices and gizmos that the demand for electricity to run them all is insatiable.

The electric companies, far from being profit-mongers, argue that nuclear power plants must be built to supply the public. But each plant needs millions of gallons of water to cool the machinery. The used water is then flushed into a lake or river at an increased temperature that kills the fish and unbalances the ecology.

What does the public want? More contraptions in its homes or clean lakes and rivers outdoors?

The choice is everywhere. Phosphates in detergents—such as Axion, Bold, Cheer, Fab, Oxydol, Tide, Trend—have been ruining our lakes and rivers, according to the House Committee on Government Operations and anyone able to see or smell. But the heavy duty soaps clean clothes fresher and brighter, and everyone, except some of our younger people, wants that. Moreover, according to the Soap and Detergent Association, eliminating phosphates "would be equivalent to setting back health, cleanliness and sanitation standards many years."

Despite the industry's talk about impending disease and pestilence, a choice is present: weaker soaps or cleaner lakes and rivers. But is there a choice? The industry swears that no replacement for phosphates is now possible; since the Interior Department is hestitant to force the manufacturers to change (Interior has funded only one study, for only $99,000, on the idea of removing phosphates from the detergents), the public has the choice made for it: rivers and lakes that are dirty today and dirtier tomorrow.

The question—who gets hurt the most in cleaning up?—easily wins the Rhetorical Question of the Century contest. The consumer, who else? Fortune magazine recently asked business leaders for ideas on solving the ecology mess. Over half—57 per cent—said the governmnet should offer industry tax relief for combat duty in fighting pollution. "This would mean," writes Michael Harrington in the current Commonweal, "that the biggest polluters, with the greatest problems, would get the largest subsidies. It would, in effect, reward those who have befouled the atmosphere. And it would, like all other tax expenditures for the private sector, take money away from social uses."

In case tax money is not about to be forked over, a few industries are telling the public outright that the latter must pay. Prices will be raised $100, for example, on new GM cars for anti-smoke devices. At this point, the temptation is to condemn the captains of industry and their corporals at the local outlet. But this is simple-minded. Naturally, industry is going to make the public pay. American business has worked hard and long to supply the public with the services, goods and technology it seemed to want. The individual consumer never asked for products that didn't pollute; instead, as in the case of cars, he said, "Make them flashy, fast and powerful." Detroit did. Now, the public suddenly wants its cars clean as well. "That's fine with us," says Detroit, but be prepared to pay for this latest whim the way you wanted and paid for the old whims.

At the base of the environmental crisis, two general theories of man are whirling. The first, from philosopher Alfred North Whitehead and popularized by Teilhard, holds that the creation of the world is still ongoing. The current mire in pollution should not discourage—it is only a venial lapse caused by the giddiness of progress. We'll snap to soon, and be swept up in what Teilhard calls "an irresistible tide of liberated energies."

The second theory is from Freud who claimed that man has an "innate inclination toward evil, toward aggression, destruction, and . . . toward cruelty."

The question raised by an earth suddenly turned cesspool, after millions of years of grace and purity, is forcing a definition of man: is he a co-creator or a violent destroyer? The hope of Earth Day is that we are the former, that survival, even self-improvement, is still possible. But even here the evidence is mixed. The very signs, posters, buttons and pictures used to dramatize April 22 will become tomorrow just more piles of junk and garbage to be hauled off to the burning ground—as much a pollutant to the aid and earth as any Detroit smokewagon guaranteed to be damned more than once today.

## NATIONAL SECRETARIES' WEEK

### HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, this week has been designated as National Secretaries' Week, and I think it is most appropriate at this time for us to recognize and honor those who work and serve us so well as secretaries. Secretaries keep the wheels of progress rolling for business, Government, and industry. They occupy positions of trust and must be dependable and responsible. The success of an executive or of an entire enterprise sometimes rests on the good judgment and the conscientiousness of one secretary. Secretaries have the responsibility for doing the detailed work which is necessary to keep our Government and industries operating smoothly and efficiently. Along with basic secretarial skills and techniques, the modern secretary must know office management, research sources, public relations, and financial procedures. Today's secretaries are professionals. I commend their dedication, loyalty, and devotion.

There are no limits to the opportunities open to capable individuals with secretarial skills. The Honorable Edgar Brown, president pro tempore of the South Carolina Senate and a renowned figure in the politics of South Carolina, attributes part of his success to the knowledge of shorthand which he gained as a court stenographer. Such internationally famous statesmen as James F. Byrnes and Bernard Baruch also attribute much of their success to their knowledge of shorthand and of the detailed work which secretaries do. Alexander Hamilton served as adjutant for George Washington when he was 20 years old and was in effect the general's personal secretary. Mrs. Bess Truman, wife of former President Harry Truman, worked as a secretary for over 30 years, and Mrs. John Nance Garner, wife of the distinguished Speaker and Vice President, was another outstanding secretary.

During this week I believe that it is especially fitting for us to recognize the secretaries associated with our Government and with the Congress. These secretaries have the privilege of dealing directly with the citizens of our country and with the citizens' representatives, and they do an outstanding job. The secretaries in various Government agencies and on our congressional staffs render superior service to the people of this country, who are their employers.

I would like to express my personal appreciation both to my own secretaries and to those in business, industry, and various agencies who work with us. I am deeply grateful for the cooperation and assistance which I have received from secretaries throughout my district, State, and Nation. It is a great pleasure for me to recognize and pay personal tribute to these secretaries during National Secretaries' Week.

## PROVIDING FOR AN ORDERLY TRADE IN TEXTILE ARTICLES AND LEATHER FOOTWEAR

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, manufacturing technology in the last 10 years has progressed to a point where the world is currently suffering from an apparent overproduction of textiles and footwear in general. America is bearing the brunt of this overproduction, with her free marketplace being glutted with foreign produced goods that are driving domestic producers out of business.

In order to bring some semblance of order to the unchecked flow of foreign textiles and footwear into our free and open markets, I am introducing a bill today which is designed to provide for an orderly trade in textiles and leather footwear. Both these items are important to the economy of our country, my State and my district.

Most people forget that less than 10 short years ago the United States was confronted by a similar situation in respect to cotton goods. Our Government then found it necessary to spearhead an international conference which enabled all the major cotton processing countries to agree on a long-term arrangement aimed at preventing undue disruption of national cotton markets.

Since then consumer tastes have changed. The chemical industry has produced and improved new synthetic fibers. Manufacturing technology has made overproduction of textile and footwear products the rule, and world producers are taxing the ability of domestic producers to compete with foreign imports that have the advantage of cheap labor.

Mr. Speaker, we are a great and thriving country because the American worker has had an opportunity to earn a decent living and make a decent income. It is unfair to put American manufacturers out of business and American employees out of jobs because a foreign country can produce a similar product at one-half the price. Foreign workers enjoy neither the level of income nor the benefits extended to any American laborer in any comparable job in industry.

I feel that the administration has not moved with sufficient vigor to protect our national interests in the foreign trade field. The threat to our workers is real: our communities are faced with the ugly specter of unemployment, and thousands are being condemned to the degrading life of underemployment because of the unfair competition of foreign imports.

In moving to protect the American worker I feel it is possible to find a suitable framework of international cooperation in which we can assure the consistent and continued participation of all producers, domestic as well as foreign, in the gains of our growing markets for textiles and leather footwear. However, it is the duty of this Nation to insure our domestic industries a sound and just economic basis from which to work.

This can only be done if, through our international agreements and various trade obligations, we agree to accept a fair volume of imports that will not severely injure our domestic producers.

I am disturbed, Mr. Speaker, that the gaping differential of low-wage content in textile and footwear imports bespeaks not only the poor labor conditions under which they are produced but also the increasing practice of foreign governments to subsidize their exports to America in order to broaden their inroads into our rich markets for a quick advantage.

The time has come to reappraise our attitudes toward excessive imports. The bill which I am introducing today would provide the President with a fresh tool to bring a modicum of orderliness in textile and footwear imports. The provisions of this measure are reasonable, feasible, and fair to our domestic producers, and the concerns of foreign producers are also considered.

Only an orderly trade in the presently unchecked flow of textiles and footwear from all over the world into this country will enhance the overall well-being of the American economy and check the undesirable aspects of a dwindling balance of trade. I am in favor of revising our present import laws and I urge my fellow Congressmen to do the same.

## THE NEEDS OF THE ELDERLY

### HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the scientific advances of this century have given us the longest life expectancy in the history of the world. But while the length of that life span has increased, in many instances its quality in the later years leaves much to be desired. All too often the man or woman who reaches retirement age after a lifetime of contributions to his community and his Nation is left without the independence or the contentment which he so richly deserves.

Our country has become increasingly preoccupied in recent years with youth. We must properly give our attention to those who will form this Nation in the years ahead. But at the same time, we must also see to it that the group at the other end of the age spectrum, to whom

we are so deeply indebted for what we have today, enjoy a dignified productive way of life, not a disheartening period of dependency or deprivation.

The people of Iowa share a particular concern because we have a larger percent of our population over 65 than any other State in the Union with the exception of Florida. Throughout the United States there are presently 20 million Americans that age and over, and this number will increase to 25 million by 1975.

We in the Congress can point to the historic progress of the 1960's with satisfaction that we have at last begun the task of providing for our senior citizens, but not with any pride that we have accomplished all that we must. Many of the older citizens of Iowa, and of the Nation, still face very critical problems in adequate income, in decent housing, in available health care at reasonable costs.

Three out of every 10 older Americans live in poverty, and other two in 10 exist just above the poverty line. At this level the average senior citizen spends most of his income on the essentials of food, medicine, and housing—precisely those items whose prices have increased most rapidly in the present inflationary economy. Yet, their income remains fixed at the same inadequate figure.

A major and often sole source of income for most elderly persons is social security. And if their economic situation is to be improved, then social security benefits must be increased or supplemented from other earnings without a sacrifice in basic benefits. In as prosperous a country as the United States, where the gross national product has been increasing at an average annual rate of 5 percent, there is no reason why social security beneficiaries should not share in the expanding prosperity.

Another area demanding the prompt consideration of the Congress is the health needs of the aged. Four out of five persons over 65 have a disability or chronic disease.

Medicare has reduced many of the financial barriers to health services which previously existed for many older persons. But serious gaps in coverage and weaknesses in administration still remain. We must take the creative steps necessary to put a halt to the skyrocketing costs of medical and hospital care, and to meet the critical shortage of medical and nursing personnel. Hopefully, this can be done under the leadership of the professions themselves.

Bold and imaginative approaches in these and other areas are needed if we are to meet our obligation to the generations who have contributed so much to the fabric of our economy and society, and if they are to continue their service to our Nation.

The goal of democracy is to improve the quality of each and every citizen's life, to open up new avenues, and to extend each person's ability and his freedom to choose the direction of his future. This must include men and women over the age of 65, just as surely as any other age group in the country.

## INDIGNATION IS A SOMETIME THING

### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, one of our colleagues entered in the RECORD this week a table showing that only 38 of the 131 governments in the world are democratic. He asked, "Where are those who criticized Greece . . . and why have they singled out only Greece when we should be voicing the same indignation in defense of freedom in the rest of the world?" I quite agree. As one who has consistently documented the sins of the Greek military junta in this RECORD, I confess to being too exclusive in my indignation. If I may be permitted to correct the error of my ways, I would like to enter in the RECORD the following account of political torture in Brazil which, like Greece, suffers the oppressive measures of a military dictatorship which enjoys substantial U.S. support. The article in the April issue of Christian Century was written by Robert H. Bolton, minister of the University Methodist Church in Syracuse, N.Y.:

BRAZILIAN TORTURE: SPECIFICALLY NEW, SPECIFICALLY TERRIBLE

(By Robert H. Bolton)

The military regime in Brazil is determined to force that gigantic half of the South American continent into rapid development. One of its chief tools in its endeavor is brutal torture.

From some well informed sources comes testimony that this torture is more frightening than any heretofore inflicted on man. Ivan Illich, who heads the famous Center for Intercultural Documentation in Cuernavaca, Mexico, declares:

"This absolutely incredible corruption is something new which has never been known in modern times. In Hitler's Germany or Stalin's Russia a person might disappear or be subjected to ghastly imprisonment. I lived under Hitler as a Jew. The cruelty in Brazil, however, is something entirely new—to put an entire people, anyone at any moment, under the threat of torture. What is new is the picking up of people *at random*, having them go through unspeakable torture and then *releasing* them. The Brazilian officials do not hide them. The Nazis and Stalinists made their victims disappear. The Brazilian torturers release people because this is an effective way of subduing a whole population. The exercise of violence cannot go further."

The new element in the Brazilian situation is the deliberate attempt to use the *fear* of torture rather than torture itself as a tool of ordinary government administration. The random choice of subjects and the blatant return of the victims to ordinary life become means of terrorizing the entire population.

Though this condition has existed in South America's most populous country for a year and a half, few knowledgeable North Americans are aware of it. Scarcely any articles or news releases have mentioned the unspeakable horrors which are taking place. Illich contends that the U.S. press has "simply suppressed" reports on the situation. Yet informed sources agree about its seriousness. I quote Dana S. Green, executive director of the National Council of Churches' Latin American department:

"Of all the heart-rending, gut-tearing agony of working with the Latin American situation, there is none so imperative as the Brazilian situation today. We have watched it get increasingly worse. . . .

"When people are turned over to the authorities as disloyal to the regime "for interrogation"—interrogation means imprisonment without recourse for as long as the authorities deem necessary—the authorities have complete liberty to do whatever they wish to do with the bodies and minds of the people they are questioning. Student leaders, people in drama, journalists, teachers, ordinary housewives—anyone who has even thought of dissent against the present ruling force in Brazil is subject to questioning of the most unspeakable kind. And I mean unspeakable. I would hesitate to go into the details in mixed company. Men come out of it dead or demented or physically ruined. . . ."

The leaders of Brazil are determined that Brazil is going to join the industrial nations of the world. And anyone who raises questions about the way this goal is being achieved will be removed, either by exile or by the constant threat of such terror as Ivan Illich has described.

METHODS UNSPEAKABLE

A thick stack of evidence of the torture has been accumulated and sent to the Vatican, and the Latin American department of the National Council of Churches has a copy. Much of the material was condensed and published in France under the title *Dossier Noir de la Torture* (*"Black Book of Torture"*).

Detailed accounts of the methods of torture used are frightening. A person may be picked up and taken to jail. In the interrogation room (in one jail it is only about six-feet square) his clothing is stripped from him and his hands and feet are tied together. A steel pole is passed under his knees and his elbows and he is lifted from the ground. One wire is attached to a finger or a toe, another is placed on a sensitive part of the body—the tongue, the penis, the nose, the anus, the lips or the nipples. An electric shock is then applied. It produces excruciating pain and violent muscular contraction. It is so powerful that if the prisoner's mouth is not stuffed with cloth he bites his lips or tongue so badly that he is unable to speak or eat for several days. People are tortured until they are unconscious, then are doused with water to revive them. While still wet they are given more shocks; the water makes the pain "ten times more intense."

If a man and woman who love each other are captured together the woman may be raped in front of the man while he is being tortured. Children, some of them less than a year old, have been tortured before their mother's eyes.

Ivan Illich speaks sadly about his friend Dom Helder Camara, Roman Catholic bishop of Olinda and Recife, in northeastern Brazil. Some time ago this eminent, outspoken cleric, whose voice is one of the most prophetic on the continent, was threatened. On the wall of his office were written the names of 25 priests scheduled for assassination before the arm of the ruling regime reached the bishop. The first priest on the list was subsequently tortured to death, his body cut to strips and burned outside his house. Then the second was similarly disposed off. "Number one crossed off, number two crossed off," says Illich, his dark eyes blazing with anger.

LAMENTABLE SILENCE

In a recent encounter at Yale Divinity School Ivan Illich challenged Dana Green to speak out publicly, to have the National Council of Churches come out with a strong,

clear, public condemnation of the evil being perpetrated in Brazil. "Mobilize the entire world in the name of God and in the favor of life against the use of torture as a means of government," Illich pleaded.

The response of the Protestant churchman was lamentably lame. His answers were irrelevant until he was forced by repeated comments and questions to face up to the issue. Then he said that such condemnation as Illich demanded is the job of the world church, not of the National Council (or, by implication, of any of its member denominations or local congregations). "There is no church but the world church," he said.

Green went on to insist that he has no power to act. After a lengthy discussion of bureaucracy he confessed: "The bureaucracy in the state department is not too different from ours (in the N.C.C.). Nobody is responsible. And I mean this seriously." Then, in an attempt at explanation: "In order to continue the admittedly meager relief program of Church World Service, we have to maintain a relationship with the government of Brazil that is for me abhorrent. One of the great tensions within the National Council of Churches, particularly regarding the programs in Brazil, is precisely at this point." Yet it looks as if the program will continue indefinitely.

The Brazilian administrator of the relief program to which Green referred is a former military man who considers it quite possible, and acceptable, that many thousands of Brazilians will have to be exterminated if his country is to make sufficient technological progress.

Sadly, one is forced to conclude that the impotence of the National Council of Churches and its willingness to compromise with evil governments and ruthless administrators of its own program have rendered it useless as a voice capable of summoning the churches and the world to vigorous denunciation of the atrocities which are being committed hourly in Brazil. The alternative would seem to be for individual Christians and churches to become informed, then to speak out. The Brazilian people desperately need such pressure on the leaders of the brutal regime which dominates them as non-Brazilians can give. The United States supports that regime when it allots to Brazil more money than it gives to any other nations except Vietnam and India. Our purchase of coffee and other Brazilian products helps keep the economy afloat.

Those of us who are concerned should write letters to our congressmen and to the state department requesting strong pressure on Brazil. We should request from the companies which process and distribute coffee information on what percentage of their product is purchased in Brazil, explaining the reasons for our concern; if some of those companies began to purchase less coffee in Brazil great pressure would be exerted on the regime. We should inform our local congregations of what has happened; we should urge local newspapers to inform the wider populace of the heart-rendering tragedy. Action by grass-roots churches might shake the national offices of our denominational and interdenominational agencies from their lethargy.

When a left-winger became president of Brazil a few years ago widespread concern and publicity arose in the United States. But when a right-wing regime rules with brutal and sophisticated terror North American Christians remain silent. Is it that we have ceased to care about people and are only concerned about political dogma? When left-leaning President Joao Goulart was forced out of Brazil in 1964 before he could become an absolute dictator, people claimed with horror that his regime had compiled lists of people who would be killed. Today the military leadership has lists of those who have been, are being, or will be tortured, deformed, crazed and/or killed. Why was there such an outcry against left-wing murderers and in the past year and a half none against right-wing murderers?

Brazil has traditionally been one of the most peaceful nations of Latin America. While other countries normally pursued political goals by war and murder, Brazil normally practiced a nonviolent approach to politics. Even military revolutions tended to be relatively free of shooting and terror. People who like myself have lived in Brazil have been deeply impressed by the people's amiability.

It is time for North American churches and North American churchmen to raise their voices against Brazil's "specifically new, specifically terrible" form of government-by-fear-of-torture. Their voices must be heard before the madness of murder, torture and violence infects an entire population and turns a comparatively peaceful populace into an uncontrollably violent one.

---

## RESTORATION OF IMPEACHMENT

### HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, since June 1, 1813, the U.S. House of Representatives has used its House Committee on the Judiciary to investigate serious questions of impropriety in the judiciary. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. FORD) has sought to avoid this clear precedent of the House by bringing a charge of judicial impropriety, not before the House Committee on the Judiciary, but before the House Committee on Rules.

I do not question Mr. FORD's motive in going outside the system and attempting to avoid the clearly established precedents and procedures of the House of Representatives.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. FORD) is quoted in a highly unreliable newspaper, the Indianapolis Star, as saying he questions my motives in following the clearly established procedures of the House of Representatives in this matter. Until he looks me in the eye and challenges my sincerity I shall withhold further comment, except for this:

I enter this investigation with a completely open mind, having bias neither for nor against Mr. Justice Douglas, some of whose legal and political opinions I have agreed with and some with which I have disagreed.

As a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, I shall demand and expect to receive a through no-holds-barred investigation of the resolution of impeachment.

If I conclude after hearing the evidence that impeachment should be voted, I shall vote impeachment. If otherwise, I shall vote against it. But in determining this most serious question I intend to follow the proper judicial procedures of the Congress.

In an attempt to deceive the public into believing that the House Rules Committee might be the proper judicial forum of the House, the Indianapolis Star on its front page Friday morning asserted that Chairman WILLIAM COLMER of the House Rules Committee is or was a "judge." That assertion is completely false.

The following is the statement I made on the floor of the House of Representatives when I introduced the resolution of impeachment:

The gentleman from Michigan stated publicly that he favors impeachment of Justice Douglas.

He, therefore, has a duty to this House and this country to file a Resolution of Impeachment.

Since he refuses to do so and since he raises grave questions, the answers to which I do not know, but every American is entitled to know, I introduce at this time the Resolution of Impeachment in order that a proper and dignified inquiry into this matter might be held.

The following is the letter which I have caused to be hand delivered to Representative JERRY FORD a few moments ago:

APRIL 17, 1970.

HON. GERALD R. FORD,
*Minority Leader, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR JERRY: On at least five occasions during the past forty hours I have been asked in news conferences my opinion about your sincerity in departing from the traditional procedures of the House in your avowed move to impeach Justice Douglas.

On each occasion I declined to speculate on your motives. In short, I refused to question your integrity.

I merely stated what I believed to be a duty that you should perform. Obviously you and I disagreed on that point. And obviously I have refused to suggest that the disagreement was not honest on your part.

When I introduced the Resolution of Impeachment I stated my motives. On the front page of my home town monopoly and unprincipled press Friday, April 17, 1970, you were quoted in effect as saying that my Record statement following your speech Wednesday night was untrue.

You were quoted as saying:

"If Mr. Jacobs actually favors impeachment of Justice Douglas he could have demanded an immediate vote on impeachment instead of turning the matter over to the House Judiciary Committee. . . . Therefore it appears that Mr. Jacobs has introduced an impeachment resolution which he himself does not support as a diversionary tactic to prevent consideration of the facts by a balanced bipartisan special committee."

A suggestion that sincerity would require me, in clear violation of House precedent, to call for an immediate vote on the Resolution of Impeachment is no different from suggesting a lack of sincerity on the part of a citizen, who, filing an affidavit containing a serious charge on information and belief with the Prosecutor, fails to demand instant indictment without investigation.

Would it be fair to suggest that you do not "favor actual impeachment" because far short of demanding "an immediate vote," you have not even so much as followed the clearly established House precedent by introducing a Resolution of Impeachment?

Did you make a statement questioning the integrity of what I said on the Floor following your April 15th speech?

Sincerely,

ANDREW JACOBS.

For 7 days this hand-delivered letter has gone unanswered. The time-distance from Mr. FORD's office to mine is 7½ minutes.

## DRUG ADDICTION REHABILITATION ENTERPRISES, INC., OF NEWARK

### HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, we are becoming keenly aware of the burgeoning drug abuse problem in the United States. The most unfortunate aspect of this problem concerns our young people, who are entering the so-called drug culture during their adolescence. These young people, if they are to reach maturity, must be rescued. Tragically, we hear little that is encouraging with respect to juvenile drug addicts.

It was therefore quite heartening to learn about one youngster who may not travel the same dire road usually reserved to the teenage drug addict. This young man, assisted by the dedicated staff of the Drug Addiction Rehabilitation Enterprise, Inc., was the topic of a story in the Newark Evening News on April 18.

The Drug Addiction Rehabilitation Enterprise, known by its acronym DARE, has an addict and ex-addict self-help program with a central office, an outreach unit and residential center in Newark. It offers a modified Daytop Village approach of induction treatment and after-care services within the community.

It is important to learn that a young drug addict can be recovered. The type of work done at DARE is impressive and, I think, should be brought to the attention of my colleagues.

The Newark News article follows:

SOPHOMORE, 15, RECOUNTS HIS EXPERIENCE WITH DRUGS

(By David A. Crombie)

Traveling by car from Princeton to Newark takes about an hour, but when Chris G. made the trip with his parents last December it seemed as though it would last forever.

The 15-year-old high school sophomore was en route to Newark to join a program called Drug Addiction Rehabilitation Enterprise (DARE). The day before his departure, he had been a patient in Trenton State Hospital and would have remained there had a young social worker not intervened in his behalf.

"At first, I felt pretty skeptical about going to DARE," the youth said. "But I knew I was just wasting my time in that hospital bed. And my parents really wanted me to get a cure. So I went. But reluctantly.

"My psychiatrist sent me to the hospital after I collapsed from an overdose of heroin. I was there for two days lying in bed. Going to the hospital was just another way of avoiding jail."

"The path that led Chris to the hospital began when he left home three days earlier in search of drugs, traveling first to Philadelphia, then to New York, and eventually back to Princeton where the need for help became obvious when he collapsed.

It was Chris' second stay in the hospital in six months. Last June, he spent two weeks at Temple Hospital in Philadelphia after he was arrested for theft of a pocketbook.

"I thought I'd come out a new man, but the same day they discharged me I went off and smoked marijuana and a short time afterwards I was into LSD and heroin.

The world of drugs and the nightmare of arrests, thievery and eventual illness began for Chris two years ago when he first smoked a marijuana cigarette given to him by a friend.

"I wanted to be part of society," he said as he sat in the living room of DARE's headquarters at 209 Littleton Ave. "I smoked it and we ended up riding around in a car for the rest of the afternoon. It was scary because marijuana can make you paranoid. At least, that's what it did to me."

"People always ask why you've taken drugs and I say that the problem really doesn't lie in drugs. It is part of a deeper problem. In my case, it was the inability to talk out my problems or to get rid of deep-seated fears and anxieties."

"Every person has a problem. It's just a question of being able to handle it. I couldn't and I turned to drugs as a crutch."

TRIED TO HELP

"I couldn't open up with my parents. But I think they really tried to help me. I just wasn't able to tell them anything. I felt very conscious of myself and my shortcomings."

"I was worried about being too short or being ignored. And I had a feeling of being neglected by my peers. All of these feelings led me towards the use of drugs as a way of attaining security."

"But," he said, "drugs only turn a person away from himself. I never confronted my own situation. Instead, I got further away from the real world and went deeper and deeper into fantasy."

"My parents would always ask me 'why.' Why did you take the stuff? But I didn't answer."

"I think they tried to listen, but after a while they said they couldn't keep me any more. They were feeding and clothing a thief. I was stealing money from them and skipping school regularly. They had no choice but to tell me to get out."

It seems hard to believe that Chris, a tall and direct youth with close cropped hair and quiet eyes, could ever be involved with drugs. His mannerisms, his voice, bear no resemblance to society's concept of a drug addict.

Until recently, most of society equated drug addiction with the poor and with the transient derelict who scrapped for drugs and ended up in the city morgue unidentified for days.

MOVING STORY

Occasionally, a moving story would be written about a celebrity who was caught in the world of drugs. Barney Ross, an ex-prize fighter turned to drugs after serving in World War II. Ross was eventually cured, but his story is an exception.

"The fact remains," and a counselor at a rehabilitation center in Newark, that most of the drug addicts five or 10 years ago were the poor, the down-and-out guy from across the tracks whose unhappy fight against drug addiction ended in a Potters Field.

But Chris says that many of the students at his high school in Princeton are turning to drugs. They've got the money. Either their parents innocently give it to them or they manage to steal it someway or another. But a much more affluent group is now hung up on the drug scene."

And there is some connection between the drug abuse in the white upper middle class suburbs and the emergence of drug programs throughout the country to deal with what is called "an epidemic problem," according to a counselor at DARE.

Chris admitted that he belonged to the upper middle class suburban society. His father is an assistant vice president of a New York-based firm. He has a younger brother and sister. He describes the relationship between his parents as "very close."

"Addicts blame everyone but themselves for the problem. I was always blaming my parents, my friends, my teachers, the cops, when I knew the problem was inside of me and not them.

But if the problem was inside of Chris, it was also inside of society itself. "It is more of a soul problem, more of a gut matter than a legal question," said an ex-addict who has been working in rehabilitative programs for five years now. Maybe a lot of blame on Chris has to be shared by the methods used to help him when he was taking drugs."

CURE NEEDED

Chris said that neither his teachers, nor the doctors at the two hospitals he visited, nor a psychiatrist he saw understood his drug abuse problem sufficiently. "They can always tell you why you went on drugs, but they can't get you off them. Maybe it's important to find out why, but a cure is needed, too.

"I went to a psychiatrist. She was nice, but she didn't know the problem. It wasn't her fault. I just conned her. Addicts can really push a snow job over on non-addicts. They fool them, plead with them, beg for their sympathy and then break them down," Chris said.

"It's all an attempt to get out and cop more drugs. So you fake enthusiasm. You pretend you're getting along better with your parents and that you suddenly see the light. But it's all a big con job," said Chris.

"It's harder to fool an ex-addict because he's been there before; he knows the whole situation and he can identify with you and understand why you went to drugs and what it was like and what you had to do to get the drugs."

"And what's really important is that the ex-addict will demand that you level with him and that you be honest with him at all times. If you're not, he'll call you on it."

STAGES

Those who enter DARE's program, like Chris, go through three stages of rehabilitation. The first includes an intensive training course in a self-help therapeutic community with a family type environment. A second stage includes residency at a half-way house located on the shore, while a third phase consists of an after care and social setting where graduates of the program meet to discuss their progress.

Chris said that he doesn't like to talk about his drug experience. "It's something I'd just as soon forget. I try not to think about it anymore. I used to worry when I was on drugs about getting arrested, about getting sick, about dying . . . you always worry about that."

"I took heroin, LSD, and marijuana steadily for almost two years," he said. He admitted that he stole to get drugs but it was more of petty thievery than anything else.

"After I shot heroin, I'd just sit back and stare at the wall. I used to think about nothing. Afterwards, I wondered why I took it," he said. "It was a despairing feeling." You know you're hooked, but you wonder whether there is any way of getting off it."

For Chris, his four month stay has produced a good feeling. He describes it as "a feeling of freedom and new found honesty. There's no more phoniness. The drug problem is all part of not squaring matters with yourself.

"I still don't think I'm ready to go out in the world. I need more time. But that time will come." Eventually, Chris hopes to obtain his high school diploma through DARE and go to college.

Since he first came into the program, he has seen his father twice. His father is pleased with his progress and likes the program so much that he agreed to donate $500 to it.

"I miss home and I'll go back there someday," he said. "But right now, I have a home here and it's a good one. I feel as if these people are my brothers and sisters."

## TRIBUTE TO HAWAII MEDAL OF HONOR WINNER, SGT. RODNEY J. T. YANO

### HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, a young man who volunteered to return to Vietnam after his tour of duty had expired so that his younger brother would not need to serve in the combat area, and who sacrificed his life so that his helicopter crew members might live, was posthumously awarded the Nation's highest recognition for valor—the Medal of Honor.

This young hero from Hawaii, Sgt. Rodney J. T. Yano, gave his life to his country on New Year's Day 1969, in combat near Bien Hoa. Sergeant Yano was cited for gallantry while performing the duties of crew chief aboard his air calvary troop's command-and-control helicopter during action against enemy forces entrenched in dense jungle. A grenade, exploding prematurely, covered Sergeant Yano with burning phosphorous, and lift him severely wounded. Badly burned and unable to use one arm, he still managed to hurl blazing ammunition from the helicopter and save the lives of others in the aircraft. In doing so, he inflicted additional wounds himself, yet he persisted until the danger was past.

He was awarded the Medal of Honor for this outstanding display of indomitable courage and profound concern for his comrades which averted the loss of their lives at the expense of his own.

Sergeant Yano was only a few days away from completing his second voluntary year of combat in Vietnam. He was serving the extra tour so that his brother, Glenn, a member of the 29th Infantry Brigade, which had been called to active duty, would not have to serve in the war zone. Rodney felt that since he had just completed a year, he was more experienced than his younger brother, and that his chances to survive were better.

Rodney, the second serviceman from Hawaii to receive the Medal of Honor in the Vietnam war, was from the beautiful fishing village of Kealakekua on the Kona coast of the big island of Hawaii. His father, a commercial fisherman for more than 20 years, also grows coffee on acreage near Kealakekua Bay. Rodney graduated from Konawaena High School in 1961, and while in school served as president of the Konawaena chapter of the Future Farmers of America.

Rodney's school records show that his longtime ambition was to be a soldier, and he volunteered in the Regular Army following his graduation from high school in 1961.

Mr. Ichiro Shikada, one of his former teachers at Konawaena High School, described young Yano as a student who showed signs of both leadership and courage when he was in school. He recalled that even then Rodney "had the habit of coming through when the chips were down."

In a White House ceremony earlier this month, Mr. and Mrs. Richard S. Yano received from the President the Medal of Honor in their fallen son's behalf. Accompanying them to the Nation's Capital were Rodney's younger brothers, Glenn and Stanley.

When a fine young man like Rodney Yano grows up in our midst and is killed in war, his loss is keenly felt not only by his parents, family, and relatives, but also by those neighbors and friends who have seen him grow up. So it is with a sense of sadness and personal loss that I pay tribute today to this valiant young hero from Hawaii, in whom we all take such pride.

In the Book of St. John we read that "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." To this I believe we may fittingly add—"and for his country."

Notwithstanding our views on the rightness or wrongness of our involvement in Vietnam, it is a testimonial to the greatness of this Nation that it has citizens of Rodney Yano's caliber willing to respond to the call of duty for love of country and to sacrifice his life for the love of his fellow man. May we be worthy of his patriotic sacrifice.

I am honored to place the name of Hawaii's Medal of Honor winner Sgt. Rodney J. T. Yano in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. His name gives added luster to the United States and to the long line of American heroes.

## POSTAL REFORM

### HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for more than a year the Congress has been considering the form which postal reorganization should take. Initially, the President proposed the creation of a public corporation, chartered with responsibility for delivering the mail.

Some felt, however, that a Government-owned corporation would be too removed from the people and the Congress. These objections, Mr. Speaker, have been met in the postal reorganization plan recently submitted by President Nixon.

It calls for the creation of a U.S. Postal Service—an institution shielded from direct control by the President and the Congress. The nine members of the bipartisan commission—nominated by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate—would provide, however, that link which would keep this service responsive to the public's needs.

The legislation now before the Congress would give us a postal service with the capacity to meet the legitimate needs of our postal workers and to develop the resources to handle our growing volume of mail—but it will still be sensitive to the demands of our economic, political, and social institutions.

## CRUSADING CONGRESSMAN CONTE: MAN OF VIGOR

### HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, we have all watched our good friend and dynamic colleague SILVIO CONTE in action on the floor and I have had the privilege over the years of serving with him on the great Committee on Appropriations, including the Subcommittee on Transportation. He is always in the forefront of debate on crucial issues affecting the destiny of our Nation and is an indefatigable fighter for the causes in which he believes. His outstanding endeavors in the House of Representatives recently won him a fine indepth word portrait in the Boston Sunday Herald Traveler. I would like to share the interview with my colleagues in the House, as follows:

CRUSADING CONGRESSMAN CONTE: MAN OF VIGOR

(By Ellen Beswick)

WASHINGTON.—There is a spirited debate going on, on the floor of the House of Representatives over an amendment to farm program legislation which would limit "exorbitant" subsidy payments to individuals.

Only a handful of Congressmen are on the floor at this point and it is easy to pick out the silver head and sideburns of Silvio O. Conte because the Republican representative from Pittsfield is standing with arm raised declaiming:

"I can assure the Secretary (of Agriculture) that the Congress and the American people will no longer stand for it."

The subject could be different. The Congress could be down to a nuts and bolts debate on aid to education, postal reform, foreign aid, the silver question, conservation projects or a number of other problems.

The cast of characters might change, but Rep. Conte would be unmistakably on the the scene, vigorously debating, conferring, scowling or smiling as he counted up the possible votes.

The battle over, won or lost, the Congressman, known and liked by his colleagues for his infectious exuberance, will disappear into the realms of the almighty Appropriations Committee and its subcommittees, to return to another battle another day.

The 48-year-old Pittsfield native told a group of students recently he believed the "primary role of a Congressman is as a trustee" for the federal government. Conte said he recognized the need for the continuing functions of a Congressman in representing the interest of his constituency and the aims of his party, but "due to the very real increase in the scope and complexity" of the federal government "a Congressman through his committee work and through his studies and associations, must become a specialist in some aspects of running the federal government."

The 12-year veteran of the Congress is strategically placed on the Appropriations Committee, the financial watchdog over federal spending.

The question of farm subsidy arose in connection with Agriculture Department appropriations, where Conte found the federal government was spending nearly $367 million in what he called "outrageously high subsidies."

The Congressman is confident he will be able to make his amendment to limit federal farm subsidy payments to individuals or farm

combines to $20,000 each, stick this year. He was successful last year on two votes in the House, only to see the measure defeated in the Senate.

Conte renewed his fight on the House floor last week, entering in the Congressional Record a 34-page list of 7,795 subsidy payments in excess of $25,000 made by the Department of Agriculture last year.

"With millions of Americans still suffering from hunger and malnutrition, the time has come to apply the brakes on this runaway program and redirect these funds to more pressing domestic needs," Conte told his colleagues.

Since he is a representative from a largely urban state, the farm program is not his main concern, but:

"I think a Congressman has to look at each piece of legislation and determine if it is good for the country.

"If it is he should stand up and fight for it, whether he gets any (political) mileage out of it or not," Conte told the Herald Traveler last week.

"I don't think I have a handful of Negroes in my district," Conte said, "but I fought on the floor against legislation which would in effect have repealed the landmark 1954 Supreme Court civil rights decision."

"They hung me in effigy in Peru for my part in foreign aid amendments limiting sale of sophisticated war weapons to countries receiving U.S. aid.

"And frankly, I'm for the birds," the Congressman said with a grin. He paused for a moment and then continued "as a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission."

Conte then moved onto a subject which he and a good many other New England Congressmen consider one of their main concerns.

"I've been fighting the battle to eliminate oil import quotas for years. This thing is causing holy havoc to us in New England," Conte said, "and it's costing the American consumer $5 billion in additional charges."

"When you have a demand, and choke off supply, which is what the quota does, you automatically increase prices," the Congressman explained. "We could be getting No. 2 home heating oil from Venezuela for $1.50 a barrel at a New England port."

Conte noted that the recent report of the President's oil import task force had recommended eliminating the quota and putting in a system of tariffs, but the President has held off action on the measure.

"The task force recommendations would put a $1.35 tariff per barrel of oil, but at least the federal treasury would be the beneficiary instead of the oil barons of this country.

"There are 54 of us supporting the elimination of the quota system," Conte said, "and we're not giving up.

"We're now exploring possible support from the Midwest and the Great Lakes area. We've never gotten support there before but the recent restriction on imports from the Midwest and the Great Lakes may work in our favor."

Conte said he was working on a plan to create a Congressional task force on oil import reform to bring added attention to the problem.

The Congressman went on to tell of some of his crusades as a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Post Office and Treasury. He was ranking minority member of the subcommittee for a number of years until he moved into a similar position on the Transportation Subcommittee during this session.

"I introduced the administration's postal reform package in the House," the Congressman noted. "The Post Office has been operating in the horse and buggy era. How can you run an effective business with no authority? The Postmaster General doesn't have the authority to establish volume—the public does that. He can't establish wages—Congress does that. And he can't establish rates—Congress does that too."

The First District Congressman went on to explain the plan for a semi-public corporation and the need for modernizing plant facilities and upgrading wages.

Conte is firm on the recent postal strike.

"I don't condone it. It was a wildcat action and illegal, but they really do have a gripe. They should be paid a wage that enables them to maintain their dignity and honor. Right now their families can't exist in the big cities on the wages they're being paid. They need a system of differential pay raises. While they're suffering in the cities, in sections of rural America the postman is the highest paid guy in town."

And Conte noted, this is having backlash results.

"They're getting a tremendous turnover, especially in city post offices. They're getting people they wouldn't normally hire and it's costing them money."

Conte has also been supporting a plan to build big new industrial type post office plants on the peripheries of major cities.

"It's ridiculous. They've been spending too much time and money building gigantic ornate monstrocities in the cities."

One new plant has already been constructed in New Jersey to process some of the load from Manhattan "at a $70 million savings on the capital investment alone," Conte said.

He said he had also been working to get more money allotted in the Post Office Department and the Internal Revenue Service for research and development.

Again, "It's ridiculous. Back in (former Postmaster General Arthur) Summerfield's time, I asked them what they were doing in the area of research and development and he started telling me about new mudflaps they were working on for mail trucks."

"Mudflaps!!! They need automated equipment!" Conte added.

Since that time, Conte noted, the Post Office Department has elevated the post of head of research and development to the title of an assistant to the Postmaster General, but "they're still not doing enough. There's a tremendous amount that could be done in this area."

Conte does not confine himself to criticism of the administrative offices of the government. How does an individual Congressman perform the myriad roles assigned to him?

"We don't. The Congress is now equipped to cope with the demands of the 20th century.

"The Appropriations Committee, for instance, is operating in the horse and buggy era. We're responsible for passing on a $200 billion budget, and we're not adequately staffed to do the job.

"The Postmaster General comes to the committee hearings to defend his budget with an Army, backed up and briefed like they're preparing for a bar exam. A Congressman asks a question and they huddle like a football team and come up with an answer.

"It's absolutely ridiculous. We need a computer and a mammoth staff to analyze all this material."

This is just part of the problem, Congressman Conte said, and then went on to list some of the other major items facing the nation.

"I sponsored the administration's water pollution measure in the House and it's a good bill aimed at cleaning up sewage. But it's just the beginning. There has to be a lot more done in this area.

"Everything is under the cloud of the Vietnam war. It gobbles up $25 to $30 billion a year," Conte said.

"We have to get out from under that, then you can talk about long-range programs for schools and hospitals . . . We need billions of dollars there—or mass transit, or housing, low income, middle income, any income. We're so far behind in housing it makes your head spin to think about it."



## NATIONAL DISASTER RELIEF

### HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, late last Friday night, and early the following morning tragedy struck the Texas Panhandle. Two separate killer storms, accompanied by a large number of tornadoes, rampaged almost 20 miles across the Panhandle. Almost two parallel tracks of carnage and destruction were left in their wake. Over 20 fatalities have been reported and property damage runs into the millions of dollars.

To the credit of our society, appropriate public, private, local, State, and Federal assistance immediately went into action in an effort to help our ravaged area. Unfortunately, the recovery process will take some time, and in certain cases the utter tragedy is such that complete recovery will never be attained.

It is within this context that I heartily commend President Nixon on his sending a message on disaster relief to Congress yesterday. Given the extent of the Texas catastrophe, it could not have been issued at more appropriate a time.

In his message, the President put into words the spirit underlying disaster assistance efforts. He said:

> The spirit of neighborliness, the readiness to extend a helping hand in time of trouble, is one of the great traditions of this country. In the early years of our history, good neighbors were essential in coping with the hardships of pioneer life. They are equally essential in meeting the challenge of life today.

It was not until I read the message that I realized that the last Presidential special message on disaster relief was written 18 years ago. This is another indication of President Nixon's deep concern about the public welfare and his great desire to make Federal institutions and instrumentalities more responsible to the needs of all Americans.

As part of his message, the President has proposed that Congress extend and improve the assistance which the Federal Government can provide in time of major disasters. The tragedies occasioned by the Texas tornados last weekend, the recent Alaskan earthquake, and Hurricane Camille, are stark reminders of the crying needs people face in the time of natural catastrophe.

His proposal, the Disaster Assistance Act of 1970, is wide in scope and particular in focus. It runs the gamut from disaster prevention to economic development assistance. Its basic concern is, however, with swiftly and effectively bringing appropriate Federal resources to bear on individual and community problems in disaster or potential disaster areas.

I urge my colleagues in the name of simple humanity to study carefully the President's proposals and to, in a nonpartisan spirit, update and improve our Federal disaster assistance laws.

## GUIDE—ANTIDRUG PROGRAM

### HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend WRC–TV for using its editorial programing to alert metropolitan area residents to GUIDE—a volunteer effort to aid the juvenile drug offender.

I am pleased that this program was initiated in my home county, Prince Georges County, and that it has enjoyed a certain measure of success for a fledgling organization.

GUIDE—or Guidance, Understanding, and Information for Drug Evaluation—utilizes the volunteer services of physicians and psychologists from area institutions, including the National Institutes of Health, Catholic University, National Naval Medical Center, and Walter Reed Army Hospital. The program provides drug education and rehabilitation for youths charged with drug abuse by the Juvenile Court of Prince Georges County. The process is short termed, lasting only 4 months. It is noteworthy, though, that of the first 118 cases processed since establishment of the program in late 1968, only three participants are known to have reverted to drug use.

More significant, however, is the approach used by this team of volunteer experts. Their program is based on the premise that drug abuse is a symptom of the youth having difficulty and, concomitantly, viewing the youth within the family social unit, drug abuse becomes a symptom of a family having difficulties.

The focus of the program, therefore, is on the general spectrum of adolescent problems, with drug abuse given a position of priority. Relationships to authority and parents, education, selection of occupation, and sex are all areas of vital concern to the adolescent and, often, they become too large for the emotionally immature youth to cope with. Drug abuse appears to offer a way out of the difficulty.

Judging by their early successes, the GUIDE approach of strengthening the total attitudes and behavior of the adolescent drug abuser is one that is well worth studying and repeating in other communities plagued by drug traffic among the young.

Mr. Speaker, I include the WRC editorial calling attention to this program at this point in the RECORD:

GUIDE ANTIDRUG PROGRAM

There is a great deal of anguish in the Washington area over the drug problem—many people are doing something about it. One program in Prince Georges County apparently has been quite successful.

It is called GUIDE which means Guidance, Understanding, Information in Drug Evaluation. It is simple in concept and follow through. Narcotics cases are referred to GUIDE by Prince Georges' juvenile court or a youngster or a parent may call a hot-line number and ask for help. The problem is discussed and a personal interview arranged. Following the interview the parents and the youngster attend a series of seminars—adults in one group—children in another.

The parents are encouraged to face the problem and the underlying reasons for it. The adolescents are assisted in making a reasonable decision on their drug use.

Dr. Richard Wunderlich, assistant chairman of the psychology department at Catholic University and now directing the GUIDE program says it is a partial solution to one phase of the drug problem.

What is needed, in addition, is money for more psychiatric care in the community—mental health clinics—a street program and the halfway house concept for the drug program.

As for the GUIDE program—of the first 118 cases processed and these are the only figures available so far—only three youngsters are known to have reverted to drug use.

Perhaps the most encouraging aspect of this program is that it will begin shortly in the District and then in Montgomery County.

An extended GUIDE will be another weapon in the fight against drug abuse in the entire Washington area.

## BACKUP POWER FOR APOLLO 13

### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the people of the United States and the world followed minute-by-minute development of events in the flight of Apollo 13 a significant article by Mr. Eric Burgess appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on Wednesday, April 15, 1970. Mr. Burgess describes well the problems of Apollo 13 and the options available in this complex manned space flight system. It is well to remember that tremendous effort has been put into providing for contingencies in the Apollo program. This article does much to point out the worth of the work done in these areas by the Apollo-NASA-industry-university team.

The article follows:

BACKUP POWER FOR APOLLO 13

(By Eric Burgess)

MANNED SPACE CENTER, HOUSTON.—Apollo is the most reliable machine made by man. But no one yet has found out how to make a machine 100 percent reliable; there's always the slight chance that some parts may fail.

And such a failure could end in disaster for a space mission many thousands of miles away from earth. So in systems design, engineers rely on redundancy and rescheduling to help out reliability.

Redundancy and rescheduling are, at this writing, working to save Apollo 13.

The unexpected catastrophe in the service module—the part of Apollo that supplies oxygen, electric power, and the needed rocket power for a large part of the flight through space—is serious. But it could have caused greater problems if it had occurred elsewhere in the flight—on the return journey for example. As the various stages of the mission are completed, the redundancy available to the astronauts is reduced.

Failure of the electric power in the service module prevented use of the module's big propulsion engine. It is like a car with a dead battery.

And although the astronauts do not have the equivalent of a spare battery they do have a small tow truck, the lunar module. In fact, they have two of these trucks—each with its own engine. One is the lunar descent stage, the other the lunar ascent stage.

This redundancy of having these engines available gave the astronauts two chances of swinging into an earth-return orbit from the hybrid orbit that would have spun them around the moon deep into interplanetary space.

TWO ENGINES AVAILABLE

If the lunar descent module engine failed to burn—a most unlikely event—there would still be a possibility of jettisoning the descent stage and using the ascent engine for the relatively small change in velocity needed to achieve earth return.

And if a greater velocity change were needed it might be feasible to jettison the service module itself, so that the small ascent engine would have less to push. This maneuver has never before been tried but appears technically feasible.

And rescheduling plays a great part. Most space missions have mission plans and optional plans. Tested out in advance by computer simulation are all manner of answers to all kinds of problems. These determine what must be done, and when, to correct specific failure that may endanger a mission. And these planned detours take in both major and minor eventualities.

COMPUTERS TEST CHOICES

So with the aid of computers the man at Mission Control can quickly reschedule the mission for a planned detour. This was done with Apollo 13 as soon as the astronauts, working with Mission Control, had clearly identified the effects of the failure in the service module.

Once the space vehicle is placed on a return orbit, the alternative plans for survival can be completed. Again redundancy and rescheduling become important.

There is no oxygen from the main supply in the service module. So instead the astronauts used the oxygen from the lunar module—the oxygen that they would have used on the moon. And if this should begin to run short because of some other failure, they might still use oxygen from the backpacks of their spacesuits.

The electric power needed to run the complicated equipment of the spacecraft and to maintain communications with earth is also supplied by batteries that would have been used on the moon.

EQUIPMENT USE CUT

So with power supplies limited, Mission Control told the astronauts to reschedule activities to conserve this precious power. They switched off unessential equipment. They switched off transmitters and receivers during the few minutes when Apollo transferred from one ground station to the other as the earth rotates on its axis. Every little bit helps.

Since the service module also supplied power for temperature control, the whole spacecraft was put into a slow rational altitude to control temperatures. This is the so-called "barbecue mode" that turns the Apollo around like meat on a spit to equalize the effect of the sun's radiation.

In Apollo 13 we saw a major example of how redundancy comes into play when even the highest reliability can sometimes fail. But in nearly all space missions, redundancy has played some part in saving the mission, even when no men have been involved. In some satellites complete systems are duplicated and can be switched into command from the ground.

Since redundancy always means extra weight, there has to be a compromise: Not every system can be duplicated in a large manned space system such as Apollo.

That is where rescheduling is used to achieve redundancy by switching subsystems intended for one purpose to serve another purpose.

This calls for very careful design and intricate systems analysis. But this extra care prevented the Monday night power failure from turning into an immediate disaster.

## ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS

### HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, people throughout the Nation this week have been demonstrating their concern for the environment by way of symposiums, conferences, and teach-in's.

Thus far, these demonstrations have been peaceful, positive, and constructive and I believe our young people, especially, should be commended for focusing national attention on this very serious problem affecting all Americans.

In my own congressional district, several of our educational institutions have planned and conducted very comprehensive and well thought out programs to make everyone more aware of the nature of the environmental problems facing us and the sense of urgency that now exists to clean up our air, land, and water.

I am including in the RECORD today, a copy of the remarks I prepared for delivery during National Environmental Awareness Week:

As a member of the House Public Works Committee, I am constantly exposed to and have become deeply involved in the wide spectrum of congressional activities dealing with water quality control. This, by the way, is the key committee in the House of Representatives responsible for water pollution abatement legislation. It was this committee that gave our Nation its first "Water Quality Control Act" back in 1965 and also the committee that will soon be considering the President's recommended water pollution abatement program that he has advanced to the Congress.

As a native-born Humboldter who grew up on the north coast and lived my entire life there, I have had first-hand experience in problems dealing with water quality control, erosion, and also what rampaging floods can actually do to the ecology of our river basins and delta areas.

In addition, as a member of the House Interior Committee, we have the key authorizing function in the Congress for legislation dealing with our public land, national parks, seashores, and recreational areas throughout the Nation.

As such, our committee had the responsibility for the enactment and development of the Redwood National Park and completion of the Point Reyes National Seashore in the southern part of our district. Authorization of a redwood research headquarters at Humboldt State College and a Marine Oceanographic Laboratory in Marin County, are other areas of resource management that we have been involved in. I have bills pending in the Congress to designate the Kings Range Region in Humboldt and Medocino Counties as a "national conservation area" and the Fort Point facility as a national monument.

This year, I have introduced what I call an "environmental legislative package" dealing with extensions of the land and water conservation fund and the Clean Air Act, turning federally held lands back to the States for park and recreational use, and a proposal whereby we can make use of our space-age technology to determine ways and means of reclaiming and recycling solid wastes for profitable economic use.

Beyond that, however, and more in keeping with the theme of your symposium this week, let me say forthrightly that I welcome and support your active interest and this open demonstration of concern for the protection of America's environment. In January of this year, which marked the dawning of a new and challenging decade, I said on the floor of the House of Representatives that the 1970's should be proclaimed "the environmental quality decade". Admittedly, that's thinking big but it is the kind of thinking, I submit, that must emerge from this national debate on the environment if we are ever going to solve the problems of dirty water, foul air, and the littered land.

Time does not permit a fair or comprehensive analysis of all the legislation that has been enacted over the past 10 years dealing with the environment or that which is now pending in the Congress. Some of the more significant statutes now on the books, however, include:

1. The Water Quality Control Act of 1965.
2. The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965.
3. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1970.
4. The Clean Air Act of 1968.
5. The Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1969.
6. The Water Quality Improvement Act of 1970.
7. The Environmental Quality Act of 1969.
8. Establishment of a Federal Water Quality Control Administration.
9. Establishment of a Commission on Population Growth and the Future.

In the 15 months that the present administration has been in office, some very positive and constructive actions and legislative proposals have emerged. In his State of the Union Message, President Nixon forthrightly committed this Nation to the most comprehensive program to provide clean air, clean water, and open spaces in the Nation's history.

Translating words into action, the President has sent 23 major legislative proposals dealing with the environment to Capitol Hill and initiated 14 new measures through administrative action or executive order dealing with pollution abatement, solid waste management, parklands and recreational areas, and improved governmental organization in these fields. Included in the measures advanced by the President are:

1. Appointment of a cabinet-level committee on the environment.
2. Creation of a Federal council on environmental quality.
3. Executive order curtaining pollution by Federal installations.
4. Agreement between Department of Transportation, FAA, and 31 scheduled and charter airlines to immediately reduce air pollution caused by jetliners.
5. Order of new and more stringent motor vehicle standards for exhaust emission and studies undertaken to modify or replace standard gasoline engines in automobiles.
6. Taken initiative to clean up rivers and lakes with House passage of President's bill to clean up the Great Lakes.
7. Establishment of new and more stringent penalties for off-shore oil spillages and dumping.

The real key to all of these initiatives, programs, and legislative actions, of course, is money. The Congress and the President has increased Federal expenditures for water pollution to $800 million for fiscal year 1970. President Nixon increased budget expenditures for air pollution control by 31% over 1969 and by 22% for recreational purposes. This, then, in effect is putting "your money where your mouth is", and this is just the first year of acceleration in behalf of the environment.

Basically, the main impetus at the Federal level is three-fold. I would catagorize these as:

1. Enforcement of existing penalties fixed by law and enactment of new and more stringent penalties for pollution violators.
2. Accelerated research and technological advancement in the entire question of pollution abatement and the effort to clean up our water, air and land.
3. New program incentives and new equipment that are both essential for an effective, continuing "clean-up program" in this country.

All of this, as you know, represents a beginning. And to begin, the President has outlined a program that will cost roughly $10 billion. Other estimates by experts and professionals in the field say actual costs will probably range somewhere between $20 to $50 billion from the Federal Government alone. If this is the case, then we in the Congress will have to begin thinking in terms of an "environmental quality control fund", similar to our existing highway trust fund, that will provide the monies needed for a continuing "clean-up program".

In addition, I firmly believe that research and technology in the area of solid waste disposal must be intensified because it is in this field that major breakthroughs must come to deal effectively with industrial waste and pollutants that are now being indiscriminately dumped into rivers, streams and lakes. Penalties alone are negative in their approach and, while absolutely necessary, they will never do the job that is required. Accelerated depreciation allowances could trigger more intensified research and construction of pollution abatement equipment. I have introduced legislation to accomplish this.

All of this, however, is not enough. Pollution problems are not just government's problems, or industry's problems; the problems of the environment are, in fact, "people problems"!

If you look at where pollution is, by far the worst, look to where people congregate the most. Look to the big cities where more than 73% of our total population is living on less than 2% of the land in this country. Look to the big cities where industry is overconcentrated and you will find the smog problem. Look to the big cities and you will find the dirtiest water, the most foul air, and the most littered land.

Preserving our environment, in the final analysis, must include a dispersal of people, a clean up of our cities, a decentralization of government and industry, and a revitalization and diversification of Rural America if we ever hope to ease the pressure in big cities and, at the same time, deal directly with the heart of our nation's pollution problems.

As you are well aware, there is an inherent tendency for people to look to legislation as a "cure-all" or panacea for all our ills. History has taught us, however, that, without the active support and direct involvement of all our people, legislation, alone, has never been an effective or meaningful instrument for problem-solving. We have laws on the books now and we will have more, we have funds appropriated now and we will have more, we have programs now to fight pollution and we will have more. But, what we need most is direct action by concerned citizens throughout America.

In closing, I submit to you, that the most effective and immediate results of a positive nature that have been achieved to date in the fight against pollution, have been attained by citizen-volunteers (including thousands of students like yourself) who have rolled up their sleeves and gone out and cleaned up our littered roadways, beaches, and auto junk yards.

And, herein, lies the real key. It's very easy to say *"they* aren't doing enough to preserve the environment"! But the fact is that "they" don't cause pollution—we do! What's important, in my judgment, is that these symposiums, conferences, and teach-in's serve as the impetus for people everywhere to get busy and translate their expressed concern for the environment into positive, immediate action—even if that means nothing more than going out and cleaning up your own backyard.

## PROPOSED RULE, HOUSE RESOLUTION 948, FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT BILL H.R. 17123

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, next week the House will consider the fiscal year 1971 military procurement authorization. This bill authorizes the appropriation of $20 billion.

I have submitted a proposed rule, House Resolution 948, to the Rules Committee which asks for 8 hours of debate. The Armed Services Committee is expected to ask for 3 hours.

In addition, the rule I propose contains four new provisions not commonly found in other rules.

First, the rule provides that one-third of the time must be yielded to those, majority members and minority members, opposed to the bill.

Second, debate may not be limited until at least two speakers have been heard on each side of an amendment.

Third, the names of those voting in teller votes will be reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Fourth, the motion to recommit must go to a member who has exhibited serious and substantial opposition to the bill.

This form of a rule will improve the quality of House consideration of this measure. I plan to appear before the Rules Committee in support of this rule and to urge its consideration. I introduce the text of the proposed rule into the RECORD at this point:

H. RES. 948

Providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17123) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1971 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes

*Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17123) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1971 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed eight hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. During general debate, the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services shall yield the floor to members of the majority party who are opposed to the bill a total time of not less than one hour and twenty minutes, and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services shall yield the floor to members of the minority party who are opposed to the bill for a total time of not less than one hour and twenty minutes.

After general debate, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. No motion shall be in order the effect of which would be to limit debate on any amendment to less than five minutes for each of two speakers in favor and each of two speakers in opposition. In each teller vote which is taken in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, the clerk shall record the names of the Members counted in favor of each amendment and the names of the Members counted in opposition to each amendment and include in the Congressional Record at the point where each teller vote is recorded the names of the Members voting on each side. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. The Speaker shall recognize for the purpose of offering a motion to recommit a Member who has exhibited serious and substantial opposition to the bill in the form in which it is then before the House.

## SLEEPING BEAR DUNES

### HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, one of the most urgent and compelling tasks confronting the Congress in this age of ecology is the job of preserving and developing parks and other recreational areas.

In the State of Michigan, along the shores of the lake which bears that name, lies Sleeping Bear Dunes. The Michigan delegation in the House stands united behind legislation to establish at this site the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore. This legislation, now pending before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, would be a significant move in the direction of making good on our national commitment to secure, protect, and make available for all the American people, the natural beauties of sites such as Sleeping Bear Dunes.

Under unanimous consent, I include at this point in the RECORD a resolution just passed by the Michigan United Conservation Clubs in favor of this legislation:

RESOLUTION, MICHIGAN UNITED CONSERVATION CLUBS

The following was approved at the April 11, 1970, meeting of the Board of Directors of Michigan United Conservation Clubs:

RESOLUTION RE SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE LEGISLATION

"Whereas, all Michigan Congressman in the House of Representatives have joined in sponsoring legislation to provide for establishment of the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore; and

"Whereas, the administration has indicated that money would be available for national recreation areas; and

"Whereas, MUCC has consistently supported the Sleeping Bear Dunes proposal:

"Therefore be it resolved that MUCC reaffirm its stand and request that Congress approve and provide the necessary funding for establishment of a Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in Michigan."

## TECHNOLOGICAL EDGE PERILED

### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in these days of cost consciousness, it is most important that we not lose sight of the vital importance of maintaining our research and development excellence. I am pleased to share with my House colleagues the following editorial from the San Diego Union which very effectively stresses the paramount necessity of avoiding a technological gap:

[From the San Diego Union, Apr. 5, 1970]

TECHNOLOGICAL EDGE PERILED—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT LAG

"Overall, the United States of America and the Soviet Union now have roughly the same number of full-time scientists and engineers engaged in research and development. However, if present trends persist, by the mid-1980s the Soviet Union will have a total force in these fields a third larger than ours."

These words from Dr. John S. Foster Jr., director of Defense Department research and engineering, are of grave importance to a nation accustomed to—and dependent on—global technological superiority. They are a warning that within a comparatively short time the United States may find it has lost that technological edge, and with it the basis for our security, not to speak of our prosperity.

Worse, it can well be an accelerating decline. Pure research, the abstract inquiry that often germinates into concrete and profitable results, is very much like great art, a product of leisure. A scientist pressed to come up with marketable mousetraps cannot afford to digress down byways where his genius might otherwise beckon—cannot chase the will-o'-the-wisp, even though by doing so he might find the path to a star.

Thus, as the technologic lead we now enjoy over the rest of the world narrows, the pressure for immediately profitable mousetraps will mount. There will be less time available for the pure research that may be a decade a generation, a century ahead of practical application. Ultimately, instead of leading U.S. technology could falter, stop, stagnate and die for want of adequate research.

Dr. Foster is, of course, primarily concerned with science in its connection with national defense. His department and other federal agencies sponsor much of the research conducted on university campuses and in private intellectual gatherings across the nation.

Government is involved in research because it is essential to our security and because it has become hugely expensive. Dr. Robert

Goddard launched mankind into space with a few dollars' worth of tubing and chemicals in a Massachusetts meadow, but today's quantum leaps in technology happens in the void between subatomic particles.

Sir Isaac Newton may have formulated the Law of Gravity around the fall of an apple, but it will be repealed someday by an unknown researcher working with a multimillion-dollar machine.

Despite its vast cost, however, research is too important to the national welfare to allow it to become solely a government province, wholly dependent on public grants, subject to partisan changes of wind. Private industry has a vested interest in new products. If a technological gap truly develops between this nation and its aggressive competitors, purely for lack of public support and private investment, private industry will be the first, obviously, to go over its edge. Our security will not be far behind.

## WOMEN'S RIGHTS

### HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post this morning carried a lengthy story describing the findings and recommendations of the President's Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities.

Although the task force report has not yet been officially released by the White House, the Post story, by Elizabeth Shelton, indicates that the task force dealt comprehensively with the broad range of discriminations, both legal and extralegal, which continue to deny to women their right to full equality and opportunity.

Judging from the Post report, the task force recommendations were forthright without being extremist and reasonable without being weak or evasive. The task force appears to have focused on real and serious problems and recommended effective action to correct them.

This report, Mr. Speaker, is of particular interest to me and to my three Republican women colleagues, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MAY), the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. REID), and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER), for we have jointly been seeking to stimulate action on problems of discrimination against women throughout the life of the present administration.

Last July, for example, we met with President Nixon for a lengthy discussion of these problems and left with him a detailed memorandum identifying areas of discrimination and recommending specific proposals for legislative and executive action.

The appointment by the President of the Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities in September was one of the first, and most welcome, fruits of our efforts.

It is especially gratifying, therefore, that the Post story indicates that the task force study and report have confirmed our findings and endorsed our recommendations to an extensive degree.

What is called for now is concrete action on these recommendations. In this respect, I am hopeful that the President will, as soon as possible, release the full text of the task force report—and add his own personal blessing. For I am convinced the President understands the problems faced by American women and is committed to do what is necessary to resolve them.

As the task force chairman, Virginia R. Allan, stressed to the President in her letter transmitting the report—again, as quoted by the Post—failure to act effectively will increase the twin dangers of "accelerating militancy" and "the kind of deadening apathy that stills progress and inhibits creativity."

The article follows:

WOMEN'S RIGHTS RECOMMENDATIONS

(By Elizabeth Shelton)

Establishment of a White House office on women's rights, under a woman director, is the primary recommendation of a task force report prepared in secrecy for the President and kept under wraps for four months.

The report of the Presidential Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities also calls for a White House conference this year on women's rights and responsibilities. "Coupled with corrective legislation, it would be a deterrent to the radical liberation movements preaching revolution," the report states.

Not yet released officially, the report equated the struggle for equality for women with the still raging battle by black Americans for social justice.

For several months, the White House has been promising that the report would be released "soon." Members of the task force, which includes both men and women, have in the interim said they were "honor bound" not to reveal its contents.

Elly Peterson, assistant chairman of the Republican National Committee, said yesterday she was advised by the office of Dr. Charles Clapp at the White House that the report is now at the Government Printing Office and that "it definitely will be released soon."

The cover letter to the President, signed by Chairman Virginia R. Allan, Wyandotte, Mich., drug chain executive, stressed both the "danger of accelerating militancy" and "the kind of deadening apathy that stills progress and inhibits creativity."

The conference call was timed to coincide with the 50th anniversary of women's suffrage and the 50th birthday of the Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor.

President Nixon has disappointed women's organizations, conservative and liberal, by not sending a women's rights message to Congress. The report of the task force asks him to send such a message, citing in it "widespread discriminations" against women, proposing remedial legislation, asserting federal leadership, recommending implementation by the states and calling on the private sector to follow suit."

Support of the proposed Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution, which has been before every Congress since 1923, led the legislation listed as required to give women full legal equality.

This would impose obligatory military service on women but "not . . . in functions for which they are not fitted." It would permit women to be bartenders and men to be recipients of alimony. More importantly, it would remove discrimination against women in marriage and property laws, state labor laws which, under the guise of "protection," bar women from earning equal pay, jury duty laws and prison sentences.

In some states, women are required to serve longer terms for the same kinds of crimes, under the belief that it takes longer to rehabilitate a woman prisoner.

Among amendments proposed to existing laws are ones which would:

Give enforcement powers to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to remove from women the burden of going into court to prove discrimination in hiring, firing, leave and pension practices.

Authorize the attorney general to assist girls and women to equal access to education. This also calls for a survey by the Office of Education of the extent of discrimination in education because of sex. A new women's unit would be established in the Office of Education to lead efforts to end discrimination.

Provide Social Security benefits to the husbands and widowers of disabled and deceased women workers. In recognition of "a new pattern of family economic interdependence," this proposal also would provide better retirement benefits for families in which the wife, as well as the husband, works.

The report strongly calls for a national system of well-run child care centers, available to all pre-school children, and after-school activities for school-age children at all economic levels who need them. It also proposes income tax deductions as a "business expense" for care of children

Stating that "sex bias takes a greater economic toll than racial bias," the report asks the President to be as seriously concerned with sex discrimination as with racial discrimination.

It cites unrest among welfare mothers and the radical women's groups mushrooming on college campuses. Among the suggested remedies were implementation of the 1968 Executive order forbidding sex discrimination by federal contractors and expansion of manpower training programs in household employment.

The task force recommended predictably that the President appoint more women to top positions of responsibility throughout government.

This has been a sore spot with women's organizations which have been collecting a "talent bank" of potential applicants for high office. They had hoped for the appointment of a woman to the Cabinet or Supreme Court.

The task force also asked federal funding for the states' Status of Women Commissions, some of which operate without money even for postage.

Problems the task force recommended for early consideration by the proposed Director of the Office of Women's Rights and Responsibilities included abortion laws, methods of changing attitudes on sex roles, maternity leave and unemployment insurance.

One of its suggestions for implementation would require the government to collect, tabulate and publish all economic and social data by sex as well as race.

## OPERATION MATCH

### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, there is an organization in the Third Congressional District of New York, which I am pleased to represent in Congress, which has made its mark as an innovator in computer work. This organization called Operation Match has become the leader in a specialized social field. It is devoted to bringing together young people.

Originated by two clever young men, this organization has become most impressive providing leadership in this field and a number of jobs for people in the community.

## SUPREME COURT JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

### HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, because of the extensive controversy surrounding the possibility of some sort of legislative action in regard to Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, and because press reports regarding my position in relation thereto were not complete, I am making this statement so that my position is clear in detail.

Justice Douglas has been charged with improper conduct as a member of the Supreme Court because of his relations with a foundation with shady connections, because of his participating as a member of the Court in decisions involving a man with whom he may have had financial dealings, and with conduct otherwise considered improper for a Justice, including inflammatory writings.

Two possible approaches to the problem have been suggested.

First, is impeachment proceedings. This is provided for in the Constitution. A bill of impeachment is introduced, full hearings are held, and the House then considers, debates, and votes on the bill of impeachment. It is in the nature of an indictment. If the bill of impeachment is passed by the House, it is the constitutional duty of the Senate to "try" the Justice, and find him guilty or not guilty. This is the proper and constitutional method, and the proper function of the House of Representatives.

The other suggested approach has been sponsored by over 100 Members of the House, equally divided politically. It would create a special committee "to investigate" the conduct of the judge.

This procedure is not authorized in the Constitution and is therefore extraconstitutional, and I believe may well be completely illegal and a nullity. Besides, the recommendations of the committee would have no force or effect of any kind. I have not joined in this second approach because of my strong belief that it is an improper procedure.

However, I plainly believe that the charges made against Justice Douglas are of sufficiently serious nature that full hearings on the bill of impeachment should be held immediately. The ends of justice demand it. Even Justice Douglas should welcome it. The Judiciary Committee of the House should hear all of the evidence, pro and con, and the full House should have an opportunity to vote on the question of whether the Justice should be impeached. The charges are serious and certainly constitute conduct, if true, much more gross than any of the complaints against either of the last two rejected Supreme Court nominees. I do not believe there should be two different standards of conduct, one for nominees and one for sitting members of the Court.

If these charges are substantiated by the evidence, then I would have no hesitation in discharging my own constitutional duties as a Member of the House of Representatives in voting to impeach Justice Douglas. But I would want to carefully study the evidence before reaching any conclusions, and not hastily react on such a serious matter to fragmentary, unsworn press reports.

## LOS ANGELES COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ENDORSES FREEDOM FOR THE BALTIC STATES

### HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives a resolution passed recently on a unanimous vote of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors enthusiastically endorsing the cause of freedom for the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

The Baltic States' Freedom resolution follows:

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES: LITHUANIAN STATE 719TH ANNIVERSARY

Whereas, this year marks the 719th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state when Mindaugas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251 and the 52nd anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918 commemorated by Americans of Lithuanian origin or descent and their friends in all parts of our great Nation; and

Whereas, the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia by legal or democratic process; and

Whereas, the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia by force of arms; and

Whereas, the Government of the United States maintains diplomatic relations with the governments of the free Baltic republics of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced incorporation into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas, the committee of the House of Representatives, created by H. Res. 346 of the Eighty-third Congress to investigate the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, found that the incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia was contrary to established principles of international law; and

Whereas, the House of Representatives and the United States Senate (of the 89th Congress) unanimously passed House Concurrent Resolution 416 urging the President of the United States to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples:

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles respectfully urges the President of the United States to bring the question of liberation of the Baltic States before the United Nations and ask that body to request the Soviet Union withdraw all of its troops and release its control of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and return to their homes all Baltic exiles and deportees from prison camps in the Soviet Union; and

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Secretary of State William P. Rogers, and United States Ambassador to the United Nations Charles W. Yost.

ERNEST E. DEBS,
*Chairman of the Board and Supervisor, 3d District.*

FRANK G. BONELLI,
*Supervisor 1st District.*

KENNETH HAHN,
*Supervisor 2d District.*

BURTON W. CHACE,
*Supervisor 4th District.*

WARREN M. DORN,
*Supervisor 5th District.*

## PRESIDENT'S PANEL ON NONPUBLIC EDUCATION

### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to learn today that the President has appointed a Panel on Nonpublic Education as part of the President's Commission on School Finance.

I was even more pleased to learn that President Nixon has selected to this panel the Most Reverend William E. McManus, bishop of Chicago, who is pastor of one of the largest parishes in my congressional district. Bishop McManus is one of the most knowledgeable and highly respected educators in America. For many years he served as superintendent of schools for the Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago, the largest parochial school system in the Nation.

Bishop McManus has made a lifetime study of America's educational institutions and is one of this Nation's best informed authorities on the role that private schools play in our pluralistic educational system.

President Nixon has made a tremendously wise selection in appointing Bishop McManus to this Panel, and the President has also made a wise decision in recognizing that it would not be good for either the country or its schools if either public or private school systems had a monopoly over the education of the Nation's children.

The strength of the educational system in this country lies in its pluralism. There are more than 6 million youngsters who are now attending parochial schools throughout the Nation, and it would cost in excess of $4 billion a year in operating costs and an estimated $5 billion more for facilities, if the parochial schools were forced to close and transfer their student body to the public school system.

We know that many States in the Union are now searching for ways to assist these parochial systems, and we also know that many of these schools are faced with great financial crises.

It is for this reason that I am particularly grateful that the President has recognized the need for assistance for the schools, and I am looking forward to the recommendations of the Commission as to how we can help parochial schools within constitutional means.

Other members of the President's Panel are Dr. Clarence Walton, president of Catholic University; William G. Saltonstall of Marion, Mass., former principal of Phillips Exeter Academy, and Ivan E. Zylstra of Grand Rapids, Mich., an official of the National Union of Christian Schools.

## EUROPE CAUGHT UP IN APOLLO DRAMA

### HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the world joined in our prayers for the safe return of the Apollo 13 astronauts. But since Friday, many Europeans have questioned why the United States, after having successfully landed men on the moon, continues to risk the lives of more astronauts in the Apollo program while much of the sought after scientific data can be obtained through automated spacecraft at approximately one-fifth the dollar cost.

For the interest of our colleagues, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a column in last week's Washington Star reporting on this worldwide questioning, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Apr. 16, 1970]

MANY QUESTION RISK—EUROPE CAUGHT UP IN APOLLO DRAMA

(By Andrew Borowiec)

GENEVA.—Dramatic headlines, radio and television bulletins and an avalanche of technical details have jolted Europe from its indifference toward manned space flights.

From Bucharest to Paris and from Scandinavia to Italy, the drama of the Apollo 13 flight dominates the front pages and punctuates the radio shows.

A color picture of the three American astronauts stared from the front page of Milan's Il Giono. In Paris, Le Figaro covered the story from every possible angle on three pages, and the East European Communist press carried lengthy factual accounts.

But while sympathy and concern for the lives of the Apollo astronauts was genuine, the average European could not help wondering why this risk was being taken.

WHY RISK MORE LIVES?

"They reached the moon last July, they beat the Russians, they know there is nothing there. Why risk more lives?" was a typical European comment.

The respected London Times summed up this attitude in more articulate terms.

"There is now a case for asking whether the space shuttle is the best way forward," The Times said in an editorial. "There is, after all, no shortage of useful work to be done in the development of usable but automatic satellites, the exploration of the solar system and the deliberate familiarization of people with the hazards and the rewards of traveling in space.

"Less haste may yet mean more speed," The Times concluded. "That is something to think in the grueling hours ahead."

COURAGE PRAISED

Europeans of various nationalities questioned at random in this international center agreed with this view. While praising the courage of the three men in the spaceship, while showing respect and even awe for America's space accomplishments, they appeared critical of America's desire to continue what they consider risky trips to the moon.

Not untypical were remarks saying "There is so much to be done on earth."

The Apollo 13 drama struck when Europe had become accustomed to successful space flights, whether American or Soviet. The U.S. landing on the moon in July was a major event and the whole of Europe cheered, genuinely, enthusiastically.

But the launching of Apollo 13 was not regarded in Europe as a historic event. It was, Europeans said, another "space adventure of those optimistic Americans."

## THE SENTIMENTS OF EARTH DAY

### HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, this most appropriate message for Earth Day was written by my staff assistant, Bette Ackerman. The poem aptly expresses my sentiments about this crucial problem we all must face, and I take this opportunity to call its attention to my colleagues. It is my fervent hope that the significance of these lines and of Earth Day can inspire a meaningful solution to the problem of pollution.

The poem follows:

THINK SPRING, BUT DO NOT DEARTH THE EARTH

Tiny-fisted buds unclench into bloom,
And they shout to the world, "It's Spring,
It's Spring!"
Fragile pink petals alight on young branches
To fly at first puff of a warm April's wind.

Even staid bankers escape from their figures
To catch a few moments of healthful inhaling . . .
They are different people, away from caged desks—
(That is, weather and outlook prevailing!)

As we all glory at the rebirth before us,
Muse, for a moment, upon the Earth . . .
The Base of this beauty, foundation of life,
The cradle for mankind . . . And now,
Scene of strife.

It isn't man's wars that are causing the battle;
It's his towering waste of earth's gift of nature,
He uses, abuses, and rapes virgin forests,
Clouding our streams with black blood of the kill.
His refuse pollutes both the seas and the air . . .
Does he dare to assess the cost of the loss?
Can he care?

We say yes!

Savor days for their beauty, and think of a plan
To help free our earth from the garbage of man . . .
For, if not, it is said (not a whimper of doubt)
We won't even be here to think about.

## FLORIDA CITIZEN GROUP FIGHTS CANCER

### HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in Florida a remarkable citizens group is forming to assist in the fight against cancer. Dr. Malcolm L. Henley, D.D.S., of Orlando, whose daughter was recently stricken with leukemia, has been active in forming a voluntary organization called the Concerned Citizens for the Cause and Cure of Cancer.

This group is now linking up with other similar local groups throughout the Nation to press for increased involvement of volunteers as well as increased congressional appropriations for cancer research.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Health of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I am very concerned with the problem of cancer. The statistics included in the attached open letter by Dr. Henley to concerned citizens reinforce my concern. Consequently, so that my colleagues will know of this remarkable citizens effort, and of the seriousness of the problem, I insert at this point in the RECORD that open letter:

I am writing you today not to ask for a contribution, but to ask for your support not just to restore, but rather to increase funds for Cancer Research. The cutback in funds from health appropriations is horribly shortsighted and will be disastrous for countless thousands.

A distinguished panel of the National Academy of Sciences and the President's Scientific Advisory Committee said, in order to maintain the effectiveness of programs such as those at the National Institute of Health, the level of support should be increased 15% each year. This means 244 million dollars are needed for research in 1971.

In the 1971 Budget, President Nixon has requested 202 million dollars for cancer research. This is 42 million dollars short of the amount needed to maintain an effective level of research into the cause and cure of cancer. Is it wise to save 42 million dollars while spending 330,000 lives? The hopes of millions of Americans are being shattered by this apparent reckless approach to budget cutting.

Supposedly, this action was taken because expenditures in this field were inflationary. I do not believe that a decrease in any service that comprises less than 0.1% of this great country's gross national product (893 billion dollars) could have any serious effect on inflation. I do believe, however, that the slashing of the Health Budget from 1.93 billion dollars down to 1.54 billion dollars represents more than a savings or a deterrent to inflation . . . it represents something that can only be described as a catastrophe to the health and happiness of millions of Americans.

The savings in dollars is a price some of us can ill afford to pay. The ultimate cost of this "saving" must be counted in the number of lives that *could* have been spared.

Surely a country that can put a man on the moon in ten years can put an end to this unmerciful killer in like time or better if properly funded and administered, and at one-tenth the expenditure. What better form of foreign aid can we give the world than a cure for this murder of men, women and children?

Our plan here in Central Florida is to first create enough local interest through

ads, articles in the news media, radio and TV, handouts by individuals, and last, but not least, via word of mouth. In other words, to educate as many people as possible.

Then we plan to take a group consisting of three women and three men with a spokesman of some standing to appear before a committee on health affairs. The Honorable Beth Johnson, one of our State Senators, is making the necessary arrangements to this end . . . or should I say *beginning!* . . . at the present time.

Enclosed you will find petitions signed by thousands of concerned citizens like myself (over 16,200 to date). Hopefully, this will serve to emphasize to you the importance of this cause. We feel sure you will support this most serious cause of increasing funds for the cancer research by signing the enclosed petition and/or by writing a personal card or letter to your congressman.

A cure must be found for cancer so the 625,000 people stricken this year can fulfill plans and dreams for all the tomorrows.

Sincerely yours,

MALCOLM L. HENLEY, D.D.S.

*Facts and figures*

| | Died |
|---|---|
| Auto accidents (1969) | 56,000 |
| Cancer (1969) | 323,000 |
| Polio (worst year), (1952) | 3,300 |
| Cancer (1969) | 323,000 |
| World War II: | |
| Deaths 1 year | 72,889 |
| Total 4 years | 291,557 |
| Cancer (1969) | 323,000 |
| Korean war: | |
| Deaths 1 year | 11,209 |
| Total 3 years | 33,629 |
| Cancer (1969) | 323,000 |
| Vietnam war: | |
| Deaths 1 year | 5,417 |
| Total 6 years | 32,503 |
| Cancer (1969) | 323,000 |

*The share of the national budget for 1970 to each American*

| | |
|---|---|
| National defense | $410.00 |
| Vietnam War | 125.00 |
| Space research | 19.50 |
| Foreign aid | 19.00 |
| National Institute of Health | 7.00 |
| Cancer research | .89 |

## QUEEN ISABELLA DAY

### HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the 519th birthday of Queen Isabella, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon, and certainly this is an occasion worthy of special commemoration.

By her recognition of the dreams and plans of Columbus, and her encouragement, she made possible the discovery of our continent, for which she deserves special tribute.

Thomas D'Alesandro III, the mayor of Baltimore, issued a proclamation for this purpose, calling upon individuals, schools and other concerned groups, to suitably observe the anniversary of her birth. I am including a copy of the proclamation in the RECORD:

PROCLAMATION

(By Mayor Thomas J. D'Alesandro III, designating April 22, 1970, as "Queen Isabella Day" in Baltimore)

Whereas, April 22, 1970, marks the 519th anniversary of the birth of Queen Isabella, dynamic Castillian queen, who through her faith and confidence in Christopher Columbus, gave the civilized world a new dimension; and

Whereas, Queen Isabella, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon, by her support of Columbus in his plans for exploration, earned for herself a unique place in this history of Western civilization; and

Whereas, in her own time, Isabella was a queen noted for her clean intellect, energy, virtue and patriotism; and

Whereas, the qualities of confidence in the future, spirit of adventure with a purpose and sacrifice in the cause of human progress exhibited by Queen Isabella are characteristics worthy of emulation in our twentieth century era of exploration.

Now, therefore, I, Thomas J. D'Alesandro III, Mayor of the City of Baltimore, do hereby proclaim April 22, 1970, "Queen Isabella Day" in Baltimore, and urge that all citizens, schools, historical and other interested organizations suitably observe this significant event in the history of the world.

THOMAS J. D'ALESANDRO III,
*Mayor.*

## DISCLOSURE OF DRAFT GAO REPORTS

### HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the invaluable assistance the General Accounting Office renders to Congress is vast and varied. It takes such forms as testimony before committees, reports to committee chairman on pending bills, temporary assignment of GAO staff members to the staffs of committees, and reports of audits in the Federal agencies.

Our Committee on Government Operations has the duty under the rules of the House to receive and examine reports of the Comptroller General and to make recommendations to the House in connection with the subject matter of the reports.

In fiscal year 1969, there were 1,023 audit reports covering almost every activity of Government. They comprise 177 reports to the Congress; 203 reports to committees, officers of the Congress, or individual Members; and 642 reports to agency officials.

It is GAO's practice to prepare drafts of its proposed reports in multiple copies to facilitate wide review and, as a rule, comment by affected agencies. These copies carry a clear notice that the report is a draft subject to revision and that its contents should not be released in any circumstance for purposes other than private review and comment.

Occasionally, however, the draft reports, or their contents, have been disclosed outside authorized circles. This has sometimes resulted in newspaper stories purporting to give the findings and conclusions of the Comptroller General, when in fact the report has not yet received his final approval and may be changed substantially before he does approve it.

Though such instances of unauthorized disclosure are not frequent, our committee feels that they should not be disregarded and that added attention should be given to the Comptroller General's desire and need to have the information in the draft reports safeguarded while still in tentative form.

We recently wrote to the Comptroller General expressing concern over this problem. I am pleased to state that he has responded by advising us of further steps he is taking to discourage premature disclosure of draft reports. In my opinion, these steps will be quite helpful.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Members of Congress will be interested to read Mr. Staats' letter, as well as our letter to which it responds. I am, therefore, inserting them at this point:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
*Washington, February 20, 1970.*

Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
*Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We share your concern over the premature disclosure of information contained in drafts of our proposed reports mentioned in your letter of February 5.

As you know, drafts of our reports are furnished to the Government agencies concerned, Government contractors, and other organizations involved in the activities being reported on. We also furnish copies to committees and Members of the Congress and to their staffs when they have a need for the information before our reports can be completed. We prefer, however, to provide finished products instead. In any event, we do make every effort to limit copies of draft reports to organizations or individuals concerned or having an official need for the report at that time.

While we keep careful records of the number of copies of drafts made available for advance review or use, it is usually not possible for us to determine the source of a premature disclosure or unauthorized use of our report drafts. Press accounts based on information taken from our report drafts, however, often indicate an awareness that the report is a draft, is unofficial, and is not available for unauthorized release. However, this knowledge has not prevented the contents from being published.

We do not think that the instances of premature disclosure are attributable to a lack of knowledge of the restricted nature of the information contained in the report. Nevertheless, we plan to have the restricted use notification on the cover of our report drafts printed in larger type and in a different color ink. Also, we will specifically call attention to this notification in transmitting copies of our report drafts.

We appreciate your interest and concern in this matter and we welcome the suggestions in your letter for further strengthening our procedures.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER B. STAATS,
*Comptroller General of the United States.*

FEBRUARY 5, 1970.

Hon. ELMER B. STAATS,
*Comptroller General, U.S. General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. STAATS: As the Committee of the House charged with the duty of considering budgeting and accounting measures and also the duty of receiving and examining your audit reports to the Congress, we are concerned, as you must be, with premature disclosure of information from drafts of your proposed reports.

Two recent apparent instances of such disclosure have come to our attention. One dealt with the Military Affiliate Radio System (MARS) in the Department of Defense. The other dealt with the endowment funds of the Smithsonian Institution. Copies of

press accounts referring to material in the draft reports are attached.

Those unfamiliar with GAO's operations may not realize that a draft report is an intermediate step. It is submitted to the agency concerned for comments, explanations, and refutations prior to being put into final form for transmission to the Congress. Frequently, the final report is able to indicate recent remedial action taken or planned by the agency. In most cases, of course, the final reports to the Congress become public documents available to everyone.

Title pages of your draft reports customarily carry the word "Draft" and a clear notice of use restriction:

"This document is a *draft* of a proposed report of the General Accounting Office. It is subject to revision, does not necessarily contain final conclusions, and is being made available solely to those having responsibilities concerning the subjects discussed for their review and comment to the General Accounting Office.

"Recipients of this draft must not show or release its contents for purposes other than private review and comment under any circumstances. At all times it must be safeguarded to prevent premature publication, or similar improper disclosure, of the statements or information contained therein."

This legend should be enough both to alert persons properly in possession of a copy to the need for safeguarding the information and to impress on them the importance of their responsibility to observe the restriction with care.

Yet breaches do occur; and it appears timely now to reemphasize the importance of safeguarding information in your draft reports. Your office may wish to consider some additional measures against improper disclosure. These might include revising the size, format, and wording of the above legend; stamping each page to identify it as part of a restricted draft; reiterating the substance of the above legend in letters transmitting copies of the draft report; additional instructions to your personnel to remind both themselves and outsiders that draft reports are tentative and restrictive; requiring draft reports to be numbered; and insuring that procedures for submittal and delivery of draft reports are fully understood and observed. In making these suggestions, we wish to stress that we have no reason whatever to believe that anyone associated with GAO was responsible for the above-mentioned disclosures.

We should be pleased to receive from you any comments you may wish to make concerning this matter.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
*Chairman.*

## MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

### HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,400 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

## THE WAR ECONOMY

### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the most tenacious and pernicious myths of the 20th century is that war is good for business. In recent testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Louis B. Lundborg, chairman of the board of Bank of America, refuted the myth in a detailed analysis of the effects of the Vietnam war on the U.S. economy. While the key points of Mr. Lundborg's statement were widely publicized by the press, I believe the public and my congressional colleagues may find the full statement instructive. For the benefit of those who have not read it, I am including it in the RECORD, along with comments by Harold Willens, national chairman of the Businessmen's Educational Fund. Mr. Willens' letter appeared in the Washington Post.

TESTIMONY BY LOUIS B. LUNDBORG

My name is Louis B. Lundborg. I am Chairman of the Board of Bank/America Corporation and of the Bank of America N.T. & S.A. I am pleased to respond to your request that I testify here today.

My testimony this morning will be on some of the economic aspects of the war in Vietnam. In preparing this testimony I have had the benefit of the best thinking of the staff of the bank's Economics Department, as well as that of many other officers of our bank on the economic impact of the war.

In this testimony I will confine my remarks to the economic impact of the war. While I have strongly-held personal feelings on other aspects of the war, I do not feel it is appropriate or proper to express these views as Chairman of the Board of Bank of America.

The thrust of my testimony will be that the war in Vietnam distorts the American economy. The war is a major contributor to inflation—our most crucial domestic economic problem. It draws off resources that could be put to work towards solving imperative problems facing this nation at home. And despite the protestations of the new left to the contrary, the fact is that an end to the war would be good, not bad, for American business.

There is, I think a pernicious, but widely-held belief that war generally has been an agent for economic growth, and therefore good for business. My plan this morning is to spend a few minutes discussing that belief and then to move on to the specifics of Vietnam where it is possible to speak, not only in general terms, but to back up our conclusions with specific economic statistics and indicators.

First, therefore, let's look at the general proposition that war has been an engine for rapid economic growth. While it is difficult, if not impossible, to prove conclusively that on balance war has not been an agent for rapid economic growth, there are a number of carefully reasoned investigations into this subject supporting the position that peace is far better for economic development. Although these careful analyses tend to reject the assumption that war is a boon to the economy, the public is generally unaware of this and continues to believe that war contributes positively to economic development. It is time to set this record straight. Mr. John U. Nef's book, *War and Human Progress*, systematically examines the interrelations of war and economic growth from 1494 down to 1950. His analysis indicates that the industrial revolutions of both the Elizabethan and Napoleonic periods were developed not in warring Europe, but in peaceful England; that the invention of gun powder and of many other weapons of war was a by-product, not of military need but of peaceful industry, and that, certainly, pure and possibly even applied science has flourished most in peace and least in war.

Dr. John J. Clark, Dean of the College of Business Administration at St. John's University in New York, in his book, *The New Economics of National Defense*, reviews the impact of war on economic development.

In summary, he states, "The preponderance of evidence supports the judgment that war, on balance, does not correlate positively with economic progress. Settlement by arms not only causes a great net waste of resources: it also retards industrial development and the division of labor."

Other authorities have shown (1) that rising expenditures for research and development may actually be reducing the rate of economic growth in the United States, and (2) that the process of transferring scientific and technological advances in space and military R and D is becoming increasingly difficult. To the extent that it can be shown that war in general is not good for economic progress, then it should be equally obvious that war is not good for business.

I could go on citing other expert testimony that war in general is not an engine of economic progress—but let me move on to the real issue—the war in Vietnam.

As you probably know, Mr. A. W. Clausen, the President of the Bank of America, specifically rejected the charge that we as an institution support and profit from the war in Vietnam. He further stated, "this bank has consistently pointed out that an end to the war in Vietnam would be good, not bad, for American business." I would like to elaborate on this point.

There have been reckless and often deliberately malicious charges that the U.S. business community has supported the Vietnam war in an effort to reap huge profits. Let's look at the record. In a very narrow sense, it is certainly true that individual firms which supply material and services to the military have made profits. In our market economy, the federal government purchases most of the goods and service it requires from private firms, and those firms must be profitable in order to survive. This is true whether the firm is contracted to build a highway, produce a postal delivery truck, construct a school, improve a slum or produce a military aircraft. But as Mr. Hudson B. Drake pointed out in the January-February 1970 *Harvard Business Review*, the Government has established elaborate procedures to assure that profits on government contracts are not excessive, and in general these procedures have been effective.

I recognize that it is statistically impossible with the data available to calculate what portion of various firms' profits are generated by demands for goods and services needed to prosecute the Vietnam War. In an effort to get some rough approximation of the profitability of corporations doing substantial business with the Government, I did some checking on the corporations receiving the largest amounts of funds from Government contracts. Actually, I took the list from a publication of a "peace group" who proclaimed these firms to be war profiteers. The top ten firms for which we had data had a pattern of profits after taxes per dollar of sales quite similar to the national average. This means that the firms did better

in the 1962–1965 period than in the post-escalation years. It is also interesting to note that except for 1962 the average profits after taxes per dollar of sales for the ten firms was below the comparable national average for all manufacturing industries of durable goods industries. When I checked the twenty-five largest firms their profit after taxes per dollar of sales figure was also below the national average.

I realize, as I said before, that these figures are inadequate to prove any case conclusively. They do, however, cast serious doubt on the extravagant claims we have heard about war profiteering.

We do have more than adequate data to demonstrate that the escalation of the war in Vietnam has seriously distorted the American economy, has inflamed inflationary pressures, has drained resources that are desperately needed to overcome serious domestic problems confronting our country, and has dampened the rate of growth in profits on both a *before* and *after* tax basis. In the middle of 1964 when the Vietnam escalation began, the economy was in quite good shape. We had at that time an uninterrupted economic advance of 52 months—a peacetime record—unemployment average 4½ percent, the consumer price index had increased only 1.2 percent during the first 6 months of 1965, and the average operating rate of industrial capacity was at 90 percent. There had been considerable success in maintaining Federal expenditures for goods and services below 11 percent of GNP from 1960 through mid-1965. In fact, the Government had even been able to change the composition of its spending by deliberately shifting emphasis from defense to non-defense spending.

The expenditures related to the Vietnam war, added to the near full employment economy that existed in mid-1965, generated severe inflationary pressures. Consumer prices began increasing rapidly as the federal deficit grew. While there is room for a wide range of opinion covering proper tax policies during this period, especially over the timing and magnitude of tax increases, and the proper role of monetary policy, the basic cause of the inflationary forces was a sharp increase in federal spending associated with the escalation of the conflict in Vietnam.

The inflation, the growth in inflationary psychology, and the very stringent anti-inflationary monetary policies have combined to produce serious distortions in the United States financial markets and resulting distortion in the economy. These distortions include the sharp drop in residential construction and the sharp growth in investment spending.

The facts clearly show that the Vietnam war has not been good for business profits. During the four years prior to the escalation of the conflict in Vietnam, corporate profits after taxes rose 71.0 percent. From 1966 through 1969 corporate profits after taxes rose only 9.2 percent.

To avoid any thought that the recent tax increase may have fudged the figures, I also have similar corporate profit figures on a before tax and inventory adjustment basis. These figures show corporate profits rose 51.3 percent from 1962 through 1965 but the gains in profits were dampened to a 16.6 percent increase during the post-escalation 1966–1969 period. It should be clear from these figures that what is good for the economy is good for business.

Most of the concern about the upward pressures on prices and costs originating in expenditures associated with the Vietnam war arise from recognition of the damaging effects of inflation on the domestic economy. This should not lead us to neglect the important impact on our position in international markets and the balance of payments. This is not to lay the blame for our balance of payments problems on the recent period of inflation or on the Vietnam war. Inflation and the war associated expenditures, however, have made the problem more intractable and solutions more difficult. These difficulties with our balance of payments have postponed indefinitely any relaxation of the restraints and controls under which international business has been forced to operate for the past several years in particular.

It is important, therefore, to comment briefly on what has happened to the U.S. balance of payments in the past few years, specifically with reference to the impact of the Vietnam war. Perhaps the first point that should be made is that the official measures of the balance of payments deficit have been misleading. The view, for example, that the balance of payments in 1968 was satisfactory because there was a surplus of $168 million and that the balance of payments in 1969 was very unsatisfactory because the deficit exceeded $7 billion is unacceptable. In fact, the greatest deterioration in the payments position in recent years occurred in 1968. The difference between the two years may be accounted for largely by massive flows of foreign funds in opposite directions which had very little to do with the basic balance of payments position.

The best measure of what happened to the long run position is the balance on current account, that is goods and services plus private remittances and payments of U.S. Government pensions. This balance declined from a surplus of $7.8 billion in 1964 to about $4 billion in 1967 and $1.4 billion in 1968 and less than $1 billion in 1969.

A good part of the progressive deterioration in this position over the years since 1964, the year before the major acceleration of the Vietnam war, may be accounted for by the large increase in foreign exchange outflows associated with military expenditures. These rose from less than $3 billion in 1964 to nearly $5 billion in 1969. This, however, is not the only measure of the impact of the war and the subsequent inflation on the balance of payments. The more important impact and the one which is likely to have the most long lasting effects is on our competitive position in international and domestic markets, reflected in the rapid rise in the rate of importing of goods and services. In 1964 merchandise exports exceeded merchandise imports by nearly $7 billion. By 1968 this excess of exports over imports had declined to less than half a billion dollars. With moderation in the rate of inflation and inflation induced expenditures our trade balance may be expected to improve this year and in subsequent years.

It is too early to tell, however, what permanent damage to our international competitive position the recent period of inflation has induced. It generally takes several years, perhaps four or five, before the full effects of excessive increases in price and costs show up in the competitive position and the effects are not confined to world markets where our products compete with that of other nations, but also in the United States where foreign products compete directly with U.S. products.

So much for balance of payments considerations. Let us return to the domestic scene.

I do not think there is any doubt that the resources used towards the Vietnam war effort could have been put to work towards solving imperative problems facing this nation at home. In the five-year period prior to the Vietnam escalation, defense spending in the United States averaged $50 billion per year. If we assume that this level would have been maintained over the most recent five-year period in the absence of escalation, the increase in actual spending totaled $118 billion. During the past four years, total spending for residential construction in the United States totaled only $112 billion.

When we survey the very real needs in our economy in the areas of housing, urban transit, environmental pollution, etc., it is clearly evident that we do not need to create war-related demand for resources in order to maintain full employment. Our problem now is one of establishing meaningful priorities to meet the quality of life demands of our citizenry. We obviously cannot do everything at once; we need to start strategic planning and action now if we hope to resolve these demands.

There is another point that at first blush might not appear to be an economic issue. But it is in real fact a very basic one: The war has divided, confused and bewildered Americans. Some Americans are strongly in favor of the continued prosecution of the war. Others are strongly opposed. But for many, the war and the issues surrounding the war are a source of confusion and bewilderment. As a result of this confusion and bewilderment, many people are losing trust in the institutions, public and private, through which we govern ourselves and run our economy. Such loss of trust is destructive of the cohesion necessary for an economy's ability to function at maximum effectiveness. To the degree banks, industrial firms, corporations, state and local governments, Federal Government agencies and universities are under attack or suspicion for their alleged part in the war in Vietnam, they lose some of their effectiveness as institutions that can provide for the common good. In the case of Vietnam it is my belief that the sum total of such loss of effectiveness is very great indeed and, while unmeasurable by any known economic indicator, this loss of effectiveness produces a very real drag on the economy.

Gentlemen, I deeply regret that the frustrations and misunderstandings arising from this conflict make it necessary to testify that overall war is not a stimulator of economic development nor is the war in Vietnam good for U.S. business. I find it repugnant, even if necessary to have to add that I would not support our role in the war in Vietnam even if it could somehow be made profitable for American firms.

The thought that war would be initiated or sustained for a single day because it might stimulate the economy should be abhorrent to any decent human being. And yet there are those who say that American business is helping to do just that.

We do know that aggressive war has been waged, all through history, to gain territory. Certainly that was war for economic gain.

But even that kind of war, that purpose for war, has been so outmoded by the experience of this century that I would like to be able to say to potential aggressors all over the world, "If you want to profit, if you want to own the world, don't dissipate your energies in wasteful warfare—follow the example of Japan and Germany since World War II and be economically aggressive."

War is, as we would say in business, a low yield operation.

I think from all this it is obvious that Vietnam is a negative influence on our economy. Let me conclude by restating my initial premise. The war in Vietnam distorts the American economy. It is a major contributor to inflation—our most crucial domestic economic problem. It draws off resources that could be put to work towards solving imperative problems facing this nation at home. And despite the protestations of the new left to the contrary, the fact is that an end to the war would be good, not bad, for American business.

---

THE WAR AND THE ECONOMY

America is committing economic harakiri in Southeast Asia. That is the gist of Bank of America Chairman Louis Lundborg's statement to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as reported by The Washington Post on April 16.

Mr. Lundborg, the highest officer of the world's largest bank, speaks words which merit the attention of every citizen. Each of

us is paying heavily for the devastating inflation produced by a costly, pointless war. Ending it quickly would benefit us economically as well as socially and politically.

No serious person can question Mr. Lundborg's capitalistic credentials. His profound knowledge of economic realities tells him—and now us—that the longer we remain in Vietnam the more we damage not others but ourselves. There is a great lesson to be learned from Mr. Lundborg's testimony; a lesson accentuated by the fact that while he was talking sense in Washington, Henry Ford was talking business in Moscow.

In our own self-interest we must finally put to rest the legacy of John Foster Dulles and Joseph McCarthy. The Cold War is ancient history. Its mythology is responsible for our Vietnam mistake, our distorted priorities, our inability to rebuild America. Paralyzed by obsessive anticommunism, we fail to see that there are now many brands of national communism, often more violently opposed to each other than to us. And we fail to understand that time is on our side if only we stop playing world policeman: for the one thing no brand of communism can survive is prosperity.

If we listen to the practical words of men like Louis Lundborg we may still have time to get our country off its present disaster course before we collapse economically as well as in other ways.

HAROLD WILLENS.

## CAMBODIA AND SEATO

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the evasive attitude of the so-called public opinion makers of our country to the urgent humanitarian request of the Cambodians for help to deter Communist aggression and enslavement is unconscionable.

Cambodia, which is in the SEATO area, has asked for no American involvement except for military areas and hardware to give its people a chance to defend their country by resisting territorial by the forces of evil from without.

Must we be reminded that the country of Cambodia is as much a part of our responsibility under SEATO as is South Vietnam—if she requests aid? If we reject Cambodia's plea for help and aid how can our decisionmakers justify any involvement in Vietnam? If "the friends of Moscow, Peking, and Hanoi" discourage involvement merely because the Cambodians are oriental then have not the Reds fallen victim to their own trigger word "racism"?

A free people with a reservoir of arms such as we possess cannot refuse aid and assistance to any peoples begging for aid to resist Communist aggression. To do so would be immoral. What is the international theory recognized by civilized countries called "territorial integrity"?

Perhaps as the columnist, Joseph Alsop, recently reported:

> If you read some of the recent reporting . . . you must conclude that it has now become illiberal, immoral and shocking to oppose foreign domination of your own country.

To free people we must remember that it is the victim and not the aggressor we should respond to.

I insert several related news clippings at this point:

CAMBODIA AGAIN ASKS FOR U.S. MILITARY HELP

Cambodia has made an urgent renewal of its plea for U.S. arms aid in its struggle against the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese—putting President Nixon in a delicate diplomatic and political bind.

The President is considering the appeal, which was disclosed last night by administration sources. A similar request for weapons and other material was made last week by the new Cambodian regime.

Nixon has taken a position against widening U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia and is under congressional pressure to adhere to this policy, even though the Phnom Penh government of Premier Lon Nol did not ask for troops.

And the administration wants to avoid any charges that Cambodia has given up its neutralist role by linking up militarily with the United States.

Yet there is little doubt Cambodia is having a difficult time handling attacks by the Viet Cong-North Vietnamese elements and Nixon does not want a Communist takeover of the tiny nation that neighbors Vietnam.

One possibility being studied by the administration is to use an international arrangement for providing aid to Cambodia with an eye toward supporting Cambodian neutrality.

Lon Nol opened up this possibility last week when he issued a call for aid from other nations, saying he would accept "all unconditional foreign aid from all sources."

Senate Democratic Leader Mike Mansfield has led the opposition to any extension of American military aid, no matter what the form, to Cambodia.

After the Phnom Penh regime's initial request for help, Mansfield said the only way for the United States to avoid further destructive conflict in Southeast Asia is to go no further "in any way, shape or form."

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 22, 1970]

THE UNITED STATES IS MISSING AN OPPORTUNITY TO END HALF OF VIETNAM WAR

(By Joseph Alsop)

DUC HUE DISTRICT.—From here, it is a short walk into the Parrot's Beak. The Parrot's Beak, in turn, is a place where the Cambodian border thrusts sharply outwards, into the midst of three key provinces of South Vietnam's Upper Delta. For that very reason, the North Vietnamese have been using the Parrot's Beak as a major sanctuary and base area for years on end.

Long before the Cambodian coup d'etat, there was obvious friction between the Cambodians in the Parrot's Beak and their North Vietnamese occupiers. Several months ago, in fact, there was an outbreak of rather serious fighting, in which the Cambodian Army used tanks. For the same reason, there has long been a certain amount of quiet, trans border cooperation between the Cambodian and South Vietnamese authorities.

Since Cambodia's change of government, moreover, the entire, very considerable area of the Parrot's Beak has clearly resembled a hornet's nest poked with a stick. The North Vietnamese occupiers, while threatening the Cambodians constantly, have taken hurried measures obviously betokening alarm, such as moving their base hospitals and ammunition stores into deep jungle.

Besides at least two regiments of the North Vietnamese Army and large northern rear service elements, the Parrot's Beak also contains the higher Vietcong leaders of at least five provinces. They took refuge there when the tide turned towards the end of 1968, and their home provinces in South Vietnam got too hot to hold them.

No doubt because they have felt unable to confront the North Vietnamese regiments, the Cambodians have been threatening these Vietcong leaders in their midst.

In addition, and most important of all, the South Vietnamese 25th Division has quietly conducted at least two rather major operations in the Parrot's Beak, with obvious Cambodian cooperation. Reportedly, the operations have been extremely successful. But the Hornet's Nest in the Parrot's Beak has not yet been cleared of all its hornets, as is so obviously desirable.

These are the facts that make the dimly indecisive policy being pursued in Washington all but incomprehensible, from this angle of vision. Surely President Nixon ought to be willing to seize an excellent chance to end at least half of the South Vietnamese war, even if this causes Senator Fulbright to spout his customary nonsense.

Furthermore, this is just the kind of chance we may be on the verge of throwing away. At least 90 per cent of the enemy military supplies in III Corps, and every ounce of the supplies for the Southern Delta, have long been brought in through Cambodia. Before the supply lines began to be pinched six months or so ago, Cambodia was also the main weapons—source for lower II Corps.

In addition, the North Vietnamese regiments and divisions, like the two big units in the Parrot's Beak, cannot possibly exist for long without the rice, other food and medical supplies that Hanoi has also been procuring in Cambodia. Without all these vital aids, and above all, without the Cambodian base areas and sanctuaries, the already weakening enemy military effort in III and IV Corps must dwindle away to nothing.

The opportunity offered by the big change in Cambodia is almost too good to be true, in fact. The opportunity is still there, furthermore, but it can all too easily slip away for good if the hovering and wavering in Washington continues.

Obviously, the new Cambodian government has not the power to resist the powerful North Vietnamese Army inside its borders, unless it gets help in doing so. Obviously, the best help will be provided by a vigorous policy of using units like the South Vietnamese 25th Division to clean out the trans-border hornet's nests for good and all. Obviously, the effort deserves all possible U.S. support and encouragement.

Finally, it should be obvious to any rational person that the Cambodians have every imaginable right to object to the long North Vietnamese occupation of large areas of their country. In truth, they have every reason to fear the actual conquest of Cambodia by Hanoi's soldiers—which is undoubtedly Hanoi's long term aim.

But if you listen to Senator Fulbright, and indeed, if you read some of the recent reporting from Phnom Penh, you must conclude that it has now become illiberal, immoral and shocking to oppose foreign domination of your own country.

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 23, 1970]

ARMS TO CAMBODIA

The Nixon administration's decision to furnish Cambodia with several thousand Chinese AK–47 automatic rifles captured in Vietnam is a minimal response to the threat now facing General Lon Nol's regime.

While North Vietnamese troops this morning were reported to have evacuated the town of Saang, 18 miles south of Phnom Penh on the Bassac River, the situation, to put it mildly, remains extremely fluid.

In its initial clashes with elements of the 40,000 North Vietnamese troops operating there, the 30,000-man Cambodian army has not distinguished itself. It is short of arms, short of ammunition (the Indonesian army, which also uses the AK–47, is expected to supply bullets for the captured weapons) and short of leadership.

This country, in the words of a joint letter to Senator Mansfield from the heads of the two chambers of the Cambodian legislature, cannot remain "indifferent to the destruction of a nation," particularly when that nation is friendly to us.

A major infusion of American aid is neither necessary nor desirable, if only because the Cambodians lack the capacity to put such aid to maximum and immediate use. But what is needed is a clear statement of diplomatic support from Washington, backed up by quick shipment of such light arms as the Cambodians need and can use.

What cannot be tolerated is a further deterioration in the military situation there. We do not advocate the dispatch of American ground units to Cambodia. But if our Asian allies such as the Thais, the South Vietnamese or the South Koreans wish to take such a step—and if Lon Nol requests this assistance—we should do nothing to stand in the way of such a development.

The Indochina conflict is one war. There is a single foe, whether he fights in South Vietnam, Laos or Cambodia. He must be made to see that aggression does not pay.

## THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH ON VIETNAM HOPEFUL NEWS

### HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's Monday night speech on Vietnam contained hopeful, yet realistic, news for all Americans and for all people of the world seeking peace.

The President made it plain that while the United States will remove troops, as promised, we will not accede to Hanoi's aggression, either in South Vietnam or in Laos and Cambodia.

The Evening Star of Tuesday carried a perceptive editorial emphasizing the effect this speech will have on its varied audiences, and calling it "exactly the right combination of firmness and flexibility." I insert this editorial in the RECORD:

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 21, 1970]

TELLING IT TO HANOI

Mr. Nixon's San Clemente speech on Vietnam last night was designed for a varied audience. To Americans, Mr. Nixon was saying both that there would be no defeat in Vietnam and that 150,000 more American boys will be withdrawn from there by this time next year.

To Hanoi, for the first time, there was a warning that escalation of the war in Cambodia or Laos might mean a sharp reduction in the pace of withdrawal from Vietnam although not in the total number. For the Pentagon, there was the reassurance that, while the process of Vietnamization must continue, conditions on the ground will be a decisive factor in determining the precise timing of withdrawals.

The President told the Kremlin—and, indirectly, Hanoi—that he has "noted with interest" senior Soviet U.N. delegate Yakov Malik's apparent call for a new Geneva conference designed to reach a general political settlement for all Indochina.

Finally, while he did not publicly accede to Cambodia's request for arms shipments, he made it clear by spreading the withdrawals over a full year that he has the present difficulties of General Lon Nol's government in mind, as well as those of Premier Souvanna Phouma of Laos.

In all respects, the President acted wisely. Had he given in to Pentagon pressures for a moratorium of up to six months on troop withdrawals, he would have irretrievably damaged his credibility. While keeping the average pace of withdrawals at the acceptable level of 12,500 per month, Mr. Nixon has preserved his credibility while at the same time meeting the minimum objections of both his military advisers and the shaky regimes in Vientiane and Phnom Penh.

In some respects, of course, the President gilded the Asian lily. He gave no justification for his statement that the progress of Vietnamization had "substantially exceeded our original expectations last June." Nor did he explain how, with all Indochina in flames, "we finally have in sight the just peace we are seeking."

But there is little point in carping about rhetoric. The thrust of the President's speech—and the reasoning behind it—was exactly the right combination of firmness and flexibility. Mr. Nixon seems to know not just where he wants to go in Southeast Asia, but how he can get there with a minimum of risk. And that should be good news for all Americans, and for men of good will in Southeast Asia.

## THE ENVIRONMENTAL CHALLENGE

### HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in February, the President submitted his environmental quality program to the Congress. No one can question its objectives to give the Federal Government authority to set proper standards and enforcement relative to intrastate polluters, big and little, virtually everywhere in this country.

The several States have always had primary obligation and authority to enforce pollution controls within their own boundaries. This has only worked in those States where there has been vigorous prosecution in the courts, but all too often, the courts have been reluctant to single out isolated polluters for actions that are so often the general rule in our economic life today.

This is understandable when one sees that pollution is not only caused by industry, local, State, and Federal governments, but individuals and groups in our American society.

It would seem that the President's program is silent in one important respect, and I hope that the Congress will correct this basic omission. That is the question of costs to industry which is something that cannot be swept under the rug. I would hope that appropriate tax incentives of some kind would be made available.

Many industries are striving hard at substantial costs to themselves to fulfill their part in banishing foul pollution caused by their operations. They now need help at local, State and Federal levels, if their antipollution efforts are to be totally effective.

For instance, the country's industry has been singled out as a big polluter of our Nation's streams. In fact, the General Accounting Office last fall pinpointed certain industrial and public wastes as a primary source of pollution in some areas.

The GAO report could well have cited the paper industry's National Council for Stream Improvement, which has spent nearly $10 million for research during the recent time. In addition, the industry has spent over $300 million for waste treatment facilities over the last 25 years. That represents a genuine, commendable effort to stop and prevent pollution.

In Fitchburg, the paper industry, which is so important to the economic life of northern Worcester County, in recent years has invested over $2 million in new equipment, primarily to curb pollution.

These large expenditures naturally result in higher production costs in a highly competitive industry, but they also represent the industry's recognition of its obligations to take corrective action now in its own backyard, and indicate a fine public spirit.

Mandatory, Federal regulatory controls, when applied elsewhere in the country, will help the Fitchburg paper industry retain its markets without unfair competition.

Moreover, the President's commendable objectives were not reflected by the administration's relatively modest pollution control budget. For pollution control, parks and open space, the budget calls for $1.1 billion, an increase of $330 million, and I think that we will have the same situation in Congress that we had last year when Congress responded to increasing public demand for action on pollution. It will be recalled that in the area of sewage treatment grants alone the Congress tripled the administration's budget by voting some $700 million more than that had been requested.

To be sure, we must and will try hard for reasonable, needed economy, but we cannot stand by, unmoved and supine, while sewage, foul wastes, and other filth turn our streams, waters and other places into obnoxious, disease-bearing, unsightly, open sewers and other repositories of stench and putrid wastes, dangerous to life and destructive of wholesome environments.

The Congress in the 1960's alone enacted some 20 to 25 legislation proposals to help curb pollution. For instance, the Federal Water Pollution Control Amendments of 1961 increased Federal aid for local sewage treatment plants. In the Nashua Basin alone, about $728,700 has been allocated for such activities. The Clean Air Act of 1963, the Water Quality Act of 1965, the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965, the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966, and the Air Quality Act of 1967 are among laws passed by Congress, to mention just a few, to help protect our natural resources.

Abnormal delay, obstruction and bureaucratic vacillation at every level have typified the planning and efforts for expeditious, corrective, purgative measures that are more essential in every sense than the Herculean cleansing of the Augean stables.

All too often, there has been a proliferation of committees, councils, and legal bodies at the local, State, regional and Federal levels, official and unofficial, working on the top priority exigencies of pollution abatement.

Within the Federal Government alone,

we have the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Interior Department, the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, the Public Health Service—the list goes on and on.

At local, State, and regional and general coordinating platforms there is, together with Federal efforts in this critical area, a profusion of frustrating agencies and bodies struggling laboriously and vainly, beset by indecision barriers and lack of coordinated leadership, hoping, praying and waiting for some magical formula to speed antipollution programs.

These ice jams of official paralysis and pyramiding delays must be speedily blasted away, and it is up to the Federal Government to take a bold, innovative initiative to coordinate and move the many well-meaning, commendably originated efforts to spark and wage massive, united warfare upon the hideous specters of pollution in our midst. Every resource—technical, scientific and financial—must be brought into play on a basis of real urgency and these programs must be adequately funded.

In transportation, concerted action by several Federal and State agencies helped to accelerate the elimination of jet pollution at its most obvious levels—the heavy black smoke visible at takeoffs and landings of aircraft in many communities.

The airlines have promised and moved to eliminate this highly objectionable black smoke by 1972, but there still remains the problem of highly toxic gases from jet exhausts, and the same pollutants that now plague our highways and endanger human well-being and comfort.

In the days ahead, I believe that Congress will have to legislate stronger standards of strict enforcement provisions against jet pollution that are technically and economically feasible in keeping with the results of continuing research into aircraft emissions. These efforts must entail understanding of the problems of the airlines as well as the urgent needs for alleviation.

There is also need for expansion of Federal programs to provide stricter controls on air pollution by automobile engines and fuels and there are pending in the Congress several bills to reduce pollutants. Prospective congressional and Federal governmental action has put the gigantic automobile and gasoline industries on notice that unless they voluntarily act now, they will have mandatory Federal controls sooner than expected.

Here again, while a rule of reason must be followed, it should be made clear to all interests that these objectives cannot brook further delay. The Nation and the American people have waited long enough. Now we must have action. It must be fair and reasonable to all, but it must be promptly designed and accomplished to get this imperative job done, and this must be true of the Federal Government's efforts in respect to all pollution and all environmental goals.

There is, understandably, increasing concern among conservationists, including myself, over the effect of nuclear electric power plants on our environment. Consequently, the construction of some 25 to 30 nuclear plants is being delayed. These plants represent about 22,000-megawatt capacity, about half the total U.S. electric power generating capacity that we had in 1940.

Balance this delay against the constantly increasing demand for electric power, antiquated generating equipment, power failures in the Northeast, and other problems facing the utilities and you can see that the Nation has a monumental dilemma on its hands. It will take concerted action by all three branches of Government—executive, congressional and State legislatures, and the courts—to help resolve these difficulties.

Power failures must positively be prevented by every feasible action. This question must have absolute, top priority. In many areas power failures are occurring with a frequency and regularity that is giving great inconvenience, loss, threats of many kinds and deepest concern to the people and a wide range of industries.

Few things are more important confronting the domestic life and the defense of this Nation. I urge the President to call a national conference on this subject at an early date comprised of representatives of government at every level, industry, labor, and the best scientific and technical brains in the country in this field to consider these great problems and come up with all possible dispatch with proposed, adequate remedies to prevent power failures and provide adequate power for this Nation. This is a problem of real magnitude, and it must be tackled and solved at the earliest practicable time. Failure to act could have disastrous consequences for this country and our pepole.

While the Federal Power Commission in 1967 made a far-reaching report to the President dealing with the massive 1965 Northeast power failure, the Presidential conference I am suggesting, especially in view of anticipated power shortages this summer, would bring into play all levels of government and the private sector and the best talents available to review what has been done to implement the FPC recommendations and spell out what remains to be done in this area.

Another environmental goal relates to power transmission lines in the country. It is evident that the question of their character, and the method and kind of their deploymen' is a very compelling, profoundly serious national problem. We must move here in this field as fast as we can, where it is required—and this is in very many places and areas—to take these lines from over our highways, our homes, our industries, our farms and many open spaces and bury them underground. This is an improvement that is bound to come in time and it should be considered, planned and started at an early date. The Congress must give careful early attention to these proposals which are in the national interest.

Long before environmental improvement became the popular slogan it is today, I had foreseen and anticipated these problems and these needs and started by efforts to solve them. I have been working for a long time in the Congress for approval and necessary funding of water resources development plans affecting the Nashua and Charles River Basins and for such watershed protection proposals as the Upper Quaboag and SuAsCo projects, and for broad national programs.

Last year, I sought the help of the House Committee on Public Works and made appeals to the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of the Budget seeking approval of the New England Regional Commission proposal calling for a coordinated $15 million Nashua River Basin water quality demonstration program. It is gratifying that the President's budget increased the Commission's funds to $9 million which means the start of the massive cleanup needed for the Nashua River.

It should be made clear and unmistakable that the principal problem is money, the taxpayer's money, whether the pollution is abated by the municipality, the State, or the Federal Government, since at every level it is the taxpayers who must pay the costs out of their own pockets.

We now have underway the planning of dams and reservoirs in the North Nashua River Basin with Whitmanville and Nookagee Reservoirs in the advanced stages. At the outset, Fitchburg indicated it was interested in increased storage capacity to meet its future water needs.

Because of the local costs involved, and local surveys showing an adequate supply of water, Fitchburg last year decided against participation in the water supply features of Whitmanville and Nookagee at an estimated cost of over $3 million to local interests.

This decision has meant that both Whitmanville and Nookagee must be redesigned. Fortunately, preliminary evaluations indicate that the projects can still meet the economically sound and justifiable requirements for Federal construction, but the Army Engineers now tell me that construction could start at the earliest in 1972 or 1973, if the redesigned projects still meet the governing criteria.

Studies conducted at my request by the Army Engineers indicate that Fitchburg can meet its water demands through 1980 and up to 1985, if the city goes ahead with the construction of Shattuck Reservoir.

These are preliminary projections, but it appears that ultimately Fitchburg will have to go to alternate sources of supply, such as watershed areas outside the North Nashua Basin, or tie in with a larger system such as the Metropolitan District Commission, should the city so choose.

The city's decision is understandable in the light of the continuous increase in the cost of municipal services and spiraling local tax rates and there is no easy solution.

In the long run, the cost of added water supply storage for local needs, as originally envisioned in the Whitmanville and Nookagee projects, is borne by the individual water users with repayments by local interests, made possible

over a 50-year period, but adding over $3 million to the city's indebtedness right now in the face of more pressing community needs, creates a serious problem.

This is a question of priorities that has to be determined by local officials in the light of local conditions. It goes without saying that I will continue my deep interest and efforts in these matters, and join with the able, distinguished mayor and officials, leaders and people of Fitchburg and other communities in the third district in pressing for any and every Federal assistance that they may seek for their water supply needs or other requirements.

## NEGRO PERCEPTIONS OF JEWS BETWEEN THE WORLD WARS

### HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the autumn issue of Judaism magazine included an article titled, "Negro Perceptions of Jews Between the World Wars."

The article deals with anti-Semitism among Negroes. On pages 445 and 446, the article commends my colleague from New York, Mr. POWELL, for raising his voice "the loudest and clearest in Harlem against the rising tide of Jew-baiting."

All Americans should be reminded of this sad episode in our Nation's history. The Nation owes a debt of thanks to my colleague, Mr. POWELL, and all others who spoke out against those who would exploit racial and religious differences in our great Nation. I insert pages 445 and 446 of this article into the RECORD:

NEGRO PERCEPTIONS OF JEWS BETWEEN THE WORLD WARS

It must not be forgotten that many Negro voices were raised in protest against the "rising tide" of Jew-baiting. Among the loudest and clearest in Harlem was that of Adam Clayton Powell, Jr. Powell, who succeeded his father as pastor of the mammoth Abyssinian Baptist Church in 1939—it had some eight thousand members—was the first black Congressman to be elected by Harlem. Lately, his difficulties with the Internal Revenue Service, his playboy escapades, and personal peccadilloes have captured the headlines and obscured his earlier substantial accomplishments. Those accomplishments actually antedate his first election to the House of Representatives in 1944. Kenneth Clark has written in his *Dark Ghetto*, that in the 1930's "Powell became the symbol of the struggle for minimal Negro rights, his name a household word." When Woolworth's on 125th Street declined to hire black girls as clerks, Powell took to the picket lines. He joined in the mass picketing of Blumstein's also. Between Powell and Sufi Abdul Hamid little love was lost, although ostensibly the two were agitating for the same "don't buy where you can't work" cause. When Powell chided Sufi, the latter assailed Adam as an alcoholic fool. "A professional anti-Semite" and a "black Hitler" were the terms Powell chose retrospectively to describe Sufi in his *Marching Blacks* published in 1945.

In the dark days of the Depression, when anti-Semitism was on the increase, Powell was instrumental in establishing a biracial committee which made a concerted effort to open up to Negroes theretofore unobtainable jobs. Using his column, the "Soap Box," in the *Amsterdam News*, he spoke out forthrightly on Negro-Jewish relations. No battle predicated on hatred could be won, he asserted on one occasion. Enmity could not be countered with enmity. Bigotry could not be destroyed with more bigotry.

Let us stop blaming the Jews for the wrongs perpetrated and blame those who are really at fault. Wherever the blame falls, let us not follow it up with hate. The fact is the Jew doesn't wrong us any more and probably much less than any other group. Maybe the corner grocer will short weigh you a couple of ounces, but so will Joe the vegetable man and Sam the ice man. Cheating is not confined to any one race. Whereas one group might cut the change a little bit or pad the bill, it is the so-called white Christian that is giving us the most hell right now.

In *Marching Blacks* he described anti-Semitism as "a deadly virus of the American bloodstream," even deadlier than anti-Negroism in some regions.

Powell also took up the cudgels in defense of European Jewry. He inveighed against Hitler, Mussolini and their minions and called international Fascism civilization's greatest danger. Nazi hatred of Jews, he felt, was unwarranted. Hitler was using German Jewry as a scapegoat. "By lampooning the Jew, he could make the lowest moron and the biggest degenerate in all Germany feel that, after all, he wasn't the lowest down, there were always the Jews." Exactly the same psychology underlay prejudice toward Negroes in the American South, Powell opined: "He [the white Southerner] wants the tobacco juice-stained moron of Tobacco Road to feel that there is always someone beneath him and so, he is taught that the Negro down the road is not his equal."

Negroes, he argued, could not stand aloof. Neutrality and apathy were self-defeating. Prejudice in Germany, China, Spain, Haiti or wherever imperiled America's "so-called free Negroes." In Powell's view the dilemma of Harlem's unemployed and the plight of the remaining Scottsboro victims on one hand, and Hitler's persecution of German Jewry on the other were inextricably intertwined.

## THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

### HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, if a business loses 36 cents out of every dollar's worth of sales, it is headed for trouble.

This is the financial situation facing the Post Office Department today. With today's postal rates, the Department will take in some $6.7 billion in postal revenues in the coming fiscal year and spend an additional $2.5 billion just to stay in business.

This huge postal deficit and drain upon our Federal budget underscores the need for prompt enactment of the Postal Reorganization and Salary Adjustment Act of 1970.

This legislation provides for additional postal revenues from all the major classes of mail. Both first-class and third-class users are asked to pay an additional 33 percent. And, most publications with second-class permits will have their rates lifted by 48 percent. These increases will go a long way toward putting this service on a sounder financial footing.

A $2.5 billion postal deficit amounts to a tax subsidy of some $40 a year for the average family. There is no reason, Mr. Speaker, why they should subsidize a service used in large part by businesses and commercial mailers.

Let us help the President put the postal service on a pay-as-you-go basis.

## WALLS RISING TO TAME A RIVER

### HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Ansonia Sentinel which is published in the heart of the Naugatuck Valley carried on April 13 an up-to-date story of the flood control program in the Naugatuck Valley. The story also touched upon the overall State program and included a statement which reflects credit upon the Army Engineers and every individual who has had any part in the building of this bulwark. It stated "the valley flood protection project is the largest under construction in the United States according to the Army. It is the largest project of any kind being built by the New England Division of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers."

As a matter of fact the Valley Complex is only a part of the massive flood control program which is underway and which is nearing completion in my district and which represents Federal expenditures of over $100 million. It is a subject of great pride to me that from the time I came to Congress and in the aftermath of the Black Friday floods of 1955 I have sponsored legislation and I have worked in the Congress and with the Army Engineers as well as with the officials and the residents of the communities affected to bring about the achievement of a series of structures which will protect lives and property from future disaster.

I include here the story by Richard S. Edinger which appeared in the Ansonia Sentinel under the heading, "Walls Rising To Tame a River":

WALLS RISING TO TAME A RIVER

(By Richard S. Edinger)

In 1955, Connecticut's Naugatuck River, swollen by torrential rains from hurricanes Connie and Diane, rose out of its banks from just south of the Massachusetts border nearly to Long Island Sound.

Several lives were lost and damage was in the scores of millions.

Today, 15 years later, a chain of giant flood-control works is nearing completion. By 1972 the Valley will have been made secure against a repetition of the tragedy.

Early in August of 1965, skies were leaden and rains continued for days.

The southern coast of New England was on hurricane alert for more than a week as Hurricane Connie threatened the area. She finally veered out to sea.

Then Diane swept close. Her eye did not hit the coast, but heavy rains associated with the storm came down in torrents in areas well inland from Long Island Sound.

Hardest hit was the Naugatuck River Valley.

The storm struck Aug. 15. By the next day, several inches of rain had fallen. The river rose over its banks for much of its length.

From points near the Massachusetts border, south through Torrington, Thomaston, Waterbury, Naugatuck, Beacon Falls, Seymour, Ansonia and Derby, the raging waters swept away business and residential buildings, bridges, roads, rail lines and public utilities.

The water tore open a cemetery and bore the dead toward the sea.

In the Valley communities of Seymour, Ansonia and Derby, damage was estimated at $25 million. Three persons lost their lives.

With their communities so clearly vulnerable to flood damage, municipal officials took immediate action to persuade the federal government to provide funds for local-protection projects.

The planning took more than a decade.

By the fall of 1968, a $21-million flood-control program was under way in Ansonia and Derby. By 1972, the communities will be safe from the danger of floods.

The Valley flood-protection project is the largest under construction in the United States, according to the Army. It is the largest project of any kind being built by the New England Division of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

The immense size of the project has turned the two communities into an area of major construction.

Thirty-foot concrete walls and earthen dikes wider at the base than a football field are going up. So are flood gates that dwarf a truck.

More than 15,000 feet of earthen dikes and 7,000 feet of concrete walls are included. Some 31,750 cubic yards of concrete are being poured.

The facilities include five pumping stations, eight street gates and three railroad gates.

The project is part of a vast system of flood-control and protection facilities being installed by the Army Engineers in the entire valley from the headwaters of the Naugatuck near the Massachusetts line south to the mouth of the Housatonic River near Long Island Sound. The Naugatuck empties into the Housatonic at Derby.

Four separate urban renewal projects in Ansonia and Derby have proceeded successfully on the assumption that adequate flood protection would be provided for the industrial and commercial facilities in their downtown areas.

The local, state and federal costs of the redevelopment programs in the two communities total some $20 million. In addition, several more millions have been committed for new business enterprises and industrial improvements.

Under construction in the flood-prone areas that will be protected in a $3.5 million interior-mall shopping center in Ansonia.

Unlike many of the projects planned and designed by the Army Engineers, the Ansonia and Derby projects will be turned over to the municipal governments when they are completed.

The Engineers maintain control and operate dams, reservoirs and canals. The Corps' New England Division operates some 35 dams.

The Ansonia and Derby public works departments will hire men to maintain the flood works when completed. This maintenance will include servicing of pumping stations and regular checking of flood gates and other operational facilities.

These same public-works officials will be responsible for activating the floor-control facilities when a flood alert is issued.

The street and railroad gates rarely will be closed except during floods.

The Ansonia and Derby projects form the final link in a series of flood-control facilities along the Naugatuck River.

The system starts with the Hall Meadow Brook Dam on a tributary of the Naugatuck near the Massachusett border.

Six other dams are completed or under construction downstream. In addition, there are two local protection projects completed in Torrington and a local protection project completed in the Waterbury-Watertown area.

DETECTION SYSTEM

To coordinate the vast flood-control system in Connecticut and elsewhere in New England, the Army Engineers recently put into operation a computer-controlled flood-detection system.

Monitoring stations have been set up on several New England rivers and at forecasting stations. Signals are sent to a central computer at the Corps' headquarters in Waltham, Mass., which digests the information and orders flood gates closed.

The monitoring stations nearest the Ansonia-Derby projects are at the Stevenson Dam on the Housatonic between Oxford and Monroe and on the Naugatuck in Beacon Falls.

With the completion of the Ansonia and Derby projects, the Valley program will be virtually finished.

## NATIONAL SECRETARIES WEEK

### HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the week of April 19–25, 1970, has been designated as Secretaries Week, with yesterday, April 22, as Secretaries Day. Since 1952, a week has been set each year to honor the "first lady of business—the secretary. Again, the theme for Secretaries Week is "Better Secretaries Mean Better Business."

The question is often asked: "Why is my secretary called a clerk-typist or clerk-stenographer, while others are called secretaries?" What is the difference? What is a secretary anyway? According to the National Secretaries Association—International—which sponsors Secretaries Week, a secretary shall be defined as an executive assistant who possesses a mastery of office skills, who demonstrates the ability to assume responsibility without direct supervision, who exercises initiative and judgment, and who makes decisions within the scope of assigned authority.

The position of secretary is primarily that of a trusted office assistant performing duties which are auxiliary to the management work of an executive. The secretary participates in the work of her superior by relieving him of details of administration, such as the acceptance of telephone calls, the reception of visitors, the preparation and processing of correspondence, the maintenance of files and records, the assembly and dissemination of information, and the transmission of instructions to his subordinates.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in extending congratulations to these invaluable ladies on their day.

## EXPLOSIVES CONTROL ACT OF 1970

### HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a proposed "Explosives Control Act of 1970."

My introduction of this bill is in response to a series of recent bomb outrages and bomb threats in various parts of the Nation. The actual and potential loss of life, destruction of property, and serious disruption of the daily lives of our citizens and our economy require that effective Federal steps be taken to regulate the use and transportation of explosives.

The purpose of this legislation is to support Federal, State, and local law enforcement. It is not intended to interfere with or place undue burdens upon law-abiding citizens with respect to the legitimate acquisition, possession or use of explosives.

Some States, notably Connecticut and New York, have enacted their own statutes to regulate the manufacture, ownership, possession, storage, use and transportation of explosives. These State laws have been supplemented in many instances by municipal ordinances, such as those adopted by the city of New York, which attempt to strictly regulate the acquisition and use of these volatile materials. The Explosives Control Act of 1970, which I have introduced, will not preempt enforcement of existing statutes. It is intended to give the States and local communities the capacity and incentive to enforce their own explosives control laws.

Although my bill does substantially increase Federal penalties for the unlawful transportation of explosives and the use of the mails or telephone to convey bomb threats or bomb scares, the measure is not solely punitive. Its approach is regulatory and preventive in that it would channel and generally restrict the interstate transportation of explosives to federally licensed manufacturers, importers and dealers. The bill also provides a system of recordkeeping to enforce the prohibitions against sales to certain classes of individuals. I am convinced that this legislation will assure that strong State and local control over explosives will not be subverted by unregulated interstate traffic and anonymous purchases of these highly volatile and destructive commodities.

This legislation is patterned on the approach embodied in the Gun Control Act of 1968. The following outline describes the main provisions of the bill:

1. *Licensing.* The bill would channel interstate and foreign commerce in explosives through federally licensed importers, manufacturers and dealers. It provides for a licensing system with meaningful standards and prescribes an annual fee of $50 for manufacturers and importers of explosives and $10 for explosives' dealers. The bill prohibits anyone from engaging in the business of an explosives' manufacturer, importer or

dealer unless he first obtains a valid Federal license.

2. *General Prohibitions.* The bill prohibits the sale of explosives to anyone under 21 years of age, prohibits the mail order sale of explosives between licensees, and generally prohibits over-the-counter sales to non-residents. However, the bill will permit licensees to sell or deliver an explosive to a non-resident if such sale or delivery conforms to the law of the State in which the transfer is made and if the purchaser resides in a contiguous State which by law authorizes such an out-of-State purchase. In such sales the bill requires that the licensee-seller and the purchaser comply with affidavit, notice and waiting-period requirements, whereby the local law enforcement officer in the purchaser's home community is notified of the explosives purchase.

In addition, the bill requires that all non-over-the-counter explosives' purchasers comply with the affidavit, notice and waiting-period provisions of the bill.

3. *Unlawful Sales.* The bill prohibits sales of explosives to convicted felons, fugitives from justice, drug addicts or mental incompetents. It also applies additional Federal restrictions on the interestate transportation of explosives comparable to those now applicable to firearms.

4. *Recordkeeping.* The bill provides for adequate recordkeeping by licensees to include data identifying purchasers. It also authorizes Federal authorities to furnish such information to State and local law enforcement authorities.

5. *Penalties.* The bill broadens existing Federal law penalizing the unlawful transportation of explosives and the use of the mails or telephone to convey bomb threats or false, malicious bomb scares. Penalties for both such offenses are increased substantially. The bill also adds new penalties to cover the malicious damage or destruction of Federal properties and penalizes the unauthorized possession of explosives in Federal buildings. The bill would establish an additional Federal penalty of not less than one year nor more than ten years of imprisonment for using explosives or unlawfully carrying explosives in the commission of any Federal felony. In the case of a second or subsequent conviction the bill provides for a minimum mandatory sentence of not less than five years nor more than twenty years imprisonment, with no probation or suspended sentence to be granted by the court.

6. *Definition of Explosives.* The definition of explosives expands the definition persently contained in the Federal Criminal Code to include incendiary bombs, grenades, and similar devices.

## POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

## HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join James Rademacher, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, in his praise for the Post Office Department's remarkable performance in providing within 38 hours after the legislation was signed the 6-percent retroactive pay raise for more than 725,000 employees.

This was an amazing performance considering the size and complexity of the postal payroll. But, even more than that, I agree with Mr. Rademacher that it is a symbol of good faith on the part of the Department's present management and evidence of a new spirit of concern for employees themselves, as well as greater efficiency in dealing with matter of bread-and-butter importance to their employees.

This is the same kind of efficiency—the same kind of performance that Postmaster General Winton M. Blount is anxious and willing to provide in all areas of postal activity—provided we give him the means to do the job. And we can do that by approving the administration's reorganization plan for the postal service which has been developed after unprecedented and productive negotiations with the postal employee organizations themselves.

## MIDDLE EAST NARCOTICS

## HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most dangerous problems with which we are confronted is the spread of drug addiction, particularly among young people.

Many States have grappled with this issue through legislation intended to cure the innocent victims or to punish local distributors of these drugs. Little attention, however, has been given to the equally important problem of cutting off habit-forming narcotics at the source by taking effective action to prevent their importation into the country.

A timely and perceptive article on this subject recently appeared in the winter–spring 1970 edition of Prevent World War III. It was written by Maxwell T. Cohen, chief counsel of the New York State Assembly Minority Committee on Crime and Safety in the Streets.

I believe Mr. Cohen's article will be of interest to our colleagues and I insert it herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

MID-EAST NARCOTICS—A THREAT TO UNITED STATES

(By Maxwell T. Cohen)

The Director of the Division of Narcotic Drugs of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, Vladimir Kusevic, on the 19th of May, 1969, reported that narcotic drug abuse *"continues to spread throughout all continents,"* and in certain regions had begun to assume *"epidemic proportions."*

According to the reports issued by this Division, the Middle East and Near East is an important center for the supply of narcotic drugs to the international illicit traffic, most of which finds its way into the United States. The traffic is spread from clandestine or tolerated plantations.

The United Nations Economic and Social Council Report on the Twenty-Third Session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, 31 January 1969, found that *"most of the heroin illicitly introduced into North America comes from Europe where opium and morphine base from the Near and Middle East are processed."* In the same document the representative of the United States reported that illicit traffic in narcotic drugs showed no signs of abatement.

Crime, and the narcotics problem as a major contributory factor in crime, has reached such gigantic dimensions as to constitute a present and active threat to the economic system of the United States and even to the preservation of an orderly society throughout the entire world.

The fantastic profits derived from the international narcotics traffic have made this depressing and dangerous condition possible. Heroin is the narcotic most used in the United States. It is a derivative of opium.

The profit on a purchase in Lebanon of a kilogram of opium for $64.00 or a kilogram of its derivative heroin for $936.00 can, when sold in the United States, average over one-half million dollars—and can be priced upwards to a possible profit of one million dollars or more.

Mr. Glenn A. Olds, the United States Representative to the Social Committee of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, on May 20, 1969, spoke of the increasing drug dependency among young people. In the United States the number of addicts under twenty-one years, he reported, increased by twenty-one per cent. Drug arrests in the under-eighteen category totaled 1,583 in 1960 but reached 13,904 in 1967.

MIDDLE EAST AND SOUTHEAST ASIA ARE SOURCES OF SUPPLY

Repeatedly, in all of the United Nations Narcotic Reports the accusation is made that the main source of supply for the traffic in narcotic drugs is opium produced clandestinely with or without effective controls in the Middle East and Southeast Asia. In May, 1969, the President of the Control Board of the Social Committee of the Economic and Social Council of the United States stated that the Board had been "regretfully obliged to record its conclusion that beyond a doubt a disquietingly large quantity of opium is diverted each year into illicit channels in the Near East."

On Page 35 of the report of the Twenty-Third Session of the Commission appears the following. We quote:

"The representative of the League of Arab States described the narcotics situation in certain Arab countries which was complicated and serious. There was substantial illicit cannabis production and consumption. Opium and opium derivatives were smuggled from this region to other parts of the world.

"The cannabis traffic passed through Syria en route to the consuming countries such as the United Arab Republic. It was carried on by organized gangs, which controlled the preparation and clandestine transport of the drug.

"Traffickers used Lebanon as a staging area for illicit drugs initially bound for other countries. Primitive laboratories were discovered in areas close to the border."

Even innocent nations were exploited by the merchants in illicit narcotics. On page 33 of the report it is noted that the observer for Spain informed the Commission that because of Spain's geographical position and its proximity to countries where there were clandestine laboratories, traffickers used Spain as a staging area for the export of drugs to illicit markets. The competent authorities had been tracing the route taken by a gang of smugglers operating between the Near and Middle East, Spain and the United States of America.

TOWARD A SOLUTION

The solution to this problem is not and cannot be exclusively local or state action, but must be national, and, most importantly, made international by the governments of the world. The Executive Branch of the Government of the United States has the most authoritative sources of information as to which countries and governments are most responsible for the flow of narcotics into the United States and there is constitutional authority and the duty to act. The United States can, should and must direct our embassies to represent to the highest authorities of certain foreign governments that we are concerned that these governments must take

immediate, effective and remedial steps to confiscate illicit narcotic plantations, narcotic processing laboratories and means of transporting narcotics. Should these governments fail to do so, the United States should employ economic and political sanctions against these governments in the form of tariff increases, and strict limitations on importation of goods from these countries, blocking any financial assistance to them, withdrawing financial aid, objecting to loans requested by the offending governments from the World Bank and United States banking institutions and using all possible measures which will give concrete effect and force to our battle against a national disaster.

The alternative to this get-tough procedure is to continue the polite and ineffectual hand-wringing shown in this sterile language of the United Nations Report, which I quote:

"Enormous quantities of opium also continues to flow from illicit or uncontrolled productions in certain well-defined areas of the world. For a variety of reasons the authorities in most of these areas were regrettably not able to control the situation."

Question: What "well-defined areas of the world"? What were the "variety of reasons"?

Although there is no precedent in United States history for the specific action proposed in this article, there have been incidents where the Government of the United States did act to protect either the United States or humanitarian interests.

The United States Government acted vigorously with respect to piracy permitted by the Barbary Coast Government. The United States Government intervened with respect to the slaughter of Armenians by Turkey. The United States Government requested its Ambassador to induce Czarist Russia to desist from its programs.

Within our own times President Franklin D. Roosevelt on October 5, 1937, made his famous "Quarantine Address" which is prophetically applicable today. I quote from this address:

"It seems to be unfortunately true that the epidemic of world lawlessness is spreading. When an epidemic of physical disease starts to spread, the community approves and joins in a quarantine of the patients in order to protect the health of the community against the spread of the disease."

Harold Ickes noted in his diary that the President contemplated cutting off all trade with future aggressors.

In December, 1937, the President agreed at a Cabinet meeting that economic sanctions could be effective. "We don't call them economic sanctions; we call them quarantines" he observed.

The narcotic traffic should be equated in international law with the crimes of Piracy on the high seas and Slavery. Rather than wait for an international treaty, the United States Government can act forthwith and effectively for the safety and well-being of our country, and for removing a very sinister threat to the peace of the world.

---

## FARM PROGRAM ARTICLE PRAISED

---

### HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues David Francis' excellent article, "The Remembered Americans: Down on the Farm," in the April issue of the Washington Monthly. For your information I will include the article at the close of my remarks.

In the process of working to reform our farm program by placing a ceiling on the huge subsidies—running into the millions in some cases—going to a handful of giant corporate farms, I have devoted a good deal of time to studying this complex subject. I know of no single article which explains it with greater clarity and insight than this effort by Mr. Francis.

I was especially pleased that Mr. Francis noted Agricultural Secretary Hardin's own admission that a large percentage of these payments—65 percent in the case of cotton—are nothing but "income supplements," and are not needed for production control. I think it fair, to put it mildly, for all of us to question whether the J. G. Boswell Co. of California needed an "income supplement" of $4,370,657 in 1969, or whether Senator EASTLAND needed the assist he received of $178,263.

I am also pleased that Mr. Francis advocated "a low limit on payments—$5,000 or $10,000 per crop." When the farm bill reaches the floor of the House soon, I intend to offer such an amendment at the $10,000 per crop level.

The article referred to follows:

THE REMEMBERED AMERICANS: DOWN ON THE FARM

(By David R. Francis)

The farmer looks out the broad picture windows of his $75,000 brick house across a portion of his 1,400-acre farm, taking a rough inventory.

To his left, he can see six silos and feeding facilities, worth $150,000. By working a few buttons and switches there, he can feed 700 to 800 head of cattle in 30 minutes. Machinery does the trick: conveyor belts take the chopped feed from a large silo, automatically mix in a mineral-and-protein supplement, and transport it to a feeding lot, where augers push it down two long troughs to the waiting cattle.

Straight ahead is a row of 22 hog units worth something like $100,000. These are concrete-floored pens that can handle all of the 4,500 pigs this farmer markets every year. If the weather gets hot, the farmer, or his two employees who work full-time with the hogs, can turn on fog nozzles to keep the animals cool—and fat. Looking over the hog units, the farmer sees some 700 acres of fine Iowa corn land—easily worth about $500 an acre, perhaps even $700. That comes to at least $350,000.

Then, way up the slope on the opposite side of the valley, lies another 700 acres of not-so-good land, suitable for grazing. It might sell for $200 an acre. Add another $140,000. Continuing his tabulation of his net worth, the farmer speaks of 1,300 head of cattle, worth, at about $200 a head, $260,000 in all; and 3,000 head of hog worth $25 apiece (figuring they are on average half grown), which are worth about $75,000. Finally, there is the machinery and equipment, valued at about $150,000. Adding all his property up, the farmer figures that he is just about a millionaire.

This man exists. But since he doesn't want to reveal all the financial details above, let us call him Farmer Jones. As we have seen, Farmer Jones is demonstrably wealthy. His large home has all the modern conveniences. He and his wife took a freighter to the Orient for their vacation last winter, and flew back.

On an adjoining farm, another couple struggles to make a living on 180 acres, 80 of them fertile cropland. We will call them the Smiths.

Farmer Smith raises about 100 hogs a year, grossing between $2,000 and $2,500 on them. He feeds they by hand with corn and skim milk, calling them to the trough with traditional hog calls. The milk comes from 17 cows. Because his milking facilities don't quite meet sanitation standards, Farmer Smith separates the cream and feeds the skim milk to the hogs. Another problem for him is that most dairy farms now handle their milk in "bulk" (tank trucks), and Farmer Smith's operation is big enough only for the old-fashioned milk cans.

Farmer Smith has to make do with used farm machinery. He built a shed with used sheet metal from government storage bins. His small house, though spotless, has no carpets. The furniture is cheap and worn. Though Mr. and Mrs. Smith do not go hungry, and their farm has considerable capital value, most middle-class Americans would regard them as poor.

These two farms, in many ways, represent the dichotomy of agriculture in the United States.

Mr. Jones is what the Department of Agriculture likes to call a "commercial" farmer. He manages his farm like a medium-sized manufacturing plant, cutting costs where he can, using the latest techniques and machinery for the sake of efficiency, and keeping good books.

There are one million other commercial farmers in the United States. Most are not so large. But there are hundreds who are as successful as Farmer Jones. And most agricultural economists believe that the size of Farmer Jones's operation will be standard in another decade or two.

In contrast, Farmer Smith is symbolic of what most people think of when they refer to "the farm problem." Mr. Smith has been left behind by advancing farm technology. He did not enlarge his farm sufficiently to utilize much of the new scientific techniques and expensive machinery. As a result, his income is not adequate by today's standards.

There are around 500,000 farms in this country today whose owners work full-time at farming but get so small a return that they are classified by the government as "poor." Mr. Smith would probably be a border case.

On another 1,500,000 farms, the owners gross less than $10,000 a year and are thus not regarded as "commercial."

But they are not officially poor, since their income is above the poverty level. In many cases their incomes are supplemented by retirement benefits, investment income, or non-farming jobs.

One might think that the tens of billions of dollars poured into the farm program over the years would primarily help the poor farmer, as well as those who manage to stay on farms by keeping second jobs.

That, however, is public mythology. The fact is that most government subsidies go to those in Farmer Jones's category—not to those in Farmer Smith's. Whether the Farmer Jones types need all that taxpayers' money is at least questionable.

The small farmer will, of course, get some government money—say a few hundred dollars with a farm the size of Mr. Smith's. But it will be chickenfeed compared to the sums obtained by commercial farmers.

As agricultural economist K. L. Robinson of Cornell University puts it: "The most serious and justified criticism of past farm programs . . . is that they have done little or nothing to reduce income inequalities or to help the poorest of the rural poor. . . . This result is not surprising, however, given the middle-class orientation of Congress and the political power of the South, particularly with respect to agricultural legislation."

Professor Robinson describes existing farm legislation as "a monument to the political weakness of the rural poor." Indeed, some economists argue that the farm program has given the relatively well-to-do farmers the wherewithal to pour capital into their farms, increase productivity even further,

and drive out those poor farmers not able to keep up.

This spring Congress appears likely to modify the farm program slightly. The goal, though, is not so much to step up assistance to the poor farmer as to limit the aid to so-called "fat-cat farmers." As it is now, the bulk of farm subsidies go to the relatively well-to-do or rich farmer because the farm program is commodity-oriented. Money goes to those who produce crops (or withhold land eligible for production) in proportion to the amount produced (or land withheld).

Today, the largest one-third of farmers produce more than 85 per cent of farm products as measured by value. John A. Schnittker, who was Under Secretary of Agriculture in the Johnson Administration, says: "In the early years of modern farm policy, there was an element of truth to the rhetoric which insisted that farm programs were needed to help, or even to save, the small family farmer. This meant most farmers in the 1930's, when there were nearly seven million farms and a deep economic depression. It is different today. The United States has three million farms, but only one million of them are serious producers and major beneficiaries of farm programs." He concludes: "Programs and expenditures to help farm people need not be primarily commodity-oriented."

Theoretically, though such action is presently unlikely, Congress could establish a system of income maintenance to help poor farmers.

Until the last few years, agricultural economists did surprisingly little research on the distribution of benefits from the farm programs. It was not clear where the billions went. It was not widely known that changing technology, with its requirement for larger farms, had concentrated production—and subsidy benefits—in increasingly fewer farms.

That fact was brought home to Congress on September 9, 1968, when Representative Paul Findley (R-Ill.) inserted in the *Congressional Record* the names of 9,952 farmers who received more than $20,000 in agricultural subsidies of various types during 1967. That long list shocked city legislators trying to squeeze funds into the budget to deal with urban poverty. A similar list, inserted in the *Record* last year (for 1968), showed five farms getting payments of more than $1 million. The largest payment—$3,027,384—went to the J. G. Boswell Company of Corcoran, California.

A total of 5,885 farms got payments exceeding $25,000 during 1968, including Eastland Plantations, Inc., in Doddsville, Mississippi, which received $116,978. It is owned by Senator James O. Eastland (D-Miss.), a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, who has consistently voted to continue such subsidies.

Representative Findley, a former weekly newspaper publisher, says it is "small wonder" that Congress has "rebelled" against the farm program. He has fought for four years to impose a ceiling on government agricultural subsidies to individual farmers.

In the fall of 1968, the House voted to limit these payments but the Senate did not. The limitation, proposed in an amendment to a bill extending to the end of this year the omnibus Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, did not survive the conference committee, which was composed primarily of Southerners sympathetic to the large payments.

Then, last June, the House voted 225–142 in favor of an amendment to the agricultural appropriations bill that would limit to $20,000 the combined federal payments any single farm operator could receive under the cotton, wheat, and feed-grain programs during a single year. That amendment passed despite the opposition of the Administration and the Congressional leadership of both parties.

"Few votes have been more significant to farmers," commented Reuben Johnson, lobbyist for the National Farmers Union. In other words, the vote clearly indicated that urban Congressmen are fed up with the farm program and will soon insist on reform.

Last summer, the Senate again voted down a limitation, and the amendment was killed in conference. But when the bill came back to the House last fall, a motion of instruction to the conference committee to insist on a limitation failed to pass by a slim four votes.

Early this year Representative W. R. (Bob) Poage (D-Tex.), chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, conceded: "I don't think it is possible to pass a farm bill without putting a limitation on. What limitation, I don't know."

Congressional dissatisfaction with the farm program is steadily gaining strength. Urban members are by far the great majority in Congress nowadays. Of the 435 House districts, only 83 have as much as 15 per cent of their respective populations living on farms.

The complaints of Representative Jeffery Cohelan (D-Calif.) are typical. During the House debate on limitations last year, Cohelan said: "The bill provides the staggering sum of $4,965,934,000 for capital replenishment of the Commodity Credit Corporation. This sum represents money which has been lost by the corporation because it has supported commodity prices above the open market price. This enormous sum—nearly $5 billion—is three times what we will appropriate for the operations of the Office of Economic Opportunity. It is five times what we will spend for Model Cities and urban renewal. It is five times what we will spend for manpower training. It is several times what we will provide in federal support for public education. . . . There must be a less expensive and more efficient way to both help transfer income to needy farmers and to maintain a stable agricultural production base."

Congressional proponents of a payments limitation sometimes oversimplify by arguing that "farmers are being paid not to farm." What they are referring to is the fact that some farmers receive government money for diverting some of their land from crop production on an annual basis.

In rebuttal, Chairman Poage argues: if the land of the big farmers were not diverted, excess production would hit farm product prices, forcing small farmers to divert more land.

He likens the diversion payments to expropriation of land for a slum clearance project. "If you put a limit on payments for expropriated land," he contends, "you wouldn't have a slum-clearance project."

However, neither argument is fully relevant. Only a portion of government payments compensate farmers for taking land out of production. Much of the money, instead, goes to boost the income of farmers.

In addition to land-diversion payments, government payments include: price-support payments on feed grains, wheat, and cotton; cost-sharing subsidies for various "conservation" practices; and other less costly subsidies.

Representative Findley's payment list, though startling, does not cover the large price-support programs for wool and sugar. Nor does it cover the huge losses piled up by the Commodity Credit Corporation in its price-support loan operations. These are "nonrecourse" loans on a farmer's crop. This means that if the market price drops below the loan level the farmer lets the C.C.C. keep the crop—and the losses. In effect, the loan guarantees a floor price for the farmer.

Secretary of Agriculture Clifford M. Hardin, in testimony to Congress last year, broke down the payments in this way:

PERCENT OF DOLLAR PAYMENTS

| | For resource adjustment | For income supplement |
|---|---|---|
| Cotton | 35 | 65 |
| Wheat | 51 | 49 |
| Feed grain | 89 | 11 |
| Total | 65 | 35 |

"Resource adjustment" means payments to keep land out of crop production; the goal is to boost prices by keeping supply close to the level of demand for farm products. "Income supplement" is simply government subsidies to raise the income of farmers.

As the table shows, the money spent on resource adjustment is a high proportion in the case of wheat and feed grains. But only five per cent of the wheat farmers and two per cent of the feed-grain farmers get more than the proposed $20,000 ceiling on payments.

Former Under Secretary Schnittker, who is now a professor of economics at Kansas State University, contends that a limitation on payments would cause no serious difficulty for the price-support program in wheat and feed grains.

Cotton is the tough problem. Here 33 per cent of the cotton farmers receive $20,000 or more. But 65 per cent of the money is to supplement the income of the cotton farmers. Only 35 per cent goes to reduce cotton output by taking land out of cotton production.

In Schnittker's view, "total (cotton) payments could be reduced by at least one-half and perhaps by two-thirds ($400 to $500 million) from 1968 or 1969 levels without any important adverse effects on the cotton growers or the cotton economy, although the value of cotton land might stop increasing for a few years."

As it is, the farm subsidy system generously helps those who need it least—the one million commercial farmers. It does little for the poor farmer, or, for that matter, the 13 million other rural poor.

Last year farmers got some $3.7 billion in direct government subsidies. That figure has been rising in recent years.

But there are also indirect subsidies. For one thing, the effort to limit the supply of farm products by the acreage-adjustment programs contributes another $1 to $5 billion to farmers' net income through its price-boosting effect. Why such a wide range?—$1 to $5 billion is quite a spread. Because that is the range of disagreement among economists. Each has his own way of calculating how much the government-imposed reduction in acreage raises prices.

Another indirect subsidy is shipments of farm produce under Public Law 480. Though declining, these shipments have been running close to $1 billion annually in recent years. They are sold to developing countries for local inconvertible currency, partially as foreign aid, partially to help U.S. agricuture dispose of its surpluses.

When all of the direct and indirect subsidies to farmers are totaled up, they come to at least $5 billion a year. This amounts to the equivalent of a tax of about five per cent on all food purchased at retail or, figured another way, an assessment of $25 per person annually for income transferred from those who are not engaged in agriculture to those who are.

Complete abolition of the farm program, in other words, would save the housewife the equivalent of five per cent on her food bill, either through lower prices or lower taxes (assuming that the government were to cut

taxes rather than use the revenues elsewhere).

To the farmer, of course, the $5 billion represents almost one-third of his net income. Government payments are especially important for wheat, cotton, and wool.

Rice producers are heavily dependent on Public Law 480 shipments. Livestock producers—except for those who raise wool from sheep—are not subsidized directly.

Without any federal aid at all, the commercial farmers (and the rural communities they support financially) would be hard hit. Yet most farm economists are convinced that considerable savings are possible. Research by Dr. James T. Bonnen, a Michigan State University agricultural economist, indicates just how the commodity orientation of the farm program results in a concentration of its benefits. His figures show that:

Sugarcane, cotton, and rice have the greatest proportion of direct benefits concentrated on few farmers. The largest 20 per cent in each of these categories receive, respectively, 83, 69, and 65 per cent of the program benefits. The smallest 20 percent receive, respectively, one, two, and one per cent of the benefits.

Wheat and feed-grain program benefits are less highly concentrated. The largest 20 per cent of the wheat farmers receive 62 per cent of the direct benefits; for those in feed grain, it is 57 per cent.

Tobacco and sugar beets are the least concentrated of the major crops. Even so, the largest 10 per cent of all tobacco growers get 53 per cent of program benefits; the smallest 20 per cent receive four per cent.

The inefficiency of the present structure as a vehicle for aiding the poorest farmers can be shown by this eye-popping fact: for every additional dollar in subsidies that the government might wish to give each farmer in the bottom 20 per cent, it would have to give $20 to $100—depending on the crop—to each of the farmers among the "top" 80 per cent.

Or, looking at the subsidy system from another angle, the 60 per cent of total subsidies going to the top 16 per cent of farmers provides an average $8,000 per farm. This brings the average income per farm, for this top group, to $18,600 net—that is, after expenses. The two million farmers with sales below $5,000 per year have average net incomes of $6,500 (primarily from off-farm sources) and receive only $400 per farm in subsidies.

Dr. Bonnen concludes, ". . . the farm programs are not an efficient means for effecting an income redistribution to the smaller low-income farmers . . . any attempt to solve the low-income, small-farmer problem via price supports would generate huge windfall profits to the more efficient larger scale operators." The income of farmers, as well as benefits, is heavily concentrated. The top 20 per cent of farmers receive 50.5 per cent of the income.

Surprisingly, a limitation on payments would have only a minor effect on the concentration of the overall distribution of federal farm payments.

However, as Schnittker points out, a payments limitation would (if properly legislated) result in large budget savings.

A study by Walter W. Wilcox, a former economist at the Department of Agriculture, finds that a $5,000 limit per program would have cut 1968 farm subsidies by $400 million.

A bill produced by the Department of Agriculture provides for a sliding scale up to a limit of $110,000 per program. This is a ridiculously high figure in the eyes of such Congressmen as Silvio O. Conte (R-Mass.). He has introduced a bill proposing the $5,000 limit. He says that, in 1968, 92 per cent of the cotton producers, 97 per cent of the wheat producers, and 98 per cent of the feed-grain producers would not have been affected by his low limit.

The Department's sliding-scale proposal would hit very few farmers. It is apparently just an effort to throw a bone to the urban dogs in Congress.

Without the price-support and supply-adjustment programs, farm product prices would have averaged between 10 and 20 per cent lower in recent years *at the farm level*. But this doesn't necessarily mean that prices at the retail level would have dropped by that percentage. The amount the farmer receives is a lesser portion of the final retail price for most products.

Since the poor spend a large proportion of their income on food (and still pay taxes), Dr. Bonnen calls the farm program "double-regressive." In his words: "A major share of the cost is borne by consumers with below-average incomes and a major share of the benefits is received by farm producers with above-average incomes."

On one hand, then, the government has been spending billions on a poverty program. On the other, it has been spending more billions to keep the price of the food consumed by the poor high.

This is especially contradictory in the case of the so-called wheat "certificate program," where the cost of a portion of the subsidy is directly paid for by the flour miller, and thus, the consumer. In most other cases, the subsidies needed to maintain a high price structure come out of general tax revenues.

Of course, Congressional advocates for the farmer still maintain that agriculture needs government assistance. It is the nation's biggest industry. Though the number of farmers has been declining, agriculture employed some 4.6 million people last year. In other words, more people are employed in farming than in transportation, the public utilities, the steel industry, and the automobile industry combined. Last year was the second best farmers have ever enjoyed. Their real income per farm was higher only once before, in 1966. Using 1957–59 dollars, the net income per farm in 1969 was $4,450, compared to $4,107 in 1968 and $4,563 in 1966.

Those figures may sound strangely low. They are. The averages cover not only the commercial farmers (over $10,000 in gross income) but the two million poor, part-time, semi-retired, and hobby farmers. And they do not include non-farm income. If they did, the figures would show that farmers came closer to their city cousins in income last year than ever before. On average, they had 75.7 per cent of the average non-farm income. That percentage was running around 50 per cent in the late 1950's and early 1960's. Remember, however, that the incomes of commercial farmers are much higher than the averages would suggest. Those farmers who have not had enough land, capital, or skill to make a good living—and have been getting only minor benefits from the commodity-oriented farm program—have been leaving the land.

Even so, current income isn't the whole story for the farm situation. The value of land, buildings, and equipment owned by farmers also has been rising; indeed it is going up rather handsomely.

On January 1, 1968, the average farm had real estate worth $62,053 and total production assets (real estate, livestock, machinery, motor vehicles, some other capital items) worth $79,223. That total was nine per cent higher than it was the year before. By January 1, 1969, those figures had jumped again—to $74,000 and $85,000—an increase—in only one year—of another 11 per cent.

In other words, farmers who own their property enjoy sizable capital gains as well as income, since the capital value of the average farm has more than doubled since 1960.

To be classified as a farm by the Census Bureau, a unit must have merely 10 acres and sales of $50 a year. Or it can have fewer than 10 acres and sales of more than $250.

So the averages above camouflage an enormous variation in the value of individual farms. Small hobby farms and moonlighting farms bring down the average values. Many small farms might be more appropriately termed rural residences, since the operators are almost wholly dependent on nonfarm or retirement income.

Those farms with gross sales of $20,000 to $39,999 have an average value of $132,000. And those with sales of $40,000 and above have an average value of $308,000. As these figures show commercial farms are no longer the rural equivalent of "mom and pop" stores. They are more like small manufacturing firms in the size of their capital assets.

To get the fairest comparison of how farmers are doing financially compared with their city brethren, economists combine both income and capital gain. This was done by the Department of Agriculture for the years 1966, 1964, and 1959.

The study's key findings are these:

In 1966, farmers earned, on the average, 81 per cent of what they might have earned by renting out their land and accepting nonfarm employment. They earned 96 per cent of what they would have made by selling their land, investing in common stocks, and working elsewhere. This was a major improvement over the farm "parity returns" of 1959 and 1964.

Farmers with over $20,000 gross income (income before expenses) did somewhat better than parity in 1966 under all methods of comparison.

The smaller farmers (those with less than $20,000 gross income from farming) earned less than parity returns under all methods of comparison and in all years tested.

Farmers in the lowest income group (under $5,000 gross sales) earned only one-third to two-fifths of parity returns, even in 1966.

This means that the bigger, more efficient farms are doing well. In 1966, the proprietor of such a farm got, on the average, 167 per cent of what his return would have been if he had sold his farm, invested the money in the stock market (taking his dividends), and put in (at $2.84 an hour) the same number of hours he worked on the farm. (The hourly pay was based on averages in non-farming industries.)

There were about 500,000 farms in the $20,000-and-more category in 1966. The number has been increasing over the years.

Another half million farms in the $10,000 to $19,999 bracket are within striking distance of parity. They got 81 to 98 per cent of a parity return, depending upon the standard used.

Those farms growing more than $20,000 worth of farm products accounted for some 68 per cent of all agricultural production in 1966. The $10,000-to-$19,999 group add another 17 per cent. So together these bigger farms produce 85 per cent of all farm products. The same percentage was true in 1969.

This leaves a mere 15 per cent of farm production for the two million farms making less than $10,000 gross. Some 1.3 million farms make less than $2,500 gross a year.

Looking over these facts, economists like to split the farm problem into two parts:

1. The Poor Farmer and Rural Poor. They should be helped to obtain new jobs. Various schemes to aid the rural poor are rather similar to those aimed at assisting the urban poor. President Nixon has a task force looking at this problem.

2. The Commercial Farmers. They are getting the bulk of the subsidy money. It is here that critical economists are asking such questions as these: Can subsidies be cut without overly damaging the financial position of the commercial farmer? Would a limitation on governmental payments be of some value in cutting costs? Could a change in farm policy reduce government costs?

Interviews with several leading farm economists indicate that the answer to all these questions is "yes."

Says Professor Schnittker: "Conventional farm programs can never help persons on small farms to the better life they want. Commodity-oriented agricultural policy must be designed principally for commercial full-time farmers."

Everyone eats. Indeed last year the average city family paid $1,173 at retail for its farm-originated foods. That was up from $1,118 in 1968. Of these amounts, the farmer got $447 last year, compared with $435 in 1968. Middlemen took the rest.

Thus, everyone, including legislators, should take an interest in farm policy. Despite this, most urban Congressmen find the farm program a big bore. For one thing it is extraordinarily—some say hopelessly—complicated.

"It is about the most complex program we have in government besides our defense program," says Senator Spessard L. Holland (D-Fla.), chairman of the Senate agricultural appropriations subcommittee.

But like it or lump it, this spring Congress must extend, replace, or let lapse the omnibus Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, which expires at the end of this year.

At this point, Congress has before it several farm bills. Representative Poage has a bill that would merely extend the life of the 1965 Act indefinitely. A coalition of 27 farm organizations, led by the National Grange, the National Farmers Union, and the National Farmers Organization, is pressing for extension of the 1965 Act, but with amendments that would add $1–1.5 billion a year to the present cost of the farm program.

The American Farm Bureau Federation, the largest and most conservative of the organizations, has proposed legislation which would phase out, over five years, the heart of the present program.

In its place, the Farm Bureau would retire at least 10 million acres a year until 1975, with emphasis on taking entire farms out of production. The government would offer to buy or lease so many acres each year, with some limitation on the amount of land that could be taken out of production in any single area. It would accept the lowest bids available.

At the end of the five-year period, according to the Farm Bureau proposal, a relatively free market for food and fiber would provide sufficiently high income for the remaining farmers.

Though the bill has been sponsored by 20 Senators and 42 House members, it is generally thought to have little chance of passage. Indeed, one of the sponsors, Representative Findley, believes an extension of the current act with some limitation on payments the most likely.

However, a talk with Representative Poage indicates that at least some features of a bill on the sidelines have a chance of being adopted. This is the Agriculture Department bill. Most observers are calling it an Administration bill, but the Administration gingerly disclaims paternity and prefers to call it a "consensus bill."

Chairman Poage, who is supposed to be part of that "consensus," finds only two features of the bill generally acceptable. One is the "set-aside" program, under which farmers could continue to divert a portion of their land from crop production, but with more freedom to use the remaining land to plant whatever crops they wished.

In addition, government subsidy payments to the farmer would be based on what the farmer produces. He would not be paid for setting aside the required acres, as he is under the current program.

Financially, the difference is negligible. The government payments to the farmer for his production can be enlarged to make up for the end of diversion payments. However, the farmer undoubtedly would feel that he is getting a higher price. And the political liability of paying farmers for not growing crops would disappear.

Poage describes the "set-aside" as "rather foolish, but something we can live with." He would rather have the present Act's more precise controls over production. He feels that something special might have to be worked out for cotton, a key crop in his state of Texas.

Though he prefers no limitation on payments at all, Poage would naturally choose the weak, sliding-scale limitation on payments in the Department of Agriculture bill to the stringent one introduced by Representative Conte.

There are other features of the Department's bill. It tightens budgetary control over the farm program. It gives the Department of Agriculture enormous leeway in setting loan rates and direct payments. It establishes three types of land-retirement programs. Just what portions of these suggestions will survive the legislative mill remains to be seen.

There has been some reform in the nation's farm program. Nine years ago the country faced a nightmare of surplus farm products. There were two billion bushels of corn in storage, enough grain sorghum to last a year and a half, enough wheat to fill domestic needs for two years. Grain was stored in every conceivable place, even on ships. Storage costs were a national scandal. The government actually owned $6 billion worth of farm commodities.

This was the result of a price-support program with ineffective limits on production. From 1961 onward, farm legislation was revised to bring production under control. There are still surpluses in storage, but nothing like those piled up in the Eisenhower Administration.

Most farm economists feel that now is an opportune time for further reform. Opinions vary, of course, as to what should be done. After examining the varied views, this observer concludes that the following changes should be made:

1. Congress should pass a low limit on payments—$5,000 or $10,000 per crop. It would not cause any major harm to the agricultural industry. It might retard the rise in land values for a while, but it would reduce the windfall of high subsidies to already prosperous big farmers.

2. Congress should launch another experiment in whole-farm land retirement, along with the annual acreage diversion system in the present farm program.

One provision in the Department of Agriculture bill provides for modest long-term land-retirement schemes. The government would pay to take complete farms out of production. The 1965 Act also included some land-retirement provisions. But Congress never funded that program. It has been suspicious of such schemes since the days of former Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson's "Soil Bank" program whose effects were concentrated in certain regions, thereby destroying economically whole towns and districts.

A new land-retirement scheme could be devised to avoid such concentrated damage. It offers the prospect of limiting production at less cost over the long term than the annual acreage-diversion route.

3. The Department of Agriculture has been spending some $200 million a year on so-called "conservation" programs. This money is used to share with the farmer the costs of various projects supposedly aimed at conserving soil and water resources. Actually some 60 per cent of it expands production.

So, on the one hand the government spends billions to restrain production; on the other, it spends a large sum to boost production. Congress should go along with the request of the Nixon Administration (and of the preceding Administration) to trim this rural pork-barrel program.

4. Any savings from such changes in the farm program should go toward rural development. The out-migration from rural areas has greatly diminished in recent years (there are fewer people to migrate). Nevertheless, government encouragement to industry to locate in less populated regions of the country could provide some jobs for ex-farmers near their original homes and prevent their migration to already crowded cities with their huge slums.

Adoption of the Nixon Administration's revolutionary welfare-reform proposals could also help stem the out-migration from rural areas. It would reduce the attraction of the relatively high welfare payments in northern cities.

There should also be programs to help marginal full-time farmers who want to change their occupation or retire.

5. Tighter budgetary control, as proposed by the Department of Agriculture, would make it easier to trim farm subsidies in the future. Though the trend to large farms is lamented by most farm organizations, it makes economic sense. Nor is it social nonsense, as farm groups claim, if rural development can be made successful.

Should adequate government help be provided for full-time small farmers, subsidies to commercial farmers should have lower priority than aid to the cities with their distressing problems.

A complete return to a free market for agriculture, however, is unlikely and undesirable. Even with fewer than half a million farms, agriculture would be too competitive and too productive. Farm income would be damaged beyond reason.

Congress is not expected to make dramatic reforms in the farm program this year. But it may nibble a bit. And those nibbles could turn out to be an appetizer for bigger bites later on.

## KERN COUNTY—NO. 1 IN PRODUCTION OF ROSES

### HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, Kern County, Calif., is the No. 1 rose-producing county in the Nation. Sixty to eighty percent of the Nation's bare root roses are grown there.

The distinction of being No. 1 has not come easy. It has taken years of research, development, and just plain hard work.

It is a beautiful sight to drive, during May or September, through the Shafter, Wasco, Delano, and McFarland areas and see all the different varieties of roses in bloom.

On April 21, I was happy to take part in a White House ceremony at which time a beautiful bouquet of roses and two rose bushes were presented to Mrs. Richard Nixon. Mr. John Davies, special assistant to the President, accepted the roses on behalf of the First Lady. The presentation of the roses was made by Mrs. Milton Whisler, the Nation's only woman rose hybridizer, and Mrs. James L. Scofield, hostess-producer of the "Sunny Today Show," KERO–TV in Bakersfield, on behalf of the Kern District California Federation of Women's Clubs.

The roses presented to Mrs. Nixon were grown and hybridized in Kern County by Mrs. Whisler. The four Kern County varieties are the nationally known signal red, "Red Skelton" rose, the "Treasure Chest," official rose of the Kern District Federated Women's Club; the brandnew "Sunny Today" rose, honoring all women in communications; and the "Germain's Centennial," symbolizing 100 years of rose progress through research in California.

Prior to leaving Bakersfield for their trip to Washington, the Kern County Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution designating Mrs. Dorothy Whisler and Mrs. Sunny Scofield as "Ambassadors of Kern County With Rose Portfolio." They were charged with the "duty and obligation to promote the rose industry and tell of the other many blessings we enjoy in this great land."

The two Kern County ambassadors are now traveling to London, England, to present Princess Margaret with the "Centennial" rose that has been developed in recognition of California's bicentennial.

While in London they will also present a rose to Buck Owens, one of Kern County's leading citizens, who will be appearing at the London Palladium.

I believe the resolution adopted by the Kern County Board of Supervisors will be of interest to all Members, and, therefore, I am inserting it in the RECORD at this time:

RESOLUTION DESIGNATING MRS. DOROTHY WHISLER AND MRS. SUNNY SCOFIELD AS AMBASSADORS OF KERN COUNTY WITH ROSE PORTFOLIO

Section 1. Whereas:

(a) During recent years Kern County has progressed to the status of a major center for the production of roses. We have now achieved the position of being Number One rose producing County in the Nation; and

(b) For hundreds of years these beautiful flowers have been symbolic of man's physical being tied to his spiritual entity;

(c) In the past year the Kern District, California's Federation of Women's Clubs has been actively promoting a program not only for the beautification of Kern County through the medium of encouraging increased planting of roses but also for drawing widespread attention to Kern County as the center of the rose growing industry;

(d) On April 20th Mrs. Dorothy Whisler, Director of Rose Research for the Gro-plant Industries, and Mrs. Sunny Scofield, Past-President of the Kern District CFWC, will travel to Washington, D.C. to present Mrs. Richard Nixon and daughters Patricia and Julie with roses grown in Kern County. From there they will journey to London, England, to present Princess Margaret Rose with the Centennial Rose which has been developed in recognition of California's Bi-Centennial. This widespread publicity of Kern County earns and deserves recognition not only by this Board of Supervisors but also from all the citizens of this County.

Section 2. Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Kern, State of California, as follows:

1. Mrs. Dorothy Whisler and Mrs. Sunny Scofield be, and they are hereby designated and appointed "Ambassadors of Kern County with Rose Portfolio" and they are charged with the duty and obligation to promote the rose industry and tell of the other many blessings we enjoy in this great land.

2. This Board urges all news media to assist in publicizing this effort by the Federated Women's Clubs and Gro-plant Industries as an example of the type of effort needed to promote Kern County.

APRIL 14, 1970.

VANCE A. WEBB,
*Chairman, Kern County Board of Supervisors.*
LEROY M. JACKSON,
*Supervisor.*
JOHN HOLT,
*Supervisor.*
DAVID S. FAIRBAIRN,
*Supervisor.*
MILTON MILLER,
*Supervisor.*
VERA K. GIBSON,
*Clerk of the Board.*

## MARTIN LUTHER KING EXPOSED

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, another American, Mrs. Julia Brown, has issued a statement on the feverished attempts by a few to glorify Martin Luther King.

Her statement follows:

AN ANTI-COMMUNIST NEGRO MAKES THIS APPEAL: PLEASE DON'T HELP GLORIFY MARTIN LUTHER KING

(By Mrs. Julia Brown)

(NOTE.—Mrs. Julia Brown spent more than nine years as a member of the Communist Party in Cleveland, Ohio, serving as an undercover operative for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. She "surfaced" in 1962, to testify in Washington about her experiences and to describe how the Communists plan to use Negroes as "cannon fodder" in their program of racial agitation. Today, she continues to risk her life on coast-to-coast speaking tours, exposing the Communist-led revolutionaries who pose "a clear and present danger" to Americans of every race.)

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, once called Martin Luther King "the most notorious liar in the country." I agree with him. But I also believe that Mr. King was one of the worst enemies my people ever had.

I know that it is considered poor taste to speak ill of the dead. But when someone served the enemies of our country while alive, and his name is still used by his comrades to promote anti-American activities, shouldn't people who know the truth speak out?

I learned many surprising things while I served in the Communist Party for the FBI. Communist leaders told us about the demonstrations that would be started, the protest marches, the demands that would be made for massive federal intervention. Every Communist was ordered to help convince American Negroes that we are no better off than slaves. Wherever we went and whatever we did, we were to promote race consciousness and resentment, because the Communists know that the technique of *divide and conquer* really works.

We were also told to promote Martin Luther King, to unite Negroes and whites behind him, and to turn him into some sort of national hero. We were to look to King as the *leader* in this struggle, the Communists said, because he was on our side!

I know they were right, because while I was in the Communist Party I learned that Martin Luther King attended a Communist training school. I learned that several of his aides and assistants were Communists, that he received funds from Communists, and that he was taking directions from Communists.

Most Americans never look at the Communist press in this country. If they did, they would learn that the Communists loved Martin Luther King. He was one of their biggest heroes. And I know for a fact the Communists would never have promoted him, financed him, and supported him if they couldn't trust him. He carried out their orders just as slavishly as Party members in Cleveland, Ohio.

Martin Luther King may never have carried a Communist Party membership card. That's not important. Most of the people the Communists counted on to further their work were not official members of the Communist Party. But I am as certain as I can be that he knew what he was doing! And I am just as certain that the drive to glorify him now is just as much a Communist project. Through it, the Communists expect to raise millions of dollars to help further their programs, to gain even wider acceptance for their campaign of civil turmoil, and to further divide the American public.

But none of this has to happen. Although many Americans are still deceived about Martin Luther King, more and more are learning the truth. I want to assure every reader that what I've said here is the truth. I urge everyone to investigate this crucial issue further. Please *make sure of the truth.* For it is only through honest information and sincere efforts that the problems this country faces can be solved.

This pamphlet is being distributed as a public service by the nationwide network of TACT Committees. Our purpose is simply to help spread the Truth About Civil Turmoil. We believe that good Americans of every race and of every religion should know that flagrant lawlessness, violence-producing "nonviolence," racist cries about "white racism," and repeated demands for "massive federal intervention" are part of a Communist program for a Communist conquest.

We hope the information in this brochure will cause more Americans to reflect on the real nature and the subversive intent of the campaign to confer "sainthood" on a man who collaborated closely with Communists, who accepted directions and funds from Communists, and who furthered Communist purposes all of his adult life.

For more information on this important issue, we recommend the following materials. All of them can be ordered through our Committee or by writing directly to our national headquarters:

The Civil Rights Packet, a collection of articles and pamphlets, including two Communist booklets and the outstanding study, *Color, Communism and Common Sense* by Manning Johnson, a Negro and former top Communist. ($1.00)

The TACT Packet, eight articles and pamphlets on civil turmoil, plus the definitive study of the "civil rights" movement, *It's Very Simple* by Alan Stang. ($1.00)

I Testify, by Mrs. Julia Brown, the autobiography of one of America's bravest patriots and a stirring account of courage, determination, and dedication to freedom. ($1.50)

The Sandersville Story, a brief pamphlet on the terrorist tactics used by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in Sandersville, Georgia, to force Negroes to accept the creation of a socialist community—*a soviet!* (10 copies for $1.00)

## NATIONAL SECRETARIES WEEK

### HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues that the week of April 19–25, 1970, has been designated as

National Secretaries Week throughout the Nation. This is the week when businessmen everywhere acknowledge the vital assistance of the secretarial profession in today's world and tomorrow's future. Through their profession, secretaries are accepting vital responsibilities and are performing important roles in commerce, industry, education, and government.

I am delighted to add my heartiest congratulations and sincerest support to the secretaries who are honored by the designation of National Secretaries Week. It is wonderful that the rightful recognition is being given to them.

---

## CHANGES IN PUERTO RICO POLITICAL FIELD

---


### HON. JORGE L. CÓRDOVA

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES


*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. CÓRDOVA. Mr. Speaker, the matter of Puerto Rico politics and Puerto Rico economics is frequently focused upon by the news media. This is natural, I suppose, because change is news, and change and forward progress have come to characterize Puerto Rico.

Not less than the progress of our institutions and the industrialization being developed in the islands, is the progress being made in our political direction.

Statehood to cement Puerto Rico to the United States as an integral and fully participating part is gaining strength in the island. The time is not yet ripe, but surely it is coming when the great preponderance of our people will clearly express its will in this sense.

Because of the demonstrated interest of our colleagues in Puerto Rico, I include at this point an article from the March 22, 1970, Los Angeles Times by Lloyd O. Wadleigh, professor of economics at Carroll College, now in the fifth year of a 20-year project to study the economic and political development of Puerto Rico.

Despite some minor errors—for instance the percentage of the vote for Commonwealth in the 1967 plebiscite is erroneously lowered by 2 percent, and the percentage of the vote for independence is correspondingly increased—Mr. Wadleigh's article shows an awareness of the changes that are taking place in the political field in Puerto Rico.

The article follows:

TOPICAL COMMENT: STATE OR NATION? PUERTO RICO NEARS ITS CROSSROADS

(By Lloyd O. Wadleigh)

Political forces in Puerto Rico have been polarized in the last two years. The issue at hand is the island's status in relation to the United States. Three questions are at hand: Should the island remain in its present unique commonwealth status, voluntarily associated with the United States? Should it seek to become the 51st state in the United States? Should it seek complete independence?

These questions came into sharp detail with the election of Gov. Luis A. Ferre in November 1968. Ferre, the leader of the New Progressive Party (NPP), has long been an advocate of Puerto Rico's seeking statehood. This attitude is in sharp contrast to the position taken by former Gov. Luis Munoz Marin, the leader of the Popular Democratic Party (PDP) and the chief architect of the Commonwealth concept.

Munoz Marin firmly believes that maintenance of the present status is to the distinct advantage of the people of Puerto Rico, both economically and culturally. Opposing both of these positions is a very active minority (Independistas) made up of several political parties who wish to sever all ties with the United States and to become a completely independent nation.

Since the election of Gov. Ferre it has become quite evident that the plebiscite of July 1, 1967, did not correctly picture the attitudes of the Puerto Rican people. At that time 58% of those voting favored continuing the present commonwealth status; 39% voted for statehood; and 3% desired independence. Those parties which advocated independence urged their members to boycott the plebiscite, knowing that they were in a very weak minority at that time.

PARTY SPLITS APART

What has happened since the 1968 election has been a split in the PDP which had staunchly supported the commonwealth status. It is very evident to anyone familiar with and in close contact with the political scene in Puerto Rico that a sizeable minority (perhaps as high as 30%) of the PDP members were Independistas at heart. These incipient Independistas have now joined one or more of the groups advocating independence, and have become much more vocal and active.

This movement has frightened many of the moderate members of the PDP and driven them into the camp of the NPP. Gov. Ferre stated in an interview Jan. 9, 1970, that he felt that the NPP, which polled less than 50% of the vote in the 1968 election, now has the support of nearly 65% of the voters. On the strength of this change, plans are being discussed for another plebiscite in the near future. Ferre feels confident that the majority of the people will favor Puerto Rico making its move to seek statehood. He feels that the move should take place in seven or eight years.

What would be the economic consequences of such a change in status? Having spent the month of January in Puerto Rico pursuing the answer to this question, I would have to admit a change in the position which I had developed over the period of the previous four years of research into the economic development of Puerto Rico.

I went to Puerto Rico on Jan. 3 convinced that it would be dangerous for the Puerto Rican economy to have its political status changed from the present commonwealth. I left the island on Jan. 31 assured in my own mind that the dilemma facing the people of Puerto Rico can be constructively resolved through a well-planned route leading ultimately to statehood. Upon considerable reflection since leaving the island, it now appears that the ultimate date should be in the present decade.

Those who advocate independence for Puerto Rico do so for three apparent reasons. First, there is a radical left wing group looking with favor on a "Castro-like" revolution against the "Yankee capitalists." Second, there is a group which feels that they and their island are being exploited and if there were the political power of independence this could be prevented. Third, there is a very emotional group which feels that the economic progress that has come and will continue under either continued commonwealth or eventual statehood will be at the cost of a complete loss of the Spanish cultural identity which they greatly treasure.

What all of these groups overlook is that without the privilege of free migration to and from the U.S. mainland, which is inherent in their present U.S. citizenship, the stabilization of the island's population so essential to past and future economic development would be impossible.

There is no question in my mind that any serious consideration of independence would be an economic disaster for Puerto Rico. In fact, the surfacing of the incipient Independistas from the PDP has encouraged the more radical fringe of this motley group to resort to acts of sabotage and disruption in the past year. These acts, being publicized widely in the United States, have created doubts in the minds of both prospective tourists and investors. These doubts have been significant contributing factors to the serious decline in tourism in the present season and the marked slowdown in the establishing of new plants on the island by continentally based corporations.

The publicity given to the independence movement and the minority anti-American attitude has blown their significance way out of proportion and raised the spectre of ultimate confiscation of American capital if independence was gained. This element of uncertainty is very costly but could be overcome by an overwhelming vote in favor of statehood in the forthcoming plebiscite.

The supporters of continued commonwealth status rightfully point with pride to the economic development which has taken place since its founding in 1953. They contend that only the ability to offer complete freedom from taxation for periods of 10 to 17 years has made this development possible. They point to the fact that under statehood firms operating in Puerto Rico would be subject to both U.S. income and excise taxes.

They feel, therefore, that there would be a severe cutback in the rate of industrialization on the island. This, they contend, would make it impossible to reduce the very high unemployment rate, variously estimated to be realistically in the range of 20–30%. The supporters of the status quo feel that statehood would make it impossible to raise the major segment of the island's population from the severe poverty in which it has been trapped.

The supporters of statehood, on the other hand, have many telling responses to these contentions. First of all, they point out that with taxation comes representation, and hence the ability to make more substantial the amount of federal funds that could be brought onto the island state under the many anti-poverty programs. This would be particularly significant if currently proposed guaranteed family income plans were to be put into operation.

The statehood group also points to existing regional economic development programs such as the ones in Appalachia and the Northern Woods area of the Midwest. They feel assured that these programs would easily offset the incidence of federal taxes.

The second point which this group makes is that under statehood the uncertainty of American investors about the status and safety of their assets would be removed. In addition they can point, with telling effect, to the great surge of investment that has taken place in Hawaii since it became a state. This has also been true in Alaska, although to a lesser degree.

Certainly these points were very influential in my own case. I am now convinced that, on the timetable proposed, statehood would accelerate the rate of economic development of the island.

ADVANCED ATTITUDE

In addition, there is a new attitude and philosophy of economic development in the Economic Development Administration of Puerto Rico (EDA). There is a definite feeling that it is time to leave the "operation bootstrap" era behind and to make every effort to bring about a more balanced industrial community that has in it all of the

industrial elements found in every viable industrial center in the United States.

One cannot help but be impressed by the new attitude as expressed by Jose Caldas, the executive assistant to the administrator of the EDA. When asked if it would be feasible for firms to locate in Puerto Rico if it were to become a state, he replied that in his years in the feasibility division of EDA he had learned that it was the role of the EDA to find the way to make each particular proposed project feasible. He was sure that this role would continue to be met regardless of the political status in the future. He went on to note that no state in the Union ever became industrialized until after it had become a state.

The first step in the movement toward closer political ties with the United States would be extension of the power to vote for the President of the United States to the Puerto Rican people. There is a special committee appointed jointly by President Nixon and Gov. Ferre studying the question. The committee will make recommendations if it is found that this is a possible move. The second step would be a plebiscite to see if a majority of the Puerto Rican people now desire statehood. If they do, then they must follow the trail blazed by Hawaii and Alaska.

## CADETS SHUN STRIFE ON CAMPUS

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the responsibilities of a Member in which I take great personal pride and satisfaction is to nominate young men from my congressional district to our service academies. The young men who are accepted are outstanding Americans in which the Nation can be justifiably proud. Therefore, it was with great interest that I noted an article in the Tuesday, April 21, Chicago Tribune by its New York correspondent, William Fulton commenting on the educational programs and atmosphere at West Point:

CADETS SHUN STRIFE ON CAMPUS

(By William Fulton)

WEST POINT, N.Y., April 20.—Education goes forward at the United States Military academy, unruffled by the turmoil at Cornell, Columbia, Harvard, and other institutions of higher learning along the eastern seaboard. Applications this spring total 6,000, an all-time high despite anti-war sentiment among young men the country over.

West Point opened with a total enrollment of two cadets in 1802 and is expanding to 4,417 by July 1972. Today's candidates will become the generals of the year 2000 unless by the turn of the century mankind has figured out a way of resolving disputes other than by military means.

Brig. Gen. John R. Jannarone, dean of the academy, said in an interview that for the last 10 years the institution had been revising and expanding its curriculum, not only to keep abreast of modern education but also to train men for the highly complicated involvements abroad.

Next year the academy will increase its elective courses from 130 to 140, including a brand new one in ecology, the relation of living organisms to their environment, highly important in the pollution era. The cadet may choose from the physical sciences, economics, political science, history management, business administration, and public affairs.

DUTIES MORE COMPLEX

West Point initiated its first foreign language laboratories.

"It should be recognized that the army's duties are becoming more complex" explained Gen. Jannarone, No. 1 graduate of the 1938 class and commander of a combat engineers battalion in the Pacific during World War II.

"We have political responsibilities, overseas; people in foreign countries, military assistance programs, and missions, besides the actual presence of troops in Germany, North Atlantic Treaty bases, and Viet Nam. We are trying to give our young men a solid basis for the future."

Jannarone noted that 75 percent of West Point's young officers go to graduate schools around the nation to follow their special interests after their first tours of military duty.

FLOOD OF APPLICATIONS

Col. Manley Rogers, director of admissions, said the flood of 1,000 more applications than last year showed there was a sizable number of youths in the country who want an orderly existence.

Rogers disclosed that a special effort is now under way to help young Negroes enter the academy. A black admissions officer is assigned for the first time to this field. He is Maj. Cornell McCollum, a Viet Nam veteran. Forty-five blacks entered this year's pledge class compared with nine last year.

IGNORE STUDENT REBELLION

"The student rebellion doesn't bother us," said Rogers.

He recalled that a group of Cornell students planned a protest march on West Point and then gave it up. A crowd of Vassar girls did attempt to storm the citadel, but the whole demonstration evaporated when cadets mingled with the marchers and dated them.

A stroll with a cadet along Flirtation Walk—just starting to burgeon out in springtime glory—should cure most coeds of revolutionary tendencies.

## OUTSTANDING COMMUNITY SERVICE

### HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to outstanding community service that has resulted in national recognition for Knoxville and Morristown, Tenn.

Both cities are mong 15 finalists in a national community improvement program cosponsored by the General Federation of Women's Clubs and the Sears Roebuck Foundation.

An entry submitted by the Ossoli Circle of Knoxville and a joint entry by four Morristown clubs—Somo Sala Circle, Ladies Reading Circle, Junior Reading Circle, and Child Welfare Circle—are being judged to determine national ratings. Needless to say, I am rooting for these two fine towns and hope their scores are at the top of the list.

## COMMUTER RAIL SERVICE

### HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my very good friend David A. Sutherland, a member of the house of delegates from Fairfax County, Va., has advised me of his strong support, with which I concur completely, of a commuter railroad program to serve displaced Navy employees and the southwest employment area.

Mr. Sutherland's efforts toward instituting low-cost commuter rail service were greatly strengthened by GSA Administrator Robert L. Kunzig, who, by letter of April 8, urged Transportation Secretary Volpe to explore use of rail transportation for commuters between Union Station and Alexandria, Va., or beyond.

Mr. Sutherland feels Mr. Kunzig's letter represents a real breakthrough for those like himself who for years have been pressing for commuter trains on existing track as a quick solution to the area's traffic crisis. Mr. Kunzig's task force determined that relocating 10,000 Navy employees from the District of Columbia to Crystal Mall in Arlington could produce a total of 122,000 vehicles per day in the Route 1 corridor, and that the problem would be compounded as highway construction in the Pentagon complex progresses. Unless something is done quickly, Mr. Sutherland believes commuters to and from Mount Vernon, Lee, and Springfield will find it impossible to get through Alexandria and Arlington en route to and from the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I believe our colleagues would be interested in Mr. Kunzig's analysis of this problem, and I insert the text of his letter to Secretary Volpe in full at this point in the RECORD:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
*Washington, D.C., April 8, 1970.*

Hon. JOHN A. VOLPE,
*Secretary of Transportation,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know I have established a Task Force to assist in the relocation of 12,000 Federal employees from Main Navy and Munitions Buildings to Northern Virginia. I have directed this group to concern itself with the individual employee and to undertake every action possible to minimize inconvenience to these people resulting from the relocation.

The Task Force has concerned itself with the problems inherent in the move and one of the most important is the transportation situation. I gratefully acknowledge that several members of your Department are currently working with the Task Force assisting in the study of various methods to improve transportation to the Jefferson Davis corridor area in Northern Virginia and to the Southwest section of the District of Columbia.

At the present time, existing highway facilities along the Route 1 corridor (Jefferson Davis Highway) are inadequate to handle the large volume of traffic being generated by the 9,000 Federal people currently working in the area. With the relocation of approximately 10,500 more employees, many of

whom will be using these roads, I am sure you will agree that the situation will become even more difficult.

At a recent public hearing held in Arlington, Virginia, by the Virginia Highway Department, it was reported that the vehicular traffic along the portion of the highway near Crystal Mall presently has a volume of 63,000 vehicles per day and this traffic is expected to increase to 122,000 vehicles per day in the near future. I am further advised that planned improvements scheduled by the Virginia Highway Department appear to be several years away.

In an effort to alleviate the situation, it has been recommended to me that commuter rail service be instituted, primarily during the period of the construction of the rapid transit system, to ease the burden on the highways created by personal automobiles.

I am fully aware of recent surveys and studies which were conducted about the use of railroads for commuter service in the Washington area. They include the Washington Area Pilot Transportation Study by the Senate Public Works Committee published in 1969; the Staff Report on Commuter Rail Service conducted by the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission in 1969; the Transit Survey conducted by the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission and the Richmond-Fredericksburg and Potomac Railroad in 1966; and the Staff Report of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority of April 1969.

It appears that great time and effort have gone into these studies. However, I believe that a new look into this method of transportation should be made at this time in light of the fact that the Federal population has and is increasing substantially in these areas. I further believe that, with a concerted effort by both of us, the institution of low cost commuter rail service can be accomplished.

Therefore, I am asking that your Administrator for Urban Mass Transportation, Mr. Carlos Villarreal, explore the use of rail service in the Washington area especially between Union Station and Alexandria, Virginia, or beyond, using the Richmond-Fredericksburg and Potomac Railroad for this purpose. A turn-around by these trains could serve a useful purpose by bringing commuters to work in the District of Columbia from the Alexandria, Virginia, area further relieving the overcrowded highway situation.

Your early consideration of this matter will be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. KUNZIG,
*Administrator.*

## THE ARMS TRADE—PART XI

### HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, last Friday's New York Times carried an article that once again demonstrates the urgent need to curb and control the international trade in arms.

In this particular case, we learn that the Pentagon in fiscal year 1970 plans to double the quantity of arms to the Greek dictatorship.

We are providing these arms in contravention of our own 1967 self-imposed curb on deliveries of "major" weapons to the regime. This increase was not and still has not been approved by Congress. There is little doubt that these arms are to be used to entrench the junta in power and to suppress the last vestiges of free expression that remain at large in the country.

To control this kind of mischief will require the passage of legislation. A beginning has been made in an amendment to H.R. 15628 submitted by myself and Mr. REUSS. Both the amendment and the bill passed the House and are now being considered by the Senate.

This amendment asks the President to institute a thorough review of our entire military aid program; to take the necessary steps to begin multilateral talks with other great powers on controlling the trade in conventional arms, to initiate a general debate in the United Nations on the subject, and to use the power and prestige of his office to work toward controlling the trade. If this amendment were law, it would be less likely that the Pentagon could get away with such an act as this.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 17, 1970]

PENTAGON DOUBLES ARMS AID TO ATHENS DESPITE RESTRICTION

(By Tad Szulc)

WASHINGTON, April 16.—Despite United States restrictions on arms shipments to the Greek junta, the Defense Department is reported to have secretly supplied this year nearly twice the amounts of military aid to Greece authorized by Congress.

The United States imposed the curb on deliveries of "major" military items to Greece in 1967 to show its displeasure over the overthrow of the government by the army.

However, the nature of this curb has never been publicly defined and the flow of equipment has continued at levels considerably above those approved by Congress under the military assistance program.

At the same time, the Administration is considering lifting altogether the embargo on military deliveries to Greece, reportedly under the pressure of the Defense Department, which is concerned over the situation in the Eastern Mediterranean, where the Soviet Union has been building up its fleet.

Figures made available in Congressional quarters showed that while Congress had authorized $24,498,000 in military aid to Greece in the 1970 fiscal year, the Pentagon plans to deliver additional equipment worth $20-million from stocks described as surplus.

Figures obtained here also showed that in the 1969 fiscal year the Pentagon quietly gave $470-million in surplus armaments to the four "forward defense countries"—Nationalist China, South Korea, Turkey and Greece—in addition to the total of $350-million in military aid approved by Congress.

The principal beneficiary was Nationalist China, which received about $157-million from this total, while Greece received nearly $26-million in 1969 on top of the authorized deliveries of $37,531,000.

Congressional sources said that the Pentagon set a "utility value" on the material of 25 per cent to 30 per cent of the cost, even if the equipment was new. Congressional experts have adopted the method of multiplying the utility figures by four to arrive at the cost of the surplus shipments.

The Pentagon's actions have raised indignation among many members of Congress, who consider their authority disregarded by the department. But the Greek situation has international implications as well because of the strong sentiment in Western Europe against the authoritarian practices of the Athens junta.

Today, Senator Stephen M. Young introduced legislation requiring the Pentagon to make "complete and prior disclosure of all proposed disposals of surplus weapons."

The Ohio Democrat cited Nationalist China and Greece as the countries where, "through the surplus disposal program, Pentagon officials have been secretly subsidizing at least two tyrannical dictatorships without any advance information given to Congress nor any authorization sought nor secured."

The restriction on arms to Greece was imposed by the Johnson Administration after the colonels overthrew the constitutional regime on April 21, 1967, and it has thus far been maintained by the Nixon Administration.

Under this ban, Greece is denied so-called "heavy" items, such as tanks and combat aircraft. But neither Administration has defined what items are considered "heavy."

In 1966, before the restrictions were applied, the total military aid to Greece was about $90-million.

$55 MILLION IN MINOR ITEMS

Although the government said that only spare parts, trucks and minor items were being provided after the coup, Greece received $44-million in 1967 and $55-million in 1968.

Officials here were unable to explain at the time how this "marginal" aid could amount to such high figures.

Following the invasion of Czechoslovakia by Soviet-bloc armies in August 1968, the United States temporarily lifted the Greek embargo as it sought to encourage the allied countries to build up their defenses. As a result, Greece received in 1969 about $63-million in military aid, of which $26-million was from the surplus stocks.

## OPPORTUNITY IN AMERICA

### HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, America is still the land of opportunity for anyone who is willing to try. If skills are lacking vocational training is available at public expense. If job change is involved vocational retraining is available also at public expense.

As the following significant statement from the Warner & Swasey Co. expresses so well, America is still the land of opportunity. It is not and cannot become the land of the free ride, or the productive genius that has brought economic prosperity to this great land will wither on the vine.

The statement follows:

YOU CANNOT CURE POVERTY WITH MONEY: STATEMENT BY WARNER & SWASEY

If that's all it took, there wouldn't be a single poor neighborhood . . . America has been pouring out money by the tens and scores of billions. But that's like trying to cure a serious disease with aspirin—it helps lull the pain for a little while, but then it's back again, and worse.

Poverty can *only* be cured by *production* and the more and better you produce, the farther and more happily you get away from poverty.

But you can't get work? Who says so? Study the Help Wanted columns. Ask your neighbor or that company down the street if they want their windows washed (*clean*) or floors swept (*neatly*) or errands run (*courteously*). Oh, you meant you can't get work of the sort you like, at the pay you want? Take what you can get, learn something better as you work—and you'll *grow into* what you like,

and earn what you want . . . that's the way everybody else had to do it.

There are more jobs in America than people able and anxious to fill them. Learn to fill one and to do it well.

America is full of *wants*. Fill the first one you can find (and you only need look, honestly)—fill it to the best of your ability, learn as you go—and you'll be *on your way*.

## ONE SIDE OF THE PESTICIDE QUESTION

## Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, we are constantly being bombarded with information on the question of air and water pollution. As with any debate, there are always two sides to a question. I would like to share with my colleagues the following article entitled "An Ecologist Views the Environment" which presents one side of the pollution question as it involves pesticides:

AN ECOLOGIST VIEWS THE ENVIRONMENT

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Dr. Donald A. Spencer is one of the country's outstanding authorities on wildlife biology. A Colorado native, he has been a practicing biologist for more than 40 years.

He earned his B.A. degree in Biological Sciences from the University of Denver in 1926, his M.S. degree in Animal Ecology from the University of Chicago in 1930, and his Ph.D. in Ecology from the University of Colorado in 1958.

The first 34 years of his long professional career was with the Fish and Wildlife Service of the U.S. Department of Interior. In this service he conducted extensive research in wildlife programs across the country. As newlyweds, Dr. Spencer and his wife, Alice, started housekeeping in nomadic fashion as they established camp after camp from the prairie lands to the mountains, as he took his assignments as a trouble shooter for the Service.

The Spencers are particularly fond of the "high country," even though it involved strenuous backpacking from base camp to remote regions for weeks at a time to study wildlife problems.

Dr. Spencer spent his last 5 years of public service as Chief Staff Officer of Animal Biology in the Pesticide Regulation Division of the Agricultural Research Service. The author has written articles for a number of scientific journals and popular publications, including National Geographic Magazine. He holds membership in the Wildlife Society; American Society of Mammalogists; British Ecological Society; International Association for Great Lakes Research; and the American Association for Advancement of Science.

INTRODUCTION

During recent years, there has been much misunderstanding about pesticides with relation to the environment and the role they play in American society.

Life and health are two important, vital processes in our environment. Pesticides serve as an important aid to continuous, daily survival.

Dr. Spencer, in presenting the *true* role of pesticides, has written his views in four parts—*Pollution, Pesticides and Runoff, Pesticides and Birds,* and *Pesticides and Fish.*

In every part—each having detailed facts and figures—Dr. Spencer concludes that environmental benefits are derived from the use of pesticides.[1]

POLLUTION

Pesticides are a small segment of the larger problem of pollution from all sources. Most pesticide chemicals are organic compounds that, in varying intervals, are degraded by other chemicals, by light, by heat, and by tens of thousands of living organisms (called detritus feeders). Thousands of chemicals, the end products of industrialized civilization, are to be found in our air, soils, and water.

Unless a broad approach is taken to all these pollutants, it is impossible to predict the metabolites that may be formed or the persistence of residues. Every estuary is different—the product of the activities in its drainage basin. The fauna and flora of the bottom silts differ in species composition according to the wastes delivered to the area. As the character of those wastes changes, so do the populations exposed to them. Change and adjustment is a basic law in Nature.

But there is another more immediate reason for including *all* pollution in this discussion. Most people have little knowledge of chemical and pharmacological action and are naturally disturbed by the implication of disaster. Maybe we can put things in proper perspective by talking about a type pollution with which we are all familiar. For example, some legislators have proposed bills which would ban fossil-burning (i.e., gas, oil, and coal) electric generating plants. Can you imagine how popular an abrupt action of that type would be when your lights went out and your refrigerator stopped working?

*Environmental improvement*

Pollution, and its correction, involves (1) basic technology, (2) economic considerations, and (3) adjustments in social behavior. We are dealing with a matter of good housekeeping. It begins with the personal habits of individuals. What does your room, your home, or the picnic area you have just left look like? How much effort and what percent of your own money can you invest to handle the problem of wastes? There are no bystanders. Everyone is directly involved, even when the subject is restricted to pesticides.

We have problems with pesticides. Most are local in nature, and progressively corrected. We'll continue to have "controllable" problems in the environment. The tens of thousands of species of living organisms in this environment form too complex a problem to be solved completely by pre-use studies of chemicals.

*Better conditions now*

Many segments of our environment are better today than they were 40 years ago. For example, the Thames River in England supported a thriving anadromous fishery until the invention of the "water closet" in the mid-1800s. The Thames then became an open sewer in which fish could not live. A recent report in Nature states that pollution has lessened so that this fishery is slowly returning.

On our own coast, the striped bass have returned to the Chesapeake Bay in record numbers to spawn. In that same bay, blue crab are expected to provide a harvest in 1970 unequaled in recent years. Yes—these waters are polluted and need some corrective action—but a disaster they are not.

*Oceans trouble free*

It is difficult to relate limited laboratory studies to field conditions. Even men in responsible positions have referred to a paper published in *Science* that permits the reader to conclude that the oxygen supply of the human race may be endangered by the effect of DDT on marine plankton.

This laboratory study on four species of marine phytoplankton found that 1 part per billion of DDT had no effect, but that 10 ppb seriously interfered with photosynthesis.

While there are several inconsistencies in this limited study, the principal point that has been overlooked is that the levels of DDT plus its metabolites in ocean waters are reported to be only 1 part per trillion or less. Levels are not expected to rise above this figure even if regulated uses continue. Thus, the alarm has been sounded about a residue 1,000 times less than the no effect level.

*Land produces more*

What measure do we have of the quality of lands around us? We know that today one farm worker provides food for himself and nearly 50 other people. And, he is accomplishing this on 83 million acres less than in 1950!

Food production per unit of land is up—way up! Is this at the expense of wildlife? Is wildlife disappearing? Certainly not. It is a fact that lands capable of producing game are shrinking every year as our cities, roads, airports, and industries sprawl over the countryside.

Nevertheless, there is more game today than 30 years ago—much more.

To the contrary notwithstanding, man is a good husbandman! Where it would take "Nature" many centuries to repair the ravages of a forest fire (many caused by electric storms), Forest Service crews are on the job almost before the ashes cool, broadcasting grass seed to stop erosion and planting seedling trees.

No one values top soil as does the farmer. He fights erosion by wind and water with contour rows, terracing, and shelter belts.

The picture is brighter than you might think, but it doesn't preclude trouble spots. It does, however, support the thesis that we are faced with *problems, not a disaster.*

*Monitoring program*

To maintain that status, a nationwide monitoring program is in progress. It seeks to ascertain the levels of pesticide chemicals in soils, inland waters, marine estuaries, air, standing crops, food prepared for the table, man, domestic livestock, wild birds and their eggs, fish, and shellfish.

The purpose is two-fold. First, it pinpoints those pesticide usages that have an adverse effect on nontarget areas or organisms, so that we can correct a local problem before it becomes critical. Second, by repeat sampling of the same area at stated intervals, it determines if residues are accumulating as the result of annual applications.

We can avoid trouble by recognizing early signs. In this respect, monitoring is like a dental or health checkup. This infant program may locate some real sore spots, such as the actionable residues of DDT in fish in Lake Michigan, the Delaware River, the Tom Bigbee River, and the Sacramento drainage. But the bulk of the drainages sampled have shown no immediate problem.

*Residues nonprogressive*

Generally speaking, the programs thus far have not established that background levels of the chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides are increasing as the result of 15 to 25 years of use. Rather, they show that the environmental residues we observe have reached a static balance between continued degradation of the pesticide and the annual input.

We must not sweep any of our problems under the rug. On the other hand, we have the obligation to insist that regulation and control of pesticides be based on sound information and the benefit/risk equation soberly evaluated.

Emotion is a pollutant we cannot live with.

PESTICIDES AND RUNOFF

Judicious agricultural use of chlorinated hydrocarbons does not significantly contribute to the contamination of flowing streams.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Such insecticides strongly resist movement once they are incorporated in soils. In general, water removes pesticides only by eroding the soil itself. They are not leached by water to the lower layers of the soil, and they do not contaminate wells by underground movement. We must not move precipitously to substitutes that have greater soil mobility.

Along 800 river miles to the Lower Mississippi, and at multiple sites along its tributaries, the U.S. Department of Agriculture monitored streambed materials in 1964, 1966, and 1967 for chlorinated hydrocarbon residues. Adjoining lands have a long history of intensive agricultural use of pesticides. Significant pesticide contamination of the river bottom was found to be *very* localized, associated with one chemical manufacturing operation, and just downstream from five small pesticide formulating plants in Mississippi. Otherwise, the study concludes that, ". . . the large amounts of chlorinated hydrocarbons previously applied to crops in the Mississippi River Delta have not created widespread contamination of streambed materials." The report also states, "There is no buildup or increasing pesticide contamination of the sediments in the lower Mississippi River."

*Low contamination*

The U.S. Geological Survey has, for many years, monitored streams of the Western United States. Where monthly water samples from 21 sites were taken over a 2-year period (October 196[illegible] to September 1968), investigators report, "Pesticide concentrations found were never in excess of the permissible limits established for public water supplies by the National Technical Advisory Committee to the Secretary of the Interior." [2] According to data in the report, 51 percent of the 333 water samples analyzed disclosed no residues for nine chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides and three phenoxy herbicides (i.e. *less* than 10 parts per trillion). The range of individual insecticides in the positive samples was 0.01 to 0.12 parts per billion, with the average only 0.018 parts per billion. Stated another way, 62.5 percent of the water samples contained no detectable chlorinated insecticide residues. Of the remaining positive samples, 66 percent were at the minimum detectable level of *10 parts per trillion.*

The statement is often made that "eventually most of man's waste products find their way to the sea." This statement has been repeatedly applied to the problem of persistent pesticides. It is correct to say that some of these wastes reach the sea, but very incorrect to say *"most".*

Photo, chemical, and biodegradation set in promptly after an organic compound is released into the environment. In the course of its travel downstream, much of this waste is recycled into energy components. Pesticide residues in streambed materials taper off sharply below the point of introduction.

*No pesticide buildup*

In the monitoring study of pesticides in California bays and estuaries,[3] John C. Modin states, "Expected high levels of pesticides were not found in San Francisco Bay, the terminating point for Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers which drain over 6 million acres of agricultural land in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys."

During the last 4 years, the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has monitored the residue levels of 10 of the most commonly used organochlorine pesticides from about 170 permanent stations in estuaries on the Atlantic, Gulf and Pacific Coasts.[4]

The oyster, soft clam, or any of several mussels were employed as sensing agents. An oyster for example, can "pump" 16 liters of water per hour through its system to extract plankton and organic debris which it uses as food. Under controlled conditions, it has been determined that an oyster will accumulate DDT and its metabolites when they occur in water at 0.1 parts per billion, and store up to 70,000 times this amount. DDT residue is lost from the oyster almost as readily as it is gained. It is thus an excellent organism for recording the rise and fall of pesticide contaminants of its environment.

With the assistance of many State cooperators, over 5,000 oyster samples have now been analyzed.

In the estuaries of the State of Washington, only 3 percent of the monthly-collected oyster samples were found to contain organochlorine insecticides. In the State of Maine, only 10 percent of the oyster samples contained detectable amounts (limit: *less* than 10 ppb). All of the positive samples in either of these States were below 50 ppb.

Oyster samples from estuaries in Alabama, California, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Mississippi, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia often contained DDT and its metabolites, but in amounts usually less than 0.5 ppm. This is all the more remarkable when you consider that the levels recorded in the oysters have a potential of being 70,000 times that found in the water. These studies emphasize the very low escape of these pesticides to seas, and *no evidence of continuing accumulation.*

Barthel [5] says, ". . . the large amounts of chlorinated hydrocarbons previously applied to crops in the Mississippi River Delta have not created widespread contamination of streambed materials."

*Minimal movement*

In Southern Mississippi [6], heavy application of DDT (2300 ppm) incorporated in soil for termite control was found to have moved laterally only 20 inches in two decades. Only minor amounts (2 ppm) were found 12 inches below treated soil.

At the College of Forestry, University of Washington [7], tension lysimeters were placed below 4-inch deep gravelly sand in a 35-year old Douglas-fir forest and below a 1-inch deep surface layer of duff and organic debris. DDT was applied to the surface of both of these soils at 0.5 and 5.0 lbs./acre and leachates collected throughout the year and analyzed. Very little DDT passed through the forest floor and even less through the surface organic layer.

There have been numerous laboratory studies in which the chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides were applied to the surface of a column of soil. Amounts of water simulating rainfall were introduced at the top of the column in an effort to wash the chlorinated hydrocarbon through the column. A typical study of this nature was conducted by M. C. Bowman and M. S. Schechter of the U S D A [8]. These scientists studied the behavior of 11 chlorinated insecticides in eight types of soil. In soils with high organic matter content, none of the insecticides were leached through the column, except for a trace of lindane. TDE and p,p'-DDT were not leached through any of the soils except for a small fraction when water equalling 400 times the weight of the soil was used.

Since pesticide contamination of streams and lakes does occur, particularly if analytical techniques are used that measure 1 millionth part of 1 millionth part, it would seem essential to pinpoint all sources of contamination.

*Urban pollution*

Research scientists at Michigan State University have been routinely monitoring pesticides in three streams—Mill Creek, Rogue River, and Grand River. Preliminary reports "implicate urban areas as the primary source of pesticide contamination."

In earlier studies on the Red Cedar River that flows through East Lansing, the statement is made . . . "the largest amount of pesticide contamination entering the river comes from the waste treatment plants and not from runoff, leaching, or other factors associated with agriculture." [9]

This sewage effluent problem can largely be solved without banning persistent pesticides. Sanitary engineers say that it is possible to remove nearly all DDT and most of the other chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides from sewage effluents,[10] but it will require complete removal of particulate matter.

*Steady states*

The residue of a particular chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticide being recorded in the lakes and wildlife is not the result of 25 years of gradual buildup. We are *not* adding to the problem with every additional pound used. In most areas where chlorinated hydrocarbon is used, either a *steady state*—a balance between annual input and degradation—has long since been reached, or residues are diminishing because of a change in use patterns.

Most, if not all, living forms of life progressively degrade these pesticides to harmless compounds, although slowly in certain cases. Thus, the minute residues in Antarctic penguins would be lost if not constantly replaced by continued new input of these materials.

DDT has been in use over a 25-year period. Use in the United States reached its highest input into the environment 10 years ago. Since then, it has declined more than 50 percent.[11] This, plus our knowledge of degradation rates, leaves little possibility that background residue levels in the environment will increase above those presently detected, even if many of the present use-patterns are continued indefinitely.

PESTICIDES AND BIRDS

There has been no "silent spring" despite dire predictions. Nor is there any likelihood that there will ever be one as a consequence of the use of pesticides.

The availability of food and cover hold the secret to thriving populations of birds. Secondly, the food supply has to be reasonably free of harmful pollution, and nesting cover reasonably free of direct harassment by man and his activities. Does the environment in the United States successfully fulfill these requirements? Let's look at the situation!

The wild turkey was near the vanishing point in the early 1930's from over-shooting. Slowly and progressively, it has been live-trapped from local concentrations and reintroduced in suitable habitats from coast to coast. Under free-living, wild conditions, it has increased to a point where hunters could harvest 128,167 birds in 1967–68.

The mourning dove is an important "product" of the cultivated fields and pastures. Populations of this bird have done so well under present land management practices that hunters harvested over 41 million birds in 1965.

The ruffed grouse, a denizen of our northern forest margins, has not only managed to sustain high population numbers, but in many states to provide ever-increasing hunter harvests.

Three upland game birds, not native of this country—ringnecked pheasant, Hungarian partridge, and Chukar partridge—have been successfully introduced into the United States and provide an annual harvest in the neighborhood of 25 million birds.

*New program*

In 1966, a new *Breeding Bird Survey* got underway, sponsored by the Migratory Bird Population Station, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. It now covers all states in the United States and several provinces in Canada.

In 1968, 1,174 routes, each 25 miles in length, were covered by carefully selected

Footnotes at end of speech.

ornithologists. Almost one million birds (965,744), comprising 472 species, were recorded. At 3-minute stops, at half mile intervals, all birds seen or heard were recorded. The 1,174 observers averaged seeing 822 birds in 2½ hours recording time. That's quite a record!

The Endangered Species program of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife includes 60 species of birds. In listing the causes for the decline in numbers, pesticides are mentioned as a possible contributing factor in only 4 of the 60 species (osprey, bald eagle, peregrine falcon, and California condor). These four species of raptor birds had been declining in numbers for a long period of time before organic insecticides came on the scene.

At the Hawk Mountain Sanctuary in Pennsylvania, excellent records have been kept of all species of raptors migrating through the area each fall since 1934. Rather than declining, the total number of hawks and eagles has increased. 1968 was a banner year with 29,765 hawks observed.

Such encouraging information on the status of our birdlife does not disclaim any adverse effect of pesticides. There have been problems, even when the chemical was "used as directed." Progressively, these troubles are corrected by changing application rates, by adjusting the timing, or by cancelling the use entirely.

*Hazard to birds*

To avoid as many problems as possible, a new pesticide must provide toxicity data on selected species of birds, which supports safety in use, before it will be registered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Information which indicates that the pesticide can be used without undue hazard to birds is reviewed by a team of biologists of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. It would be a rare occurrence for a new pesticide chemical to be registered (and marketed) without one or more conservation research groups having had the opportunity to study the chemical in its own laboratories.

It is the more remarkable that birds generally have succeeded so well in modern times. We fence our livestock out, and man himself refrains from harvesting a pesticide-treated crop until residue levels have subsided. It is impossible to keep birds out of a freshly treated area—as a result, they receive greater exposure.

Then, no differently than man or mammals, they can accumulate residues of some chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides. Again, similar to man and mammals, birds are little affected by the residues that are slowly acquired—with two important exceptions. First, the fat that a bird has can be completely metabolized (used like a spare tank of gasoline) in 24 hours—a stunt no mammal can duplicate. Thus, if the bird is carrying a high level of chlorinated hydrocarbons in its body fat, it is particularly susceptible to stress that calls on fat reserves. Second, the bird transfers fat containing chlorinated hydrocarbons to the yolk of the egg where *high* levels may have an effect on developing young.

Much attention has been focused on thinning of egg shells. Most of the laboratory studies on DDT have been conducted at day age levels well above field exposure and thus may not relate to conditions in nature. One thing is certain—there is wide variation in response. Some species of birds appear little affected.

PESTICIDES AND FISH

Pesticides tend to have a greater effect in the aquatic environment because fish and shellfish are literally bathed with any chemical that is in solution—actually breathing it through their gills, absorbing it through body exposure, and ingesting it with their food. Fortunately, many pesticides, particularly the chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides, are usually incorporated in organic debris before they reach streams, lakes, and estuaries. Thus, they are only slowly available through the food source. In this form, hundreds of times as much chemical may be required to cause acute mortality than would be true if it were in solution in the water. Chlorinated hydrocarbons, for example, are progressively blotted-up by the neutral fats of the body (literally immobilized) so that harmful concentrations do not reach the nervous system. These same fats release the "stored" chlorinated hydrocarbons at a slow enough rate that the excretory and degradation systems in fish and shellfish are seldom overwhelmed.

*Residue tolerance*

Although pesticide residues may have little, if any, effect on the fish carrying them, those residues may be objectionable if that fish is used for food. The recent establishment of "action levels" for DDT and dieldrin by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration for fish shipped interstate is a prediction of regulations to come. It should be anticipated that acceptable tolerances for pesticide residues in fish will be established, as with raw agricultural foods. The regulation will present immeasurably greater difficulties in management, for the fish producer may not himself have used the chemical. Other independent and widely divergent activities of the drainage basin will undoubtedly be affected. The benefit/loss equation will bear heavily on decisions.

*Few fish kills*

Fifteen to 25 years of using organic pesticides have developed local problems. However, fish and shellfish—fresh water and marine—have not been "irreversibly harmed" by this use. In view of the high toxicity of some pesticides to fish, they account for a surprisingly small number of pollution caused fish kills.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration has kept an annual census of fish kills since June 1960. In the Ninth Annual Report (1968), only 51 of 438 reported fish kills were due to all insecticides and agricultural poisons combined. And, of the number of fish reported killed, only 2.5 percent were attributed to pesticides. Pollution from municipal sewers and treatment plants "was the most deadly type of pollution" followed in turn by industrial wastes and transportation accidents.

*Fish thriving*

On the positive side, fish populations are thriving in most of our aquatic habitats. The Michigan Department of Natural Resources in a December 1969 News Bulletin said, "Lake Michigan's sport fishermen never had it so good as they did this season when they caught an estimated 175,000 coho and chinook (salmon) with a total weight . . . approaching 2 million pounds." Despite this record, Department scientists predict, "1970 should yield vastly improved returns of coho and chinook."

The press and the radio have been full of dire predictions about Lake Erie. But in November 1969, the Executive Director, Robert J. Bielo, Pennsylvania Fish Commission, in Conservation Viewpoint stated, "Lake Erie isn't dead. In fact, it is far from dead and may be emerging once again as an exciting fish producer."

The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has kept records on the catch of fish by commercial fishermen on the Great Lakes since 1867.[12] In 1967, commercial fishermen took almost 59 million pounds of fish from Lake Michigan, an all-time high. On Lake Erie, the annual catch during the 1930's (before DDT) averaged 42.6 million pounds. Since 1960, the annual catch from this so-called "dead" lake has averaged better than 50 million pounds annually. The commercial catch of fish today is of less desirable species, the result of over-fishing and exploitation—not pesticide selection.

*Chesapeake productive*

For nearly 10 years, the striped bass have been at an all-time high in the mid-Atlantic states. Dr. Ted Koo [13] reported in March 1969 that there had been an eight-fold increase over 1935 in the commercial harvest of these fish with Maryland producing more than any other state and accounting for 40 percent of the total.

The commercial harvest of fish and shellfish in Chesapeake Bay is approaching 500 million pounds annually with species such as alewives, menhaden, sea bass, shad, hard and soft clams, and oysters in increasing numbers.

The Virginia Institute of Marine Science is predicting a banner year for crab in 1970. This is the more remarkable because these crustacea are among the most susceptible species to chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides.

*A future tool*

The U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife undertook to monitor the residues in three species of fish collected at intervals from 50 sampling stations located in the Great Lakes and in major river basins throughout the United States. Their first report [14] covers two collection periods in both 1967 and 1968. At 12 of the 50 sites, at least 1 of the 12 analyses made exceeded the actionable level of 5.0 parts per million for DDT and its metabolites. However, the residues in excess of 5.0 ppm were sufficiently replicated at only four sites—the Delaware River at Camden, New Jersey; the Tom Bigbee River at McIntosh, Alabama; Lake Michigan; and Lake Ontario. The analytical techniques, shared by three different laboratories, resulted in such a wide spread variation in residues found that some question can be expressed as to the reliability of data on the precise quantities of pesticide residue actually present.

Thus, pesticides in the aquatic environment present local problems; but nationwide, the fishery resource appears little troubled by the long continuous use of chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides. The major difficulty will rest on holding residue levels within acceptable bounds—not in production of fish and shellfish.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Barthel, W. F., J. C. Hawthorne, J. H. Ford, G. C. Bolton, L. L. McDowell, E. H. Grissinger, and D. A. Parsons. "Pesticide Residues in Sediments of the Lower Mississippi River and Its Tributaries." Pesticides Monitoring Journal 3 (1): 8–66. June 1969.

[2] Manigold, Douglas B. and Jean A. Schulze. "Pesticides in Selected Western Streams—A Progress Report." Pesticides Monitoring Journal 3 (2): 124–135. September 1969.

[3] Modin, John C. Chlorinated Hydrocarbon Pesticides in California Bays and Estuaries. Pesticides Monitoring Journal 3 (1): 1–7, June 1969.

[4] Butler, Philip A. Monitoring Pesticide Pollution. Bioscience 19 (10): 889–891 October 1969.

[5] Barthel, W. F., J. C. Hawthorne, J. H. Ford, G. C. Bolton, L. L. McDowell, E. H. Grissinger, and D. A. Parsons. 1969. Pesticides residues in sediments of the lower Mississippi River and its tributaries. Pesticides Monitoring Journal 3(1):8–66, June 1969.

[6] Smith, Virgil K. 1968. Long-term movement of DDT applied to soil for termite control. Pesticides Monitoring Journal 2 (1): 55–57.

[7] Gessel, S. P., D. W. Cole, and H. Riekerk. 1966. Techniques and preliminary data on the movement of DDT and Zectran through a forest soil. American Soc. Agronomy: Agron. Abst. 1966: 94.

[8] Bowman, M.C., M.S. Schechter, and R. L. Carter. 1965. "Behavior of chlorinated insecticides in a broad spectrum of soil

types." Journal Agr. and Food Chem. 13 (4): 360–365.

[9] Anon. 1968. "Relationships of pesticides in soils, water, and plants." Michigan State University, 3rd Annual Report PHS–CDC Grant, pp. 24–26.

[10] Robeck, G.G., K.A. Dostal, J.M. Cohen, and J. F. Kreiss. 1965. "Effectiveness of water treatment processes in pesticide removal." Jour. Amer. Water Works Assoc. 57: 181.

[11] Eichers, Theodore, Robert Jenkins, and Austin Fox. 1969. "DDT Used in Farm Production." USDA: Economic Research Service: Agr. Econ. Rpt. No. 158.

[12] Baldwin, Norman S. and Robert W. Saalfeld. 1962. "Commercial Fish Production in the Great Lakes 1867–1960," Great Lakes Fishery Commission, Tech. Rpt. No. 3, July 1962 (with added annual supplements).

[13] Koo, Ted, Chairman, Department of Fisheries, Natural Resources Institute, University of Maryland, News Release, Montgomery County Sentinel, March 15, 1969.

[14] Henderson, Croswell, Wendell L. Johnson and Anthony Inglis. 1969. "Organochlorine Insecticide Residues in Fish" (National Pesticide Monitoring Program), Pesticides Monitoring Journal 3(3):145–171, December 1969.

## MARIHUANA

### HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention by a fellow of the American College of Surgeons and an outstanding physician in eastern Kentucky that interviews with servicemen from Vietnam revealed that many, many of them have smoked marihuana.

We constantly hear that the effects of marihuana are unknown. Perhaps some are, but there are many effects that have been known over the years; and in the Middle East, it was called hashish, which means assassin. In my opinion, the name was well deserved.

For reports from interviews conducted by a fellow of the American College of Surgeons, Dr. S. H. Flowers, with returnees from Vietnam, I inclose the following report:

THE MIDDLESBORO
CLINIC AND HOSPITAL,
*Middlesboro, Ky., March 24, 1970.*

Congressman TIM LEE CARTER,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SIR: As a physician here in Middlesboro, I do a considerable number of pre-employment examinations, and in this way, come into contact with an increasing number of veterans of the Vietnam War, who have returned from service and are getting jobs.

Recently, I have talked with several of these men regarding their own, and their fellow soldiers' experience with marijuana, and especially regarding the use of marijuana in the field, where it seems to be more commonly used.

Their conversation indicates that—

(1) Marijuana is almost as common as any other weed in Viet Nam. It is available in the field, and can be bought in almost any store for a very low price. The natives use it widely.

(2) While each ex-soldier denies that he himself used marijuana, more than an experimental single puff on a cigarette of it.

(3) Each states that he knows that many, 50 to 60%, of the infantry units in the field are "on" marijuana. Imagine a man going into battle with his mentality fogged by the use of a drug!

(4) One man this morning, states that the effectiveness, judgment, and alertness of any man on this drug are radically reduced, even to the point of the "hopped up" man shooting his fellow soldier purposely, without knowing that it was one of his own company.

(5) Further, that guards on duty, taking the drug, neglected their posts and allowed the enemy to infiltrate the camp or fortified position.

(6) Also, that men taking the drug would resist a fellow soldier, objecting to their use of it—even to the point of threatening the life of the objector.

(7) The above statements were alarming to me, but the most alarming statement this man made was "the officers in charge of the infantry units, in which he was serving, made no effort to prevent the use of marijuana in that unit." Whether this was a condition only in the company in which this particular man served, I don't know, but my reading in the daily newspapers would indicate that it was not. I do know it ought not to persist in any company. I know also, that this situation has been, and is being concealed from the American pepole.

May I urge you to use your position and considerable influence to put pressure on the military to do everything necessary to change this situation. You and I know that any military situation can be changed, if the division and company commanders are forced to make the necessary effort, and I presume, that it will be necessary to use more than ordinary requests with tact, and gentlemanly persuasion. I think force must be applied to the division and company commanders from headquarters to remedy this situation, since it has gone on to the point where it, apparently, has gone.

Thanking you for your assistance to the American people in this thing, I am

Sincerely yours,

S. H. FLOWERS, M.D.

## AIR LINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION'S EIGHT-POINT PROGRAM FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION

### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the March 1970 issue of Air Line Pilot magazine carries an excellent article by Mr. Phil Salk outlining the Air Line Pilots Association's eight-point legislative program.

I am placing this article in the RECORD because the ALPA has developed a broad program of legislative action which is of urgent importance to the entire transportation industry.

The article follows:

ALPA'S EIGHT-POINT PROGRAM ON CAPITOL HILL

(By Phil Salk)

One of the primary reasons for ALPA's Home Office move to Washington last year was to enhance our position on Capitol Hill and in the regulatory agencies that affect pilots so critically, like the Federal Aviation Administration, the National Transportation Safety Board and other offices of the government.

Today the Association's hopes are being realized in this regard, and President Ruby's assistant for government liaison, attorney Charles King, is carrying out a broad program of activities that are making ALPA's voice heard throughout the nation's capital and across the country.

Here is a progress report on eight of the most important issues facing airline pilots and flight crews today:

1. Aircraft hijacking.
2. Mandatory minimum standards for airports.
3. Master Two Step.
4. Funds for SST development.
5. Age 60—right to continue work.
6. Age 60—full social security benefits.
7. Airport-vended trip insurance.
8. Multiple taxation.

1. AIRCRAFT HIJACKING

The Association is continuing its efforts to achieve a permanent solution to the hijacking problem. Hijacking of commercial airplanes will cease only when an international agreement is reached that recognizes hijacking as a vicious international crime and provides that the hijacker shall be punished.

Toward this end, ALPA was largely responsible for ratification of the Tokyo Convention by the U.S. Government on Sept. 5, 1969, and also for the introduction in Congress of concurrent resolutions proposed by the Association, which provide that the Administration should act immediately to enter into bilateral agreements with as many nations as possible for mandatory extradition of a hijacker, including a hijacker who requests political asylum.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 340 and 341) was introduced in the House by forty-three House members, including the principal sponsor, Congressman Pucinski (Illinois), on Sept. 16, 1969, the same day that the Revolutionary Government of Cuba announced the enactment of a law permitting Cuba to enter into bilateral agreements for requesting the return of a hijacker. An identical resolution (S. Con. Res. 38) was introduced in the Senate by Senator Cannon (Nevada) on Sept. 24, 1969.

In the International area, the Association participated in the second meeting of the ICAO Legal Subcommittee on Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft which began Sept. 22, 1969. Attorney King was an Advisor to the U.S. Delegation and in addition, coordinated his activities with the IFALPA Representative Captain Grady Stone (EAL) and the IATA representative in urging the delegates to consider the hijacking problem an air safety problem rather than one of a political nature.

This Subcommittee, made up of delegates from 11 countries, was charged with preparing an international agreement or convention that would deter hijackers by making the act of hijacking an aircraft a punishable offense and providing for appropriate measures with respect to prosecution and extradition of the offender. The Association has been invited to participate again as an advisor to the U.S. Delegation when the Legal Committee of ICAO meets this month to consider the convention drafted by the Legal Subcommittee.

The Association is presently engaged in a program urging the State Department to seek bilateral agreements with as many nations as possible for mandatory extradition of airplane hijackers. At the time ALPA's efforts began in this area, none of the more than 80 bilateral extradition agreements in existence recognized the crime of aircraft hijacking. Following our efforts, which included the resolutions introduced in Congress, the State Department has thus far entered into negotiations to amend extradition treaties with the United Kingdom, France, Spain, Italy and New Zealand. However, the amendment of such treaties over the past five-month period has been too slow. The Association believes the State Department should

make more than three lawyers available for this purpose and should furnish the lawyers concerned with adequate travel funds.

Hijacking is a subject requiring liaison not only with the Congress but also with the FAA, Department of Justice, Department of State and the Air Transport Association. This is pointed up by the $25,000 ALPA–ATA combined hijacking reward offer which was coordinated with FAA and the Department of Justice, and also by consideration of suggested anti-hijacking devices which would have to be approved by FAA, installed by ATA, and approved by our members.

Some of the ALPA members actively engaged in the Anti-Hijacking program include Captains Grady Stone (EAL), Ray Gerber (PAA), B. J. Dietrich (BNF), F. L. Houston (NWA), Homer Mouden (BNF), and Jim G. Brown (NAL).

2. MANDATORY MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR AIRPORTS

The Association was afforded an opportunity to press for mandatory minimum safety standards for airports as a result of recognition by the Congress, the Administration, and the aviation community that many of tl.e nation's air carrier airports are obsolete. Legislation was introduced in the House and Senate, finally resulting in House Bill H.R. 14465 entitled "Aviation Facilities Expansion Act of 1969," and Senate Bill S. 3108 which are both concerned with the expansion and improvement of the nation's airport and airways system and with providing funds to carry out the legislation. The Association testified on the proposed legislation before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on Friday, July 25, 1969 and the Senate Committee on Commerce on June 24, 1969, at which times Association representatives urged that what was needed was not more airports, but better airports than we now have.

The Association's position was that the only way we are going to get airports that provide an adequate margin of safety for flight operations was to require air carrier airports to meet minimum safe standards under the Administrative Procedure Act. In this way, all interested parties, including ALPA, would participate in the formulation of the required airport standards.

It should be noted that in the course of the hearings before the House and Senate, ALPA was alone in requesting airport mandatory minimum standards and was opposed by the FAA on grounds that the Administration had authorization to do this, but had never found it necessary. The Association's position was presented to the Senate Committee by Captain Joseph Meek (DAL) accompanied by President Ruby and Captain Phil Perry (NAL). In the House, the Association's position was presented again by Mr. Ruby, Captain Meek and Captain Bill Alford (BNF).

H.R. 14465 (Aviation Facilities Expansion Act of 1969) was amended by the House Committee to require certification of air carrier airports. The bill, in this form, passed in the House on November 6, 1969. In spite of the Association's efforts to effect a similar amendment of the Senate bill, S 3108 was not amended in Committee and probably will pass the Senate without airport certification provisions in it. A conference to resolve the differences in the House and Senate bills was due to take place as this issue goes to press.

Following passage of H.R. 14465 by the House, the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedures, chaired by Senator Edward Kennedy, scheduled hearings concerned with whether FAA was carrying out its statutory responsibilities to promote the safety of flight of civil aircraft. The Association took this opportunity to testify before the Subcommittee on Jan. 21 to again pass for establishment of mandatory minimum standards at air carrier airports by the FAA.

The Association's position before the Kennedy Subcommittee was presented by Captain Meek, Captain Perry and Captain Alford. Captain Meek testified: "The Association, which represents more than 30,000 airline pilots who daily fly into and out of many of the nation's obsolete airports, is particularly concerned that the FAA, which has the responsibility to establish minimum standards in the interest of safety, has failed over the past 10 years to exercise its authority to prescribe minimum standards for airports.

"Moreover, the FAA insists today that establishing minimum standards is unnecessary because existing mechanisms adequately ensure safety in the operation of the nation's air carrier airports.

"We believe this position is not responsible in view of more than 140 air carrier accidents that have occurred since 1957 at or near airports and in the judgment of the Association's most qualified air safety representatives, would not have happened had there been proper mandatory standards set by the FAA.

"In these accidents, there were more than 223 persons killed, 118 persons seriously injured, and 140 air carrier aircraft substantially damaged or destroyed. In addition, there have been numerous potentially dangerous aircraft incidents at airports in which there were no fatalities, serious injuries, or major aircraft damage due to flight crew skill and fortunate circumstances."

In connection with the Kennedy subcommittee hearings, ALPA which works closely with the National Transportation Safety Board in matters of air safety, noted that Governor Reed, Chairman of the Safety Board, testified that airport standards is an important problem and the NTSB would like to see minimum standards for airports established. He also testified that it was a possibility that NTSB would recommend certification of airports to FAA.

3. MASTER TWO-STEP PROGRAM

Aeromedical Committee members Captains Richard B. Stone (NEA), John Gaylord (CAL), and C. S. Huggins (BNF), and First Vice President Robert L. Tully (EAL) have been following a very aggressive and positive program to prevent FAA from putting this procedure into effect. Their program includes Congressional liaison and liaison with other aviation and governmental agencies.

The Association's Master Two-Step program is still in progress.

4. FUNDS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT

To assist in making an appropriation of $86 million available to the FAA for development of a supersonic transport aircraft, the Association wrote to all 50 members of the House Appropriations Committee and strongly urged that sufficient funds be made available to continue the SST project at a pace that would assure that U.S.-built aircraft would be available to air carriers in the future. Speaking on behalf of the members of the Association, President Ruby informed the members of the committee that air line pilots in the United States would prefer to fly a supersonic transport built in the United States over aircraft built by any other country. Several members of the committee replied to our letter and thanked the Association for its views. The $86 million proposal was approved by the committee and later enacted into law.

5. AGE 60—RIGHT TO CONTINUE WORK

Members of the Air Line Pilots Association appeared and gave testimony at the Senate Special Committee on Aging Hearing in Washington, D.C., on Dec. 19, 1969. Presenting papers at the hearing for the Association were First Vice President Robert L. Tully (EAL), Captain Stewart W. Hopkins (DAL Retired), Captain Charles Rogers (EAL), and Dr. Robert Proper, Lovelace Foundation. Captain Gerry Goss, Chairman, ALPA Committee on Discrimination in Pilot Employment, was unable to testify at the hearing due to an illness in the family.

Some excerpts of the testimony given by ALPA members included the following: "Since 1959, when the FAA established its compulsory retirement regulation for air line pilots (Section 121.383(c) of the Federal Aviation Regulation), some 700 air line pilots have been forced into retirement at their 60th birthday, even though their current, FAA-required physical and proficiency examination have shown them to be competent, qualified and in faultless physical condition. Currently, age limitations are also being urged as a means to limit the progression of senior air line pilots to new aircraft types, primarily because the age 60 limitation reduces the period in which a carrier may amortize its training costs. As a consequence, one arbitrary age limitation tends to give birth to another."

"The most striking feature of the compulsory retirement rule for air line pilots is that it is imposed by an agency of the Federal Government, and at a time when our nation's policy is unequivocally opposed to forced retirement, in any form. We air line pilots have the rather dubious distinction of being the only group of employees in private industry, so far as I am aware, on whom the Federal Government has imposed a mandatory retirement age. And with the enactment of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, our employers, the air lines, were legally forbidden to terminate careers solely because of age, though this is precisely what FAA is doing today, as it has been ever since 1960."

"A 1969 thesis issued by the Aviation Medicine Research Laboratory of Ohio State University concluded that the possibility of sudden incapacitation among the air line pilots at age 55 and above was substantially less than the possibility of such an occurrence between ages 40 and 55."

"FAA has never offered any medical or scientific data supporting compulsory retirement at age 60 for air line pilots; a federally-funded study of this subect conducted at Georgetown University under FAA auspices some years ago ended without any published findings after an expenditure of seven million dollars."

"Because normal Social Security benefits are not available until five years after retirement, a pilot's financial maintenance during his retirement years may well be a subject of serious concern."

"We believe that it is consistent with all affected interests to suggest that, at long last, a public hearing of all the evidence for or against the rule compulsory retirement at age 60 for air line pilots be held by FAA."

"I am convinced that compulsory retirement under these circumstances is contrary not only to the principles for which this committee stands, but also that it is completely inconsistent with my rights as a citizen to equal protection of the law."

Captains Clyde Muirheid, Jr., (EAL) and Truman Outland (DAL) also participated in the hearing and Captain Outland was called to testify.

Members of the Association's Committee on Discrimination in Pilot Employment are pursuing an active program to get the FAA's mandatory age 60 compulsory retirement for airline pilots removed.

6. AGE 60—FULL SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

The following testimony was given by the Honorable Jerry L. Pettis, California 33rd Congressional District, before the House Committee on Ways and Means in November. "I wish to express my appreciation for the opportunity to come before this committee to testify in support to my bill, H.R. 313, on the subject of Social Security. In essence,

this proposed legislation would permit certain individuals who are forced to retire at age 60 under Federal regulations to continue to pay Social Security taxes and receive appropriate benefit credit for those payments until they reach 65, when full social security benefits are presently payable. My statement will be brief and to the point.

"Basically, it is a simple piece of legislation with a single specific purpose. Its aim is to eliminate what I believe to be an obvious, glaring injustice to thousands of this nation's air line pilots. They are caught now in a situation completely beyond their control because one federal regulation, that of the Federal Aviation Administration, requires that they retire at age 60 while other federal law, that of the Social Security Administration, requires that they wait until age 65 to receive lower benefits of Social Security.

"This is doubtlessly one of those unmeant inequities caused by overlapping federal regulations but it is a burdensome oversight nonetheless. To my knowledge, the air line pilots are the only workers who are, collectively, so victimized by such a legal caprice. And it is my sincere wish that this committee will see fit to correct it by eliminating this five-year limbo of uncertainty hanging over a group of men who work with great dedication under extreme burdens of responsibility. Incidentally, the F.A.A. also controls the medical and disability requirements of pilots as part of its normal jurisdiction.

"It is currently estimated that some 4,000 members of the Air Line Pilots Association will reach age 60 in the next 10 years. Because they are caught in this intolerable situation many of these men, perhaps a majority, will continue working in some related field. But the pilot who cannot or does not wish to continue working should have the right to immediate payments of his Social Security benefits upon forced retirement as a pilot.

"Today the technology of flying aircraft which is becoming increasingly complex is such that these individuals have to be virtually high-trained scientists. And air lines are experiencing a shortage of qualified applicants for this vital and extremely demanding profession. I think the least we can do is to give them a fair break at retirement. For many years, Social Security has been promoted as the best insurance a man can buy. If that is so, then it should be as good for pilots as for others.

"I will close with the hope that the Committee will look favorably on this suggestion. Thank you."

Present at the hearing were Kay McMurray, ALPA executive administrator, Harry McKee, acting director of public relations, and Charles King, assistant to the president for government liaison.

The House Ways and Means Committee will meet in executive session shortly and decide whether or not the proposed amendment of the Social Security law should be adopted by the committee and recommended for approval by the House.

7. AIRPORT VENDED TRIP INSURANCE

The Association's legislative efforts to preclude the sale of vending machine insurance either by state law or a federal law have been given a high priority. The Association plans to vigorously renew its efforts both at the state and federal levels by updating its legislative package for use in opposing vending machine insurance, by contacting the insurance commissioners of all states to express our opposition, and to offer our assistance to those opposed to vending machine insurance by furnishing documents and members of the Association to present testimony before insurance commissioners and the legislative bodies of the states. At the federal level, the Association will continue to work sale of vending machine type insurance passengers traveling on air carrier aircraft.

8. MULTIPLE TAXATION

More and more states and cities are passing tax laws for the purpose of collecting income taxes from nonresidents who are engaged in interstate commerce. Alaska is one such state.

Through the combined efforts of a group of disgruntled taxpayers from various ALPA, Maritime, and Teamster Councils, legislative bills have now been introduced in Congress that could give ALPA members some relief from such tax practices by states or cities.

Bill S. 2044 has been introduced in the Senate by Senators Magnuson and Jackson. Bill H.R. 1240 has been introduced in the House by Congressman Moss, and Bill H.R. 10634 has been introduced by Congressman Adams. All three bills would accomplish essentially the same purpose, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to provide that no part of the salary paid by a carrier to an employee who performs his regularly assigned duties in more than one state shall be withheld by other than the state or subdivision of the employee's residence and only pursuant to the laws of such state or subdivision. These bills also provide that the carrier shall not file any information for tax purposes with any state or subdivision thereof other than the state or subdivision of residence.

All ALPA members were urgd to write personal letters to their representatives in Congress supporting this position.

The Association is presently engaged with the transportation unions and managements of the other modes of transportation to eliminate the problem of multiple taxation, probably by legislation such as is described above This is one of the major projects in the legislative program of the Association this year.

ALPA'S LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

The Association's legislative and governmental affairs program is moving ahead, with work under way in dozens of important areas in addition to the eight key issues described in this article.

With this major activity in full swing, ALPA's voice is being heard sooner, stronger and more effectively across the land.

---

## RELEVANCY IN LEARNING

### HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have often addressed this tribunal on the drastic need for educational institutions to respond to the real needs of its student body—on the professional school to respond to the needs of the profession. When academic administrations do not respond or do not attempt to respond, we witness riots—as we have seen throughout the country on college campuses these past months.

It is often stated that law changes society; some disagree and say society changes the law. In either event—one thing is certain—the law and the lawyer play a major role in society's changing values. The outstanding law schools train the creative and responsive mind. If law schools are omissive in meeting the needs of its constituency—then I see little hope in our educational system.

Law schools and their administrators should be showing the way for the other professional and academic institutions. Some students at Hastings College of Law, a part of the University of California, have challenged the school's administration to respond to the needs of the profession, the needs of the public and the needs of the student body. I am inserting into the RECORD a copy of the students' petition to the law school's administration.

I am confident, in the fine tradition of Hastings, that the school will make the appropriate response to the petition.

PETITION

We, the students of Hastings College of the Law, hereby inform the people of California that a crisis exists at the College, a part of the University of California, and we request the asistance of the public in redressing our grievances. Our grievances fall into the following general categories:

I. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STUDENTS

The Hastings Administration has demonstrated that it does not understand that the purpose of financial assistance is to assist those who *need* it. Heretofore the Administration has treated financial assistance programs as a source of rewards or prizes to be handed out to students without regard to their need for funds.

The Work/Study program, funded by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is intended to benefit those students whose *parents* (and not the students themselves) earn less than $7,500 per year. Thus, while Hastings had only three black students last year in a student body of 1,100 partly because there were no funds to assist those who could not afford to come to Hastings, the Administration awarded Work/Study funds to the son of Assemblyman Don Mulford, the Assemblyman from the wealthy suburb of Piedmont. Although Assemblyman Mulford last year funded a new scholarship for Hastings students, the Hastings Administration found it necessary to give Assemblyman Mulford's son money which the Federal government had earmarked *for students from poor families*. As a result of Hastings' inability to justify the amount of Work/Study money given students in relation to their need, the Hastings Administration was told by the Department of HEW, nearly a year ago, to document the "need" factor for funds expended or reimburse the Federal government for those funds. Hastings agreed to do this by July 1, 1969, but has not yet complied with this agreement. Hastings' failure to administer the Work/Study program in the manner intended resulted in the cut-off of Work/Study funds for Hastings by the Federal government on December 31, 1969.

Again, while the Hastings Administration was claiming that no funds were available to adequately finance needy students, it handed out over $45,000 in scholarships to students, largely without regard to the recipients' need for it. In fact, in many cases the scholarships "traditionally" go to students who hold certain non-paid offices or positions favored by the Administration. Although the Hastings Administration admits that these scholarships are by no means limited to these "traditional" recipients, Hastings cannot find the money to finance needy students.

Thus, Hastings' financial assistance program assures that the state law school will continue to produce inordinate numbers of middle and upper-class, white graduates.

2. GRADING

Hastings College would have its students believe that its "anonymous" system of grading is sacrosanct. This system, upon which depends the very survival of the students' careers and on which basis jobs are handed out at graduation, operate on the theory that professors grade examination books with ex-

amination numbers rather than names on them to ensure unbiased grading. No one is supposed to have access to the numbers other than the College Administration, which matches the grades and numbers with the names. We have also been assured that there is no way anyone can tamper with these grades—and we believed this.

However, the system is a sham. Without the students' knowledge, Hastings has been separating the exam books of the top ten students in each course, supposedly to enable each professor to evaluate his examination questions better when grading the "lower" students. Thus, a professor is to grade an exam which he has been told was written by a "top" student on the same basis as that written by one who is not a "top" student. For an *educational* institution to employ such a practice is unpardonable in the light of the many classroom studies done on the self-fulfilling nature of a teacher's expectations of a particular student's performance. (*Pygmalion In The Classroom*, by Robert Rosenthal and Lenore Jacobson, demonstrates this principle.)

Furthermore, it has recently been discovered that the Hastings Administration made a written proposal to a student offering a passing grade in a course without the necessity of ever examining in the course.

Thus, the Administration can and will assign any grade they wish to any student while at the same time denying that they have the power to do so. The importance of grades at a law school cannot be over-emphasized. Yet if a student has Professor X for the required course in Evidence at Hastings, his class median is five points lower than that of Professor Y. Five points on a student's average can mean the difference between getting a good job or no job at all. Five points can mean the end of a student's long-planned career in the law.

3. CURRICULUM

Hastings continues to force-feed its students the knowledge necessary to serve the wealthy elements of society. The weightiest course (in terms of academic units) given in the second year is the required course in Trusts and Estates, a course which serves the needs of only about 4% of the American people. Yet, Hastings offers no courses in Juvenile law, military law, and draft law—subjects which affect large numbers of people whose needs apparently are not important enough to be considered by the state-owned university.

The Hastings Administration has been attempting to set up a course in conjunction with the University of California School of Medicine, but a Hastings student, after two months work, put together such a course, and it is now being taught at Hastings—for no credit. While the ancient Hastings curriculum suffers increasing academic arteriosclerosis, the Administration's response (in a recent TV interview) is simply that "Sociology is ruining Boalt Hall (the law school at U.S. Berkeley) and the University of Southern California Law School." Thus, poverty law should not be a proper course of study at Hastings, because of its inherent sociological aspects.

Hastings College, located within three blocks of the Federal and State courts and administrative agencies, has not had the imagination to make use of this natural advantage. These institutions might just as well be 500 miles away.

The Administration and Faculty of Hastings College of the Law are unwilling and/or unable to up-date the curriculum. Only the students are willing to do this, but we are allowed no voice.

4. THE BAD FAITH SHOWN BY HASTINGS TOWARD ITS STUDENTS

This year a group of students attempting to implement a directed studies course in water pollution law spent several days on the research necessary to write a proposal for the course. The proposal was approved—with the stipulation that each student would submit a paper whose minimum length would be fifty pages. These papers were to be graded "rigorously" by the instructor, after which each paper was subject to review by the entire Faculty. This was a very effective means of "processing" a student request, as most of the students who prepared the proposal subsequently transferred into more traditional courses.

Although there had been no campus disturbances or violence at Hastings, a committee of Faculty members was formed to deal with student disturbances. An hour before a meeting of students, Faculty, and Administration was to take place on April 3, police were on the campus conferring with the administration; yet the meeting was described the following day by the San Francisco *Chronicle* as "a different kind of protest," "a school protest with some class." The Administration seems intent on creating a crisis, and it has succeeded.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Administration does not administrate at Hastings. Students initiated the new but inadequate minority students recruitment program. A student committee was formed to help Hastings through its financial assistance crisis. The used-book exchange was initiated by students and staffed by the Hastings' Wives Club. Students should not have to administrate—this is what the Deans are paid to do.

It has become apparent that two overriding obsessions motivate the present Hastings Administration. The first is the slavish attention paid to the California Bar Examination results. The second is the capturing of famous names for the collection of retired professors comprising the "65 Club," irrespective of their current ability to teach. Hastings students should no longer be made the pawns in a bar examination game played against other law schools by the Administration. Nor should Hastings professors be collected like rare butterflies, to be put on display by the Deans. We ask that Hastings be operated less like an automatic car wash and more like its sister institutions in the University system—like an institution of learning.

Since only the intervention of the public on behalf of the student can now save the situation at Hastings, we request that the following recommendations be immediately implemented:

(a) That an investigation be made of the entire Hastings financial assistance program.

(b) That student examination numbers be issued and held by a *neutral* party in order to minimize any possible reprisals against students for taking this action.

(c) That all grades *already* earned under the present tainted system be suspended and replaced by grades of "Pass."

(d) That the present Hastings Administration be removed.

(e) That the new administration process include members of the student body, Faculty, and practicing attorneys.

April 15, 1970 at San Francisco.

Students of Hastings College of Law:

James R. Ayoob, Gordon N. Baldwin, Peter Blackman, Edmund K. Brehl, Sandra Carter, Margot Champagne, Steven Chase, Ralph A. Courtney III.

Darcy T. Cremer, Richard Draper, Steven K. Easton, Mike Ferguson, Donald Fischbach, Richard Fischer (concurs in recommendations a, b, e, d, with exception of Dean Anderson).

Dennis T. Gary, Richard Goldman, James D. Grandjean, Charles Greenwood, Alan Hampson, Rita Hersh, Roger Hurt, Sharon Jarvis.

Ralph Johnson, David Jung, William Jung, Bruce Ketron, Carolyn Kresse, J. Kendrick Kresse, Martin Kresse, Dennison Lane.

Howard Levy, Daniel Louis, Jon Malsnee, Dave McClain, J. Michael McGowan, Edward E. Mevi, Clark A. Miller, Mike Miller, Clarence Moy.

John Murray, Richard Oliver, Gregory C. Paraskou, Deborah Peyton, Donald Prigo, George W. Quick, Mark Ross, John D. Rothschild.

Zona Sage, Armand Salese, Donald Schall, Leslie Scher, Ronald Schiffman, Douglas Schmidt, Charles Schwartz, Mary Schwartz, Terrence Shannon.

James C. Shine, Arthur W. Simon, Lowell W. Sykes, Robert M. Teets, Jr., Tom Whitener, Steven Ybarra (excepts Dean Anderson from recommendation d), James A. Burke.

Please make your feelings known to any of the following:

*Hastings Board of Directors*

Justice A. F. Bray, District Court of Appeal, State Building, San Francisco, Calif. 94102.

Harry H. Hastings, Esq., 333 El Cerrito Ave., Hillsborough, Calif.

Max K. Jamison, Esq., 615 South Flower St., Los Angeles, Calif.. 90017.

Justice Daniel R. Shoemaker, First District Court of Appeal, State Building, San Francisco, Calif., 94102.

Leonard A. Worthington, Esq., Barneson Building, 256 Montgomery St., San Francisco, Calif. 94104.

The Board of Regents, The University of California, 7th Floor, University Hall, Berkeley, Calif., 94720.

Senator Albert S. Rodda, 4048 State Capitol Bldg., Sacramento, Calif. 95814 (Senate Committee on Educ.)

Assemblyman Victor V. Veysey, 141 South 6th Street, Brawley, Calif. 92227 (Assembly Committee on Educ.)

Assemblyman Willie L. Brown, Jr., 666 Octavia St., San Francisco, Calif. 94102.

Senator George R. Moscone, 3082 State Capitol Bldg., Sacramento, Calif. 95814.

Harold S. Dobbs, Esq., 351 California Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94104.

Ingemar Eric Hoberg, Esq., 703 Market, San Francisco, Calif. 94103.

William C. Sanford, Esq., 43 North Sierra Street, Reno, Nev. 89504.

Chief Justice Roger J. Traynor, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, State Building, San Francisco, Calif. 94102.

## CHAPLAIN'S PRAYER FOR THE ASTRONAUTS

### HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, during the recent Apollo 13 crisis, all the world prayed for the safe return of our three courageous astronauts. After Lovell, Haise, and Swigert safely returned to earth, Cmdr. Philip E. Herauld, U.S. Navy chaplain of the Carrier *Iwo Jima*, put into words the precise feelings of all people. C. P. Harris of the McGrail-Coyne Post 223, Pittsburgh Veterans of Foreign Wars, sent me the prayer and asked that I include it in the RECORD for my colleagues. The following is Chaplain Herauld's prayer for the astronauts:

O Lord, we joyfully welcome back to earth Astronauts Lovell, Haise and Swigert, who, by Your grace, their skill and the skill of many men, survived the dangers encountered on their mission and returned to us safe and whole. We offer our humble thanksgiving for this successful recovery. Amen.

## BENEFITS OF THE SPACE PROGRAM

### HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 21, 1970*

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I share a deep concern with many of my colleagues on the Committee on Science and Astronautics that the American people should be made broadly aware of the benefits the space program is bringing to them. That concern is highlighted by the fact that the payoffs are often indirect, often intangible, and often very complicated. Many do not seem to the man in the street to have a direct impact on his life. There seems to be a wide belief that the NASA benefits should result in new gadgets, fancier cars, pocket-sized air conditioners and the like. I am sure that many results of space research will be translated eventually by private industries into such intriguing items. But such products, in terms of human existence, in terms of bettering our society and environment, could hardly be labeled of national importance.

The important question to ask is What is the space program doing for people, for their health, longevity, for purifying the air they breathe; for the security of their homes and families, and many other facets of daily life? The answer is that NASA-sponsored research has contributed technologies to answer many of those problems, often in exciting and dramatic ways.

Let me cite one example of which I am personally aware, because it is an outstanding accomplishment of the Grumman Aircraft Corp. Most of the Members probably know that Grumman has been deeply associated with the Apollo program as the manufacturer of the lunar excursion module, or the LEM. During the course of research into biomedical aspects of the LEM, Grumman engineers became aware of work being done by Dr. DeBakey, the famous specialist in heart transplants, in developing a device by which hearts and lungs could be kept alive and transported from one place to another. This was needed because donors and recipients sometimes cannot be brought together in the same hospital.

The Grumman engineers quickly saw that by applying Apollo technology to this development, they could produce an efficient and highly reliable device to do the job. This device is already being used to great advantage by giving to medical researchers at the Baylor College of Medicine a means by which they attack the problem of organ incompatibility and rejection. This, we all know, is the principal obstacle to be overcome in providing longevity to people with new hearts. It will also be a great step-up in tracking body rejection of other organs such as kidneys.

Now, no one could deny that such a payoff from space research is a very important advance. I ask the question: How important could that development be to a farmer in Iowa, a stockbroker in New York, or a mother of six children in Pasadena? The answer is obvious. Another question I must ask is this: Does the farmer, the stockbroker, the mother, the citizenry of this country know of such contributions—and this is only one of hundreds of its kind—to their health and continued productive lives? I do not think enough of our people are really aware of such benefits that could some day be of vital importance to themselves and their families.

I think that we, the Members of the House, could help to make them aware, since all of us are in broad contact with our constituents, in one way or another. I think that whenever opportunity presents itself, we can propagate the idea that in human terms the space program has and will continue to pay off the investment that the American people have made in the exploration of space.

## MEMORIAL PARK DEDICATED IN DEDHAM, MASS., IN HONOR OF PRIVATE FIRST CLASS JOHN A. BARNES III, CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR WINNER

### HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it was a great honor and privilege to be in attendance at the Memorial Park dedication in honor of Dedham, Massachusetts' only winner of the Congressional Medal of Honor—Pfc. John Andrew Barnes III.

I know that the U.S. Congress and all Americans wish to honor this brave and dedicated young man who has given his life in service to the United States of America.

I include in the RECORD the citation accompanying the Medal of Honor authorized by the President of the United States, which describes the gallantry and bravery of Pfc. John Barnes III, and remarks on the tribute of Dedham, Mass., to John Barnes:

MEDAL OF HONOR

The Medal of Honor was presented posthumously today to Private First Class John A. Barnes, III, United States Army, by Vice President Spiro T. Agnew in ceremonies at the White House. The citation for the award follows:

Private First Class John A. Barnes, III distinguished himself by exceptional heroism on 12 November 1967, while engaged in combat against hostile forces in Dak To, Republic of Vietnam. Private Barnes was serving as a grenadier when his unit was attacked by a North Vietnamese force, estimated to be a battalion. Upon seeing the crew of a machine gun team killed, Private Barnes, without hesitation, dashed through the bullet swept area, manned the machine gun, and killed nine enemy as they assaulted his position. While pausing just long enough to retrieve more ammunition, Private Barnes observed an enemy grenade thrown into the midst of some severely wounded personnel close to his position. Realizing that the grenade could further injure or kill the majority of the wounded personnel, he sacrificed his own life by throwing himself directly onto the hand grenade as it exploded. Through his indomitable courage, complete disregard for his own safety, and profound concern for his fellow soldiers, he averted a probable loss of life and injury to the wounded members of his unit. Private Barnes' conspicuous gallantry, extraordinary heroism, and intrepidity at the cost of his own life, above and beyond the call of duty, are in the highest traditions of military service and reflect great credit upon himself, his unit, and the United States Army.

[From The Dedham Transcript, Apr. 16, 1970]

MEDAL OF HONOR WINNER: MEMORIAL PARK DEDICATED SUNDAY IN HONOR OF PFC. JOHN A. BARNES III

Veterans' officials, town and county officers and members of the family of the late Pfc. John A. Barnes III will join with residents of Dedham to dedicate Memorial Park in honor of the town's only winner of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

There will be a parade of marching units, including several bands, prior to the formal dedication ceremonies which will be held at the monument site at the corner of East street and Eastern avenue, opposite the Fairbanks House, around 2:30 p.m. on Sunday (April 19).

Congressman James A. Burke, the principal speaker, will head a list of distinguished guests at the exercises which will re-name the park as the "Pfc. John A. Barnes III Memorial Park." He was killed in Vietnam.

The parade will form at 1 o'clock at the Central Fire station and the Ames School, and soon after that will march through Dedham Square, onto High Street to East Dedham square, turn onto Walnut street, then to Whiting avenue and the location of the Barnes Memorial.

The weekend of ceremonies will begin on Saturday afternoon with the unveiling of a new headstone for Pfc. Barnes at Veterans' Hill in Brookdale Cemetery.

Present will be the parents of the young hero, Mr. and Mrs. John A. Barnes; his sister, Mrs. James Fleming and family; members of the Barnes Memorial Committee, members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion, and members of their Ladies Auxiliaries.

Officiating at the brief rites will be Rev. Henry King, Navy Chaplain (Commander USNR).

Exercises at the monument on Sunday afternoon will get under way as the final unit in the parade reaches the site. The master of ceremonies at the dedication exercises will be Selectman Francis W. O'Brien, who also will introduce the distinguished guests.

The invocation will be by Rt. Rev. Edward C. Bailey, retired pastor of St. Mary's Church, and the benediction will be by Rev. Richard W. Manns, pastor of St. Luke's Church.

Actual unveiling of the Barnes Memorial will be by Stan Embree, chairman of the Memorial Committee; Cmdr. James Cline of the VFW post, and Cmdr. James Tansey of the Legion Post.

Representative Charles McGowan, chairman of the Board of Selectmen, will give the official welcome on behalf of the Town.

Following the address by Cong. Burke, the National Anthem will be played by the Air Force Band from Westover, the gunfire salute by the VFW and Legion units and the sounding of taps.

In addition to those already named distinguished guests will include Senate President Maurice Donahue, Secretary of State

John F. X. Davoren, Sheriff Charles W. Hedges, Frank Hunt and William Connors, representing the Veterans Administration;

Also, Dept. Cmdr. VFW Clarence Raymond and Dept. Sr. Vice Cmdr. Richard Lawlor; National Executive Committeeman Leo Malloy of the American Legion, and other town and veterans officials.

In the line of march will be Color Guards from Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps. Bands will include the Air Force, the Dedham High School Band, Recreation Band, Norwood Debonaires, Golden Rays, Canton American Legion Band, St. Joseph's of Medway, Colonial Boys of Norwood, and perhaps others.

Representing the VFW will be units from Dedham, Norfolk County, District 5, Needham, Weymouth, Wellesley, Whitman, Hyde Park, Quincy, Oak Sq. Brighton, Brookline and several of their auxiliaries.

And representing the American Legion will be units from Dedham, Malden, Norfolk County, Norwood, Stoughton, Weymouth, Canton and their auxiliary units.

Authorized by the recent Meeting, which appropriated funds for the monument and the services, the monument will be 10 feet two inches over all in height, six feet wide, and two feet six inches thick. It will carry the name of Pfc. Barnes, an engraved replica of the Medal of Honor, and the citation.

Chairman of the Barnes Memorial Committee is Stan Embree, assisted by Charles McGowan, Francis W. O'Brien, Daniel P. Driscoll, James Cline, James Tansey, Edgar L. George, James A. McNicholas, Robert Casey, John McMillen, the late Ralph Timperi, Paul Howard, Joseph Columbo, and secretary Susan Embree Thorsell.

Pfc. Barnes was the son of Mr. and Mrs. John A. Barnes Jr., of 48 Peacedale road, Needham, where they moved some time ago. They resided in Dedham, at 246 Colwell drive, when John Barnes III attended Dedham High School and while he was in the service. During one of his visits home in the summer of 1967 he joined the Jacob Jones Post, VFW in Dedham.

The 22-year-old paratrooper was a 1964 graduate of Dedham High. He was killed in action near Dac To, Vietnam, Nov. 12, 1967, when he threw himself on a hand grenade just before it exploded in a group of wounded men.

The Medal of Honor was awarded on Nov. 4, 1969, and accepted by his parents from Vice President Spiro T. Agnew in a ceremony at his Washington office. Attending the ceremony were Barnes' sister, Carson, and her husband, James Fleming, along with four of their seven children.

---

DEDICATION OF THE PFC. JOHN A. BARNES III MEMORIAL

Dedicated by the citizens of the Town of Dedham, Mass., on Sunday afternoon, April 19, 1970, 1:00 p.m.

Citation: The President of the United States of America by Act of Congress, March 3, 1863, has awarded in the name of the Congress the Medal of Honor posthumously to Pfc. John A. Barnes III, U.S. Army, for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty.

PROGRAM

Master of ceremonies, Francis W. O'Brien.

Welcome, Charles McGowan, Chairman, Board of Selectmen.

Invocation, Msgr. Edward Bailey, Chaplain.

Unveiling of monument, Stanley V. Embree, Chairman; Cmdr. James Cline, Veterans of Foreign Wars; and Cmdr. James Tansey, American Legion.

Introduction of guests, Francis W. O'Brien.

Musical selections, Air Force Band, Westover A.F.B.

Address, Congressman James E. Burke.

Benediction, Rev. Richard W. Manns, St. Luke's Lutheran Church.

National Anthem, Air Force Band, Westover A.F.B.

Rendering of honors, Dedham V.F.W. and A.L. Taps.

INVITED GUESTS

Mr. and Mrs. John A. Barnes.

Mr. and Mrs. James Fleming and Family.

Mass. Senate President Maurice Donahue.

Secretary of State John Davoreen.

Sheriff Charles E. Hedges.

Francis Hunt (V.A. Public Relations Officer).

William Connors (Manager, V.A. Boston).

J. Frank Colbert (Postmaster).

Clarence Raymond (V.F.W. Department Commander).

Richard Lawlor (V.F.W. Department Sr. V. Commander).

Leo Malloy (A.L. National Executive Committeeman).

* * * * *

The PFC John A. Barnes, III Memorial Committee wishes to express its sincere appreciation to the Town of Dedham and the many organizations and friends who voluntarily contributed their time, efforts, and funds in order to make this memorial possible.

PFC. JOHN A. BARNES III MEMORIAL COMMITTEE

Stanley V. Embree, Chairman; Charles McGowan, Francis O'Brien, Daniel Driscoll, James Cline, James Tansey, Edgar L. George, Joseph Columbo, Paul Howard, Robert Casey, John MacMillan, James McNicholas, Ralph J. Timperi, Paul D. Chisholm, and Susan Embree Thorsell, Secretary.

---

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN JAMES A. BURKE AT DEDICATION OF THE PFC. JOHN A. BARNES III MEMORIAL, DEDHAM, MASS., APRIL 19, 1970

It is a great privilege and honor to speak at this ceremony today in tribute to First Class John Andrew Barnes III, United States Army.

I know that nothing we can say here today will take the place of Private Barnes in the lives of his family and friends—but we join them in their grief and extend our deepest sympathies.

Private Barnes has received the highest honor which a grateful nation can bestow upon one of its citizens—the Congressional Medal of Honor. He exemplified in his military service the exceptional courage and heroism that comes only to a few—it did indeed come to John Andrews Barnes, III. Pfc. Barnes also received: Bronze Star Medal with 1st oak leaf cluster, Purple Heart with 1st oak leaf cluster, Combat Infantry Man Badge, National Defense Service Medal, Vietnam Service Medal, Vietnam Campaign Medal (Vietnamese), and Parachutist Badge.

Although his family, friends and his community are diminished by his death, we can be grateful to John Barnes for his valor—we can hope that through his supreme sacrifice in Southeast Asia, that we have been brought closer to a just and lasting peace.

Perhaps the words of Robert Kennedy, may give us comfort as we honor John Barnes: "Each time a man stands up for an ideal or acts to improve the lot of others or strikes out against injustice—he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope and crossing each other from a million different centers of energy and daring—those ripples build a current that can sweep down the mightiest walls of oppression and resistance."

We honor Pfc. John Barnes who has received the highest award from his Nation. We honor him because of his concern for his fellow man above and beyond the call of duty in giving the last full measure of devotion to that which he believed in.

## MEMORIES OF PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

---

## HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Franklin D. Roosevelt died on April 12, 1945, and so this month is the 25th anniversary of his passing.

In this connection William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst Newspapers, in a recent editor's report, recalls the "magnetic force and almost total self-assurance" of this great President.

Mr. Hearst's recollections are interesting and poignant, and because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in President Roosevelt, I place Mr. Hearst's report in the RECORD.

The report follows:

MEMORIES OF F. D. R.

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

NEW YORK.—Memory is somewhat like a telescope. Examined one way by the lens of your mind's eye, events of long ago can come into the diamond-sharp focus of yesterday. When the lens is reversed, the same events can seem so compressed and remote it is difficult to discern more than a dimly reminiscent blur.

There is something of this strange shifting of perspective in my own mind while sitting here examining my youthful recollections of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, whose death occurred today just 25 years ago. In one way it seems like yesterday. In another it seems ages ago.

My earliest memory of FDR—and certainly the most vivid—is the first time we met. It was in Albany, around about 1930, in his office as Governor of New York. The reason for my being introduced escapes me, but his impact on a young fellow 22 was remarkable.

What I remember best is the famous cigaret holder; the defiant angle it jutted from the massive jaw, the way its owner took it out to gesticulate and stab the air to make a point. The whole impression was one of magnetic force and almost total self-assurance.

So powerful was the impact of FDR's personality that you completely forgot he was paralyzed from the waist down. This affliction, resulting from infantile paralysis at the age of 39, would have ended the public careers of most men. To Roosevelt it was just another challenge which he met by outwardly ignoring it.

My next strongest memories involving FDR are indelible because they concern the activities of my father in getting him nominated for President at the historic 1932 Democratic National Convention in Chicago. It is no exaggeration to say he probably wouldn't have made it without Pop's help.

Pop was quite a political powerhouse in those days. When he was not running for office himself he was right in the thick of other major campaigns. Electing an appropriate President in the Depression-stricken crisis year of 1932 was of paramount importance to him.

Roosevelt was the leading choice of the delegates at Chicago, but he could not get the necessary two-thirds majority. Pop's candidate, and that of the five newspapers he then owned in California, was his old friend and former fellow U.S. Congressman, John Nance Garner of Texas.

Fearful that an undesirable third candi-

date would emerge as a compromise choice, Pop and Sen. William Gibbs McAdoo of California—together with a few others—prevailed upon Garner to accept second place on the ticket. FDR thus got the Texas and California votes he needed for nomination.

On my desk is a letter written by my father on July 3, 1932, which summarizes his tremendously important headline switch to Roosevelt. Here are the key quotes in his masterpiece of understatement:

"We were unable to secure the abolition of the two-thirds rule. It looked as if the Wall Street interests would repeat their strategy of former Democratic conventions and, by wearing out the genuinely Democratic majority, finally succeed in imposing on the will of the convention the will of an autocratic minority.

"I felt that there was nothing to do but communicate with Speaker Garner and tell him the truth about the whole situation.

"He responded nobly.

"So we threw California and Texas, and by means of Mayor Cermak, Illinois also into the Roosevelt column and Governor Roosevelt was nominated.

"I think it was the only proper thing for the convention to have done. I am glad to have had a hand in accomplishing it."

There's a bit of history in the raw for you. And because I was there in the middle of it all, it certainly is a whole parade of memories which will never fade.

Most of my other memories and impressions of FDR's subsequent 12 years and one month in the White House are colored by my father's strong reactions to this strong President. It was somewhat typical of Pop that, after helping elect Roosevelt, he should almost immediately start disagreeing with him on various issues.

Their first falling out was over the controversial price controls of the NRA Blue Eagle, which eventually were declared unconstitutional. Among many other matters, Pop also battled the President over his attempt to pack the Supreme Court and—most notably—FDR's decision to run for an unprecedented third term.

Because I was more of a Hearst fan than an FDR fan in those tumultuous days, I was inclined to agree with my father that the President was an arrogant and willful man who considered himself indispensable. I can remember almost exactly something Pop told me at that time:

"You mark my words, Bill. That man will never give up his job as President as long as he lives."

He was certainly right about that. Four years later, FDR ran successfully for a fourth term at a time when his health was clearly failing and he must have know his days were numbered—as they were.

So—as I said—my feelings about FDR when he was in office were somewhat ambivalent. I was naturally inclined to go along with my father; at the same time. I couldn't help but be impressed by the powerful leadership of the powerful man I had first met in Albany.

Today, looking back after 25 years, his image and record emerge most favorably. He was a man of bold and decisive action who never hesitated in meeting such terrible crises as the Depression and World War II, whose grim details are now blurred.

From first to last, he was primarily and inevitably controversial—so much so that few Presidents have ever been so hated by his enemies.

It still is debated, for example, whether the many trappings of socialism he brought to this country are fundamentally good or bad. And whether or not he was flim-flammed by Stalin at Yalta into making possible the Communist enslavement of Eastern Europe.

The thing to remember, despite the controversies, is that drastic decisions had to be made in those drastic times—and FDR made them, for the most part successfully.

A whole generation of Americans have grown up to whom Roosevelt is only a figure in history books. But to their parents he was a father figure in a period of great distress. If you were 18 when he was elected, you were 30 when he died.

So those who lived through the Roosevelt years—which now seem so long ago—can still vividly remember the powerful personality whose confident grin and defiant cigaret holder gave so much strength and assurance to so many.

He had his bitter critics, and still has. But who is really to say that matters would be better today if he hadn't done what he did?

Put a really big man under pressure and you are bound to get a lot of criticism over his decisions.

In a sense, the many controversies stirred by FDR are a measure of his greatness.

## HOUSTON CHRONICLE LAUDS CONGRESSMAN BOB CASEY

### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 14, 1970, the editors and publishers of the Houston Chronicle saw fit to editorialize the accomplishments of my good friend Congressman BOB CASEY. This is certainly fitting when one considers that BOB has given better than 30 years of his life to public service, the last 12 of them serving the 22d District of Texas. The editorial follows:

CASEY SERVES HOUSTON WELL

Rep. Bob Casey, who is seeking reelection to Congress from the 22nd Congressional District, is well known to the voters of Houston. He has spent most of his adult life in positions of political leadership. Voters in his South Harris County district have had ample opportunity to know him and to appraise his congressional leadership.

He is in his 12th year in Congress, during which time he has acquired valuable experience and—more importantly—congressional seniority.

A conservative Democrat, Casey is a member of the powerful House Appropriations Committee, a position from which he has strongly supported the nation's space program with which Houston is so closely identified.

He also serves on the subcommittee which funds all educational job training, medical and health research and hospital medical programs which are so important to the Texas Medical Center.

Casey's name has prominently been associated with the public controversy over crimes of violence. He advocates stiff, mandatory federal penalties for persons who use firearms in the commission of a crime. His efforts resulted in the passage of a law two years ago which applied to federal crimes only.

Rep. Casey was an author of the federal law which has made flood and hurricane insurance available for the first time.

He has proposed granting $750 income tax deductions to taxpayers for the repair or improvement of their homes or for rapid amortization over 60 months for such improvements to rental properties.

He has a bill pending which would extend Medicare to retired teachers, firemen, policemen and state employes.

Houstonians who have moved to this city in recent years may not be aware of Rep. Casey's long experience in politics.

He is a native of Missouri who moved to Houston 40 years ago. He was educated at San Jacinto High School, the University of Houston and South Texas College of Law.

He has served as assistant district attorney for civil affairs for Harris County, as a member of the Texas Legislature, and as city attorney and as a member of the school board of Alvin. He was serving as Harris County judge when he was first elected to Congress.

As county judge, Casey established the first county pollution control office in Texas. And at a time when there were no federal regulations or laws and only limited state statutory authority, he introduced legislation to permit an accelerated tax write-off for the cost of installing pollution control facilities. The legislation passed.

Casey has served Houston, Harris County and the 22nd Congressional District well during the 30 years since he was admitted to the Texas bar. He knows his constituents. He understands their problems and the problems of Texas. He is an experienced and reliable voice in Congress.

Casey has often been opposed in his bids for public office, but he has never been defeated. This says a lot about the public's confidence in his ability and leadership. This newspaper again endorses his candidacy.

## NIXON ON LAOS

### HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, sometimes, in their eagerness to embarrass President Nixon or make him look bad in the public eye, critics of the administration will conveniently overlook open facts and accuse the President of hiding something from the American people.

These tactics will not work, however, Mr. Speaker, because there are honest observers who will point out the truth for all who will listen.

Such a case is seen in the recent criticism of this country's involvement in Laos. Although critics on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and elsewhere are trying to make this seem like a "secret war" in which the United States is being trapped, the facts are that any involvement has come because it is integral to our overall effort in South Vietnam, and at the request of the Laotian Government.

Moreover, President Nixon outlined to the American people just what our role in that country is and why it came about in his speech on Laos of March 6. I commend to the careful attention of my colleagues a column by David Lawrence, which reviews the President's March statements and shows that no contradiction has been presented by the recent testimony, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 21, 1970]

LAOS ROLE ALREADY CITED BY NIXON

(By David Lawrence)

When the Senate Foreign Relations Committee released for yesterday's papers the testimony taken last fall disclosing that the forces of the government of Laos were trained and equipped through a secret American group operating out of Thailand, the story

naturally emphasized that the United States is participating in a "secret anti-Communist military operation in Laos" and that this has been directed by the U.S. Embassy in Vientiane for the last four years "without the knowledge of Congress."

But a careful examination of the facts reveals that in wartime not all information is given out to the enemy or even to committees of Congress while important military operations are under way.

It so happens that when the news was printed in the last couple of days, most of the writers of the dispatches in their haste forgot to tell the readers that President Nixon had described these same events and the reasons for the activity of Americans in Laos when he made a policy statement on Laos on March 6, 1970, at Key Biscayne, Fla. He had pointed out that the North Vietnamese have kept a growing number of troops in Laos—climbing from a token number in 1962 to 55,000 in mid-1969 and now to an "all-time high of some 67,000 men." He had added:

"These are not advisers or technicians or attaches: they are line units of the North Vietnamese army conducting open aggression against a neighbor that poses no threat to Hanoi.

"In addition, since 1964, over a half million North Vietnamese troops have crossed the Ho Chi Minh Trail in Laos to invade South Vietnam. This infiltration route provides the great bulk of men and supplies for the war in South Vietnam."

The President had made it clear that in the Vietnam war there are certain operations reaching into Laos, whose government requested American aid. He had said that Hanoi infiltrated more than 100,000 men through Laos since his administration took office and more than 500,000 all together. He had declared:

"Our air strikes have destroyed weapons and supplies over the past four years which would have taken thousands of American lives."

The President had stressed that the purpose of American aid has been to help the Laotian government "to prevent the Communist conquest of Laos" and that American forces "have used air power for the purpose of interdicting the flow of North Vietnamese troops and supplies."

Nixon had explained that it was not considered in the national interest to put emphasis on American activities in Laos because to do so might hinder the efforts of the prime minister of that country "to bring about adherence to the Geneva agreements by the Communist signatories." The President then added:

"In recent days, however, there has been intense public speculation to the effect that the United States involvement in Laos has substantially increased in violation of the Geneva accords, that American ground forces are engaged in combat in Laos, and that our air activity has had the effect of escalating the conflict.

"Because these reports are grossly inaccurate, I have concluded that our national interest will be served by putting the subject into perspective through a precise description of our current activities in Laos."

Nixon had gone on to say that there are no American "ground-combat troops" in Laos and that he had no plans for introducing such forces in Laos. All the military activities have been related to equipment, training and logistics for the Laotian army and to air operations. The President had said he considered it his responsibility to use air power on the Ho Chi Minh Trail and to carry out reconnaissance flights in northern Laos and "to fly combat-support missions for Laotian forces when requested to do so by the Royal Laotian government."

The President had asserted that the American air operations in Laos, which were escalated in 1964, had increased only as the number of North Vietnamese had multiplied and the level of their aggression has risen.

Nothing has been revealed by the belated publication of testimony given last autumn before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which contradicts anything that Nixon had said before.

---

## ROSENTHAL INTRODUCES ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION BILL

---


### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES


*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I think that the day after Earth Day is an appropriate time to introduce a bill which would increase substantially the opportunities to educate our citizenry against the problems of environmental deterioration.

The crisis has developed at a staggering pace—as can be attested by the revelation that 15 years ago the earth was relatively free of pollution. Man can no longer tolerate the ignorance and nonchalance that has led to his despoliation of the environment. Time has, suddenly and without warning, run out.

A ray of hope in this grim picture is the surge of public recognition over the environmental threat. Such awareness, however, has not sprcad as rapidly as the problems themselves.

To retain the momentum of public concern so that it reaches every corner of this country and is translated into positive action, I propose the Environmental Education Act of 1970.

The bill would appropriate $3 million in the current fiscal year to the U.S. Education Commissioner for the creation and development of environmental protection programs and curriculums in educational institutions throughout the Nation. Under the measure, $7 million would be appropriated in 1971, $10 million in 1972, and $12 million in each of the next 2 years.

The sums requested in the legislation are paltry for the objectives conceived, but realistic under present budgetary conditions. I am hopeful, however, that as the magnitude of the problem becomes clearer, the necessary funds will be authorized by Congress.

This legislation I have introduced should be acted upon promptly, for it seeks to exploit the heightened tempo of public concern which is our best—perhaps only—hope for survival. One of the most effective ways to perpetuate interest and fervor in resolving the environmental crisis is to make certain the younger generations are taught the dangers. If we can achieve this, particularly at the ages when the human mind is the most impressionable, we will have assured the existence of a dedicated and enlightened corps to battle further environmental disintegration. In the process, we shall also have raised considerably the odds of a habitable planet for centuries to come.

H.R.—

A bill to authorize the United States Commissioner of Education to make grants to elementary and secondary schools and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning environmental protection and for other related educational purposes

*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 "Environmental Education Act of 1970".

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that the loss of our natural resources and despoliation of our environment has reached an alarming level; that public knowledge of the problems is vital to arrest environmental deterioration and establish sound conservation practices; that there is a lack of coordination and information leading to environmental protection studies in elementary, secondary and adult education classes throughout the nation; and that the establishment of these studies is essential to produce a public awareness which will accept the sacrifices and activate the energies needed for the preservation of a decent life on this planet.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to encourage the development of new and improved curriculums on the problems of environment and preservation of natural resources; to demonstrate the use of such curriculums in model educational porgrams and evaluate the effectiveness thereof; to disseminate curricular materials and significant information for use in educational programs throughout the Nation; to provide training programs for teachers, counselors, and conservationists, and to offer community education programs for parents and others, on environmental problems.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and $12,000,000 for each of the next two fiscal years for the purpose of carrying out this Act. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available until expended.

USES OF FUNDS

SEC. 4. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 3, the Commissioner of Education shall assist projects designed to educate the public on the problems of environmental deterioration by—

(1) making grants to or entering into contracts with institutions of higher education and other public or private agencies, institutions, or organizations, for—

(A) projects for the development of curricula on ecology and the environmental crisis, including the preparation of new and improved curricular materials for use in elementary, secondary, and adult education programs;

(B) pilot projects designed to demonstrate, and test the effectiveness of curriculums described in clause (A) (whether developed with assistance under this Act or otherwise);

(C) in the case of applicants who have conducted pilot projects under clause (B), projects for the dissemination of curricular materials and other significant information regarding the environment of public and private elementary, secondary, and adult education programs;

(2) undertaking, directly or through contracts or other arrangements with institutions of higher education or other public or private agencies, institutions, or organizations, evaluations of the effectiveness cur-

riculums tested in use in elementary, secondary, and adult education programs involved in pilot projects described in paragraph (1)(B);

(3) making grants to institutions of higher education and local educational agencies to provide preservice and inservice training programs on environmental problems (including courses of study, institutes seminars, workshops, and conferences) for teachers, counselors, and other educational personnel, law enforcement personnel, and other community leaders;

(4) making grants to local educational agencies for community education programs on environmental problems (including seminars, workshops, and conferences) especially for parents and others in the community.

(b) In addition to the purposes described in subsection (a), the Commissioner may make available not to exceed 5 per centum of the sums appropriated to carry out this Act for each fiscal year for payment of the reasonable and necessary expenses of State educational agencies in assisting local educational agencies in the planning, development, and implementation of environmental education programs.

APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) Financial assistance for a project under this Act may be made only upon application at such time or times, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as the Commissioner deems necessary, and only if such application—

(1) provides that the activities and services for which assistance under this title is sought will be administered by or under the supervision of the applicant;

(2) sets forth a program for carrying out the purposes set forth in section 4 and provides for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of of such program;

(3) sets forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this Act for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available by the applicant for the purposes described in section 4, and in no case supplant such funds;

(4) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this title; and

(5) provides for making an annual report and such other reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may reasonably require and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(b) Applications from local educational agencies for financial assistance under this Act may be approved by the Commissioner only if the State educational agency has been notified of the application and been given the opportunity to offer recommendations.

(c) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Commissioner may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulation, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

CONSULTATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

SEC. 6. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall promulgate regulations establishing the procedures for consultation with other Federal agencies and with other appropriate public and private agencies.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall appoint an Advisory Committee on Environmental Education, which shall—

(1) advise the Commissioner concerning the administration of, preparation of general regulations for, and operation of, programs supported with assistance under this Act;

(2) make recommendations regarding the allocation of the funds under this Act among the various purposes set forth in section 4 and the criteria for establishing priorities in deciding which applications to approve, including criteria designed to achieve an appropriate geographical distribution of approved projects throughout all regions of the Nation;

(3) review the administration and operation of programs under this Act, including the effectiveness of such programs in meeting the purposes for which they are established and operated, making recommendations with respect thereto, and make annual reports of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for improvements in this Act to the Secretary for transmittal to the Congress); and

(4) evaluate programs and projects carried out under this Act and disseminate the results of such evaluations.

(b) The Advisory Committee on Environmental Education shall be appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws and shall consist of twenty-one members. The Secretary shall appoint one member as Chairman. The Committee shall consist of persons familiar with education (including elementary, secondary, and adult education, and higher education). The Committee shall meet at the call of the Chairman or of the Commissioner.

(c) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while serving on the business of the Advisory Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 8. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Attorney General shall, when requested, render technical assistance to local educational agencies and institutions of higher education in the development and implementation of programs of environmental education. Such technical assistance may, among other activities, include making available to such agencies or institutions information regarding effective methods of coping with problems of drug abuse, and making available to such agencies or institutions personnel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Justice, or other persons qualified to advise and assist in coping with such problems or carrying out an environmental education program.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 9. Payments under this Act may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 10. (a) The Commissioner may delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

(b) In administering the provisions of this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or private agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 11. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(b) The term "elementary school" means a day or residential school which provides preschool or elementary education.

(c) The term "secondary school" means a day or residential school which provides secondary education.

(d) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which—

(1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate;

(2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education;

(3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree;

(4) is a public or other nonprofit institution; and

(5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association or, if not so accredited, (A) is an institution with respect to which the Commissioner has determined that there is satisfactory assurance, considering the resources available to the institution, the period of time, if any, during which it has operated, the effort it is making to meet accreditation standards, and the purpose for which this determination is being made, that the institution will meet the accreditation standards of such an agency or association within a reasonable time, or (B) is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited.

Such term also includes any school which provides not less than a one-year program of training to prepare students for gainful employment in a recognized occupation and which meets the provisions of paragraphs (1), (2), (4), and (5). For purposes of this subsection, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

(e) The term "local educational agency" means a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or such combination of school districts or counties as are recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary or secondary school.

(f) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(g) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States of the Union, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(h) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Government or by State law.

## WATER PLANT MADE BIGGER ON THE INSIDE

### HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, in this day and age of increased national emphasis on the perils of environmental pollution it is indeed gratifying to note the efforts of our local city and State governments and citizens in seeking new and less costly ways to purify and treat wate" for reuse. The winter 1970 issue of the CH2M Reports relates how the city of Corvallis, Oreg., has achieved the desirable goal of increased water treatment plant capacity without increasing the size of the plant itself. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues as yet another fine example of the technological advances which Oregon is utilizing in combatting water pollution.

The article follows:

WATER PLANT MADE "BIGGER ON THE INSIDE"

The City of Corvallis has increased the capacity of its Douglas Taylor Municipal Water Treatment Plant by 2½ times—without increasing the size of the plant.

This seeming feat of legerdemain was accomplished through the application to the existing facilities of new technological developments in water purification—much of it the product of Oregon research and engineering.

Results of this application of advanced concepts and processes have included substantial saving of construction costs, improvement in water quality, and a considerable stretch-out of the City's long-range plan for expansion of its water supply.

Using the Willamette River as a source of supply, the treatment plant was designed and built in 1949 as a conventional rapid sand filtration plant. It was designed in increments of 4 million gallons per day capacity, each increment consisting of two 16 x 139-foot flocculation-sedimentation basins and two 484 square-foot gravity filters.

The initial plant capacity of 4 million gallons daily was increased to 8 mgd with the addition of a second increment in 1961. Under the original plan, the plant was scheduled for expansion to its ultimate capacity of 16 mgd with construction of the third and fourth increments in 1968–69. This, plus 4.5 mgd available from the City's second source on Rock Creek, was expected to take care of municipal water requirements through 1975, when construction of another treatment facility would have been necessary.

As it stands now, Corvallis has a water supply of 25 mgd, enough to last through 1980 at the current growth rate of 6 per cent a year. Capacity of the Willamette River treatment plant has been increased to 21 mgd, and since there still is space for the third and fourth increments called for under the original plan, the ultimate capacity has been boosted to 42 mgd.

While the plant appears virtually unchanged on the outside, it's a lot "bigger" on the inside. Two major advances in water treatment technology have been applied: High-rate mixed-media filtration, and shallow-depth sedimentation with tube settlers.

Piping for the plant had to be changed, to provide for the increase in capacity from 8 up to 21 mgd, with eventual expansion up to 42 mgd.

The converted plant has been operated under adverse conditions, and gives every indication of performing up to expectations. Operating on raw water with turbidities of around 15 to 30 JTUs, the basin effluent comes through the tube settlers at 1 to 2 JTUs. The plant consistently is producing finished water of high clarity.

The City can cite a substantial saving in capital outlay as a result of using technological advances to upgrade the plant. Construction costs for converting the plant to increase capacity to 21 mgd came to $430,000. Cost of achieving the needed capacity with conventional expansion through adding more sedimentation beds and filters is estimated to be approximately $650,000.

The project included other improvements in the City's water system. A new 5 million gallon prestressed concrete base level reservoir provides needed storage for meeting peak demands and added fire protection. A 1.25 million gallon prestressed concrete reservoir, a 125,000 gallon elevated steel tank, and two new pump stations were added for improved services to second-level and third-level service areas.

The city water department staff designed a new cross-town 16-inch transmission line between the filtration plant and the reservoirs to increase reservoir filling rates. Cornell, Howland, Hayes & Merryfield designed the other improvements, with C. Y. Shieh and George Dotson as project engineers.

## A TRIBUTE TO TED YUDAIN: AN HONORED REPORTER

### HON. LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 19, 1970, in Greenwich Hospital one of the great newspaper editors of our time died. Theodore Yudain was 63 years old when he passed away after a short illness.

For 45 years Ted Yudain was a responsible newspaperman. He called the shots as he saw them and was dedicated to public service and his community.

Ted started in the newspaper business as a cartoonist for the Stamford Advocate and the New Canaan Advertiser. In 1927 he became a reporter on the Advocate. Moving up through the ranks of his profession, Ted Yudain became editor of the Greenwich News-Graphic in 1936.

From 1943 through 1945 he was legislative correspondent for the former Bridgeport Herald after which he returned to Greenwich to become editor of the Greenwich Times.

Ted served on the Merritt Parkway Commission and was a member of the Republican State Policy Commission. In 1963 Ted returned to the Stamford Advocate as its editor and served the newspaper, where he began his career, as an editor until his death.

During his career Ted Yudain was president of the Connecticut circuit of the Associated Press and in 1967 won the Liberty Bell Award presented by the Stamford Bar Association.

Ted was known as one of the leading political commentators in the State of Connecticut. This is not the usual form eulogy because there was a time when Ted and I locked horns.

But when death took Ted Yudain from Connecticut a few days ago, it took from me a friend and confidant.

I respected his friendship. I believe that the best compliment I can pay Ted is summed up in the comment of one of his colleagues: "He was a newspaperman's newspaperman."

## SUPPORT FOR STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT GROWS TO NEARLY ONE-THIRD OF THE HOUSE MEMBERSHIP

### HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing House Resolution 375 which would amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing Committee on the Environment. Eighteen Members are joining me as cosponsors. This brings to 142 the number of Members who have sponsored this proposal which I first introduced on April 28, 1969.

There has recently been a great deal of discussion on the problems of our environment. Hundreds of bills to upgrade the quality of our environment have been introduced in Congress, and Americans of all persuasions have expressed increasing concern about air pollution, water pollution, and the numerous other environmental issues.

If this flurry of activity is to be translated into constructive legislation, I feel it first is necessary for us in Congress to establish a sound infrastructure of legislative machinery. This is why I have proposed a standing Committee on the Environment, and I believe this is also why 141 of my distinguished colleagues have joined me in this effort.

At the present time, our environmental efforts are fragmented. Interrelated problems are considered individually by many of our existing committees. To cite just one example, the legislation to implement President Nixon's message on the environment has been referred to three different committees. Each of these committees has a myriad of other problems with which to deal. None of them can concentrate on environmental matters exclusively.

Mr. Speaker, the committee I have proposed would have jurisdiction over air pollution, water pollution, solid wastes, acoustic problems, weather modification, herbicides and pesticides. Thus, most of the great environmental issues confronting the Nation today would be sorted by one committee which could proceed to offer the Congress the hard-driving type of environmental legislation the people of this country want.

In addition to lending cohesiveness to our environmental efforts, a standing committee would offer another important advantage. It would provide Congress with a professional staff having

expertise in the many problems of the environment working under one roof. Each Member is aware of the valuable work performed by the professional staffs of the committees on which they now serve. The problems of our environment are so technical and of such great magnitude that they should be treated by a separate committee with the assistance of an accompanying professional staff.

Last year I expressed the belief that our generation is the first which has the opportunity to leave the earth, its waters, and its atmosphere in better condition than we found it. I still believe that, but before it can happen we must gain a positive and perpetual control over those by products of civilization which are destroying our physical environment.

The standing committee which 142 Members of this body are sponsoring would make it possible to obtain the necessary control in an orderly, positive fashion.

Sponsoring Members come from 43 of our 50 States, from both of our great political parties, and from each of the standing committees now in existence in the House. This broad support makes it clear that concern for the quality of our environment transcends all political, regional, and philosophic differences.

Mr. Speaker, I fervently hope that the Rules Committee still will be able to hold hearings on House Resolution 375 in the 91st Congress.

At this point, I wish to announce that the following Members of Congress have sponsored resolutions identical to House Resolution 375:

ALABAMA

Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. FLOWERS.

ALASKA

Mr. POLLOCK.

ARIZONA

Mr. STEIGER.

CALIFORNIA

Mr. DON CLAUSEN, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. REES, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. WIGGINS.

COLORADO

Mr. BROTZMAN.

CONNECTICUT

Mr. MESKILL, Mr. WEICKER.

DELAWARE

Mr. ROTH.

FLORIDA

Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BURKE, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. GIBBONS.

GEORGIA

Mr. BLACKBURN.

HAWAII

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

IDAHO

Mr. HANSEN.

ILLINOIS

Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. YATES.

INDIANA

Mr. ADAIR, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. MADDEN.

IOWA

Mr. CULVER, Mr. MAYNE.

KANSAS

Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. WINN.

KENTUCKY

Mr. CARTER, Mr. COWGER.

LOUISIANA

Mr. CAFFERY.

MAINE

Mr. KYROS.

MARYLAND

Mr. BEALL, Mr. HOGAN.

MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. CONTE, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mrs. HECKLER, Mr. KEITH, Mr. MORSE.

MICHIGAN

Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ESCH, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. RIEGLE.

MINNESOTA

Mr. KARTH, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. NELSON, Mr. QUIE, Mr. ZWACH.

NEBRASKA

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. WYMAN.

NEW JERSEY

Mr. CAHILL, Mr. DANIELS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HUNT, Mr. MINISH, Mr. ROE, Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. WIDNALL.

NEW MEXICO

Mr. FOREMAN, Mr. LUJAN.

NEW YORK

Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. FISH, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. GROVER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KING, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. REID, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. WYDLER.

NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. BROYHILL.

NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. KLEPPE.

OHIO

Mr. BROWN, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. STANTON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TAFT, Mr. VANIK.

OKLAHOMA

Mr. CAMP.

OREGON

Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. WATT.

PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. BIESTER, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DENT, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. YATRON.

RHODE ISLAND

Mr. TIERNAN.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. MANN.

TENNESSEE

Mr. KUYKENDALL.

TEXAS

Mr. BUSH, Mr. WHITE, Mr. WRIGHT.

UTAH

Mr. BURTON, Mr. LLOYD.

VIRGINIA

Mr. POFF, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WHITEHURST.

WASHINGTON

Mrs. HANSEN, Mr. PELLY.

WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HECHLER, Mr. MOLLOHAN.

WISCONSIN

Mr. BYRNES, Mr. OBEY, Mr. SCHADEBERG, Mr. THOMSON.

WYOMING

Mr. WOLD.

---

## THE ROMANCE OF NATURAL HISTORY

---

### HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, on May 6, 1970, the Post Office Department will issue four special commemorative stamps in the natural history series. First-day ceremonies will be in New York City, where the American Museum of Natural History is currently celebrating its centennial year.

The four stamps depict an American bald eagle, a herd of African elephants, a group of prehistoric reptiles, and a ceremonial canoe of the Haida Indian tribe of the Northwestern United States.

The design for the eagle stamp, that of America's national bird, was from a model in the American Museum of Natural History. The elephant head stamp also comes from a display in the museum.

The age of reptiles stamp design is a detail from one of the largest murals in the world—110 feet long, 16 feet high—which was painted for Yale's Peabody Museum, a special commission that took 4½ years. The creatures shown are from the Jurassic geologic period: the more prominent being a brontosaurus, a stegosaurus, and an allosaurus.

The Haida ceremonial canoe stamp is based on an American Museum display. The seagoing canoes, almost 65-feet long, are made by holiowing out spruce trees. The figures in the canoe represent a Tlingit chief and his party on the way to a marriage ceremony.

Issuance of these stamps should serve as a reminder to all of us, and especially to those who call themselves alienated from society, that the world of natural history is indeed the most logical refuge for those who profess to suffer from materialism. To youth, in particular, discovery and romance and exploration are still very much alive in the realm of natural history. They can and do pose challenges greater to the intellect and the perseverance of those who dare to take up these challenges than anything else you could name. As the poet has writtten:

We travel not for trafficking alone,
By hotter winds our fiery hearts are fanned;
For love of knowing that which should be known,
We make the Golden Journey to Samarkand.

What is the driving force that stands behind the greatest explorations and discoveries, today, as it has in the past? Not fame nor fortune; no, each had his own Samarkand to seek out, and in practically every instance, it was "for love of knowing that which should be known."

The Samarkands of natural history still wait, glistening, faint and far in the distance, beckoning, and their challenge is waiting for those with the courage to accept it. Their scope is incredibly vast

and has through the ages meant many things to many men. To begin, let us look at what it meant to one man, in the final hours of his life.

THE TENT ON ROSS BARRIER

It was the last voyage for Robert Falcon Scott, captain, Royal Navy. The dramatic contest in 1911–12 between Scott and another great polar explorer, the Norwegian Roald Amundsen, to be first to reach the South Pole, was also the last of the romantic types of such exploration in which enormous personal risks were taken, and it was about to end in tragedy.

At midpoint, for Scott and his party, it was bitter, heartbreaking disappointment. Fifty miles from the South Pole, on January 16, 1912, sledge tracks and a Norwegian flag revealed the Norwegians had won. On January 17, at the pole, a dark tent flapped in the wind on the frozen plain; inside was a message from Amundsen.

Scott wrote that day in his journal:

Wednesday, January 17 . . . The Pole. Yes, but under very different circumstances from those expected. We have had a horrible day . . . There is very little that is different from the awful monotony of past days. Great God! This is an awful place and terrible enough for us to have laboured to it without the reward of priority . . . Now for the run home and a desperate struggle. I wonder if we can do it.

Scott did have the very slight and poor consolation of planting of flag 1,000 yards beyond Amundsen's tent; a summary of all calculations showed the Norwegian was off in his location of the pole by that distance. On January 18, the little party began its return; one man was already showing signs of madness and had to be strapped to a sledge. He died on February 17.

The Antarctic winter was setting in and temperatures were minus 43 degrees Centigrade —minus 107 degrees Fahrenheit— the four men made only 6 miles a day. Captain Oates' feet were badly frostbitten; he asked, time and again, to be left behind. The rest refused; then, on March 16 or 17, he quietly and painfully struggled to his feet, and, hand on the tent flap, calmly told his friends "I am just going outside and may be some time." He walked into the blizzard and was never seen again.

Around March 29, 1912, they were but 11 miles from a supply camp they had established 5 months before on the great ice mass known as Ross Barrier, but could go no further. With barely enough strength to pitch their tent, they lay down to await the end. "To My Widow" was the opening line of Scott's last letter to his wife.

One of the greatest of all polar explorers lay waiting to die in the Antarctic. Exploration and attempts to solve the riddles of nature and the earth had been his whole life. Now it was to end; Ross Barrier for a catafalque, a tent for a coffin, and a blizzard to be his shroud. But, his thoughts for his son, in the painfully scrawled letter to Mrs. Scott:

You see I am anxious for you and the boy's future. Make the boy interested in natural history if you can. It is better than games. They encourage it at some schools. . . .

A few more lines the pencil dropped from nerveless fingers. Robert Falcon Scott was dead.

Cease to be ruled by dogmas and authorities; look at the world. (Roger Bacon)

For Thomas Henry Huxley, the great English scientist, knowledge of natural history was a magic key:

To a person uninstructed in natural history, his countryside or seaside stroll is a walk through a gallery filled with wonderful works of art, nine-tenths of which have their faces turned to the wall.

A gallery, indeed; the first major work ever written on natural history painted a panorama of its scope that has never been equaled. Although written nearly 2,000 years ago, it is still valid and amazingly accurate in many respects. Of all the works of Pliny the Elder—23–79 A.D.—only his 37-book "Naturalis Historia"—Natural History—has come down to us, and it has well earned for him the title historians grant him: "the most learned Roman of his age."

Pliny spent his life in the service of Rome. Friend and confidant to Emperor Vespasian, he continued in that capacity to Vespasian's son Titus. First a soldier in Germany, later an administrator in Gaul, Africa, and Spain, he was commanding a Roman fleet stationed near Naples when Vesuvius erupted on August 24, 79.

Pliny immediately gave orders to set sail with part of the fleet, both to view the eruption close at hand—always the natural historian—and to aid those who were in danger. His galley grated on the beach near the thundering volcano and Pliny leaped ashore. The next morning, in the course of surveying the scene, he was suffocated by poison gases.

WHAT IS NATURAL HISTORY?

A sample dictionary definition of natural history reads as follows:

1. The observation and study of the phenomena of the material universe, especially the biological and earth sciences. 2. The sum of knowledge regarding such phenomena.

This is somewhat sterile; a look at part of the subjects covered by Pliny is more enlightening, descriptive, and colorful: astronomy, ethnology, meteorology, zoology, botany, metallurgy, geography, anthropology, human physiology, pharmacology, and medicine. To be even more specific, among the 20,000 facts which the preface says the work contains, we find the following:

Augustus' fleet sailing around Europe to the Baltic Sea; exploration by King Juba of the Canary Islands; arrival in Italy of rajahs from Ceylon; the surprise of the Roman navigator Plocamus, who saw shadows in the southern latitudes were cast toward the north, and not, as in Rome, toward the south; the skeleton of the monster to which Andromeda had been exposed; the chains with which Andromeda was fastened; tricks taught to elephants; perils of sponge divers; British coracles (small, primitive boats); the introduction of barbers into Italy; the variety of mattresses and woolen cloths used in Rome; use of hedgehogs quills for carding wool and the Roman Senate's decrees to keep them from being monopolized; the price of a cook; Lollia Paulina's jewels; foie gras and goosefeather pillows; and, even, an excursion into cosmetology with a note on how to use asses' milk to remove wrinkles.

Pliny would be right at home in the 20th century. In a series of current books under the heading "Natural History Selections" we find works on mathematical games; gravity; the prairie; apes; canoeing; microbes that live on the human body; Persepolis, home of the ancient kings of Persia; unidentified flying objects; oceans, mammals; the forest; the sea; helicopters and autogiros; a history of early zoology; prehistoric Europe; whales; speculations for the future; wildlife in danger of extinction; culture of the stone age tribesmen of New Guinea; glass blowing; survival in natural disasters; a pictorial guide to the stars; poisonous snakes; lives of the Egyptian pharaohs; Lake Nyasa, often called "Livingstone's Lake"; the Johnstown flood; honeybees; orchids, and songbirds.

Indeed the vastness of the scope of natural history is beyond total comprehension and grasp of any man. And this very vastness is testimony to the fact that—

All things by immortal power
Near or far
Hiddenly
To each other liked are,
That thou canst not stir a flower
Without troubling a star.

The world is the geologist's great puzzle box. (Louis Agassiz)

No one can ever say who first puzzled over the world around him, and made that first, fumbling attempt to understand Nature and what she holds. Man has changed, but curiosity and wonder have not. Man celebrates, investigates, studies, marvels at, rhapsodizes over, stands in awe or fear of, and sings the joys of, Nature, in a myriad of ways. Probably all of us have something of the naturalist in our makeup and it is the dull and sluggish mind indeed that is not moved or stirred by the wonders and marvels and beauties of Nature that constantly surround us. Indeed, we may say, with the Psalmist, that—

The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handiwork.
Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night seweth knowledge.

and probably poet never set of paper richer, more descriptive phrases than these from Wordsworth's "Lines Composed a Few Miles Above Tintern Abbey":

The sounding cataract
Haunted me like a passion; the tall rock,
The mountain, and the deep and gloomy wood,
Their colours and their forms, were then to me
An appetite; a feeling and a love,
That had no need of a remoter charm,
By thoughts supplied, nor any interest
Unborrowed from the eye. . . .
A sense sublime
Of something far more deeply interfused,
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
And the round ocean and the living air,
And the blue sky, and in the mind of man;
A motion and a spirit, that impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
And rolls through all things. . . .
Knowing Nature never did betray
The heart that loved her. . . .

Yes, as one poet has said, there are "Anthems ringing, in the sea or sky," and they are there for those who will listen and for those who are also driven to seek them out. Hamlet's famous rebuke in act I, scene V, notes that—

There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, than are dreamt of in your philosophy.

One stanza from Kipling's "The Explorer" graphically describes the fascination and hold the unknown has:

Something hidden. Go and find it. Go and look behind the Ranges—
Something lost behind the Ranges. Lost and waiting for you. Go!

Something hidden—something lost—those who sought them out are as fascinating as the things they set out to find, and let us look at some of both.

SIR RICHARD FRANCIS BURTON

Scholar, linguist, naturalist, explorer, anthropologist—Burton was all these, and, more often than not, "greatest" was prefixed to each term. He was also translator of the Arabian Nights—Alf Laylah wa-Laylah, The Thousand Nights and a Night, and at one time he was known as "Europe's Greatest Swordsman." The night of April 18–19, 1855, was to be one unparalleled in any of the tales Scheherazade told to King Shahriyar, and it was also to be a night when the "Greatest Swordsman" title was to serve him best.

A few months before, Burton had been the 31st Westerner to try, and the first to come back alive from, the attempt to penetrate the mysterious and forbidden city of Harrar, deep in the Somaliland, in East Africa. Friendly natives had tried to talk him out of it: "Burton Effendi, the head, once struck off, does not grow again like a rose."

But he had gone alone, except for a small native escort, riding on a white mule with a brace of Colt's six-shooters slung at his waist and a double-barrelled rifle across his lap. The Eesa, the Tribe of the Hundred Thousand Spears, through whose country Burton had to pass, had a reputation for treachery second to none in the entire area, but Burton's tact, combined with his ability to shoot vultures on the wing with his double rifle, got him through.

He had gone in, and come out, and now he was ready to go back again, Burton, three English army lieutenants, Speke, Herne, and Stroyan, and a nondescript and unreliable native contingent of 42, were camped on a ridge near the Red Sea coastal town of Berberah. Not for 30 years had an Englishman been molested in Berberah and the little party went to bed, not too troubled, although there were reports of hostile natives gathering in the hills.

Burton said it was "the rush of men like a stormy wind." Speke described it "as though the world were coming to an end." Between 2 and 3 in the morning of April 19, in a wild, screeching flurry of spears, clubs, daggers, and javelins, 350 Somali warriors swooped down on the camp. The native guard fled almost at once; Stroyan was nowhere to be seen. Burton, Speke, and Herne, beseiged in a large, penthouse-shaped tent, were armed only with revolvers and sabers. Under the rain of blows from clubs and spears, the tent threatened to collapse and if the three were entangled in its folds, they would be butchered like sheep. Burton gripped his saber; "Charge!" he roared, and stormed into the howling mob outside.

Burton had not exactly been born with a sword in his hand, but he might as well have been. While still in his teens, his skill with the blade had reached the point where he was refused admission to the meanest, toughest duelling brigade of the scar-faced German students at Heidelberg. Brigade rules demanded he "fight" his way in—literally—and in the test duel Burton showed only half what he could do. It was too much, and he was turned down.

A French Sergeant of Hussars, of considerable fame as a swordsman, challenged him to a match. The sergeant, in preparation, put on mask and jacket. They were to use fencing sabres, light, tipped, and dull-edged, but still a blow on bare flesh would not be welcome. Burton shrugged casually, tossed his jacket aside, rolled up his shirt sleeves, and opened his collage. It did not faze the sergeant; Waterloo was less than 40 years in the past, and French Hussars, a tough lot to begin with, had no feelings of tenderness toward Englishmen.

They saluted; the steel clashed; Burton's blade swept down violently on the Freshman's sabre and it clattered to the floor. Burton repeated the performance seven times in as many minutes; the sergeant acknowledged defeat, with his wrist nearly dislocated. Burton had suffered only a light touch on the neck.

But these were not fresh Hussar sergeants before him now. The Somali were wild to dip their ostrich plumes in the blood of slain enemies. Burton bored directly into a knot of 20 warriors—cut, slash, parry a war club or spear, thrust—the sabre now rose and fell, now darted in and out, now swept before him in a great glittering arc, as the Somali shrieked and pressed home their attack. Out of the corner of one eye Burton thought he saw Stroyan's prostrate form, and, raging out in a new fierce burst of energy, cut his way through the howling mob. A hand pressed against his back; he paused, blade upraised, then stopped as he recognized one of his own men.

The momentary pause was almost fatal. A Somali, seeing his chance, stepped in and thrust a javelin through Burton's jaw. It entered one cheek, tore away four back teeth and part of the palate, and emerged on the other side. The savage fled; Burton, half mad with pain, somehow managed to cut his way through the mob and in the darkness and confusion made his way to the harbor, where a friendly ship was anchored. There the sailors found him, javelin still through his face, searching for his companions. Herne and Speke somehow had escaped. Burton carried the scar of the javelin thrust to his grave.

In the history of natural science, a history full of colorful characters, Burton stood out like an oak upon the hills. In a letter he wrote in 1863, he described the urge that pushed him on:

Starting in a hollowed log of wood—some thousand miles up a river, with an infinitesimal prospect of returning! I ask myself "Why?" and the only echo is "damned fool! . . . the Devil drives!"

"Discovery is mostly my mania," he wrote at another time. He is in the first rank of British explorers and one of that group of gifted scientists who, in a sudden burst of discovery, shoved back the frontiers of man's knowledge. As one of his biographers cataloged his abilities, he was more a man of the Renaissance than of the 19th century. Soldier, explorer, ethnologist, archaeologist, poet, translator, one of the greatest linguists who ever lived—counting dialects, he knew 40 languages; add to that amateur physician, botanist, zoologist, and geologist, and last but not least, as has just been told, master swordsman.

In his lifetime, he produced 43 volumes of his explorations, travels and discoveries. When Sir Henry Stalney had to cut down his African baggage to one book, he retained Burton's "Lake Regions of Central Africa." Sixty years after Burton wrote "Pilgramage to El Medinah and Meccah," Lawrence of Arabia himself was to testify to its absolute accuracy in every detail. In World War I, his reports of routes in part of East Africa and Arabia were cited in intelligence documents as the best available.

Burton's journal entry for December 2, 1856, gives the measure of this man, and very probably for a great many others like him who felt the magic lure of exploration of the unknown:

Of the gladdest moments in human life, methinks, is the departure upon a distant journey into unknown lands. Shaking off with one mighty effort the fetters of Habit, the leaden weight of Routine, the cloak of many Cares and the slavery of Home, man feels once more happy. The blood flows with the fast circulation of childhood . . . Afresh dawns the morn of life. . . .

Saul, he went to look for donkeys,
And, by God! he found a kingdom!
—Kipling: The Explorer.

Change the words a bit; for Saul, read "Napoleon" whose "donkeys" were the members of the Scientific and Artistic Commission the Little Corporal took with him on his expedition to Egypt in 1798—and "donkeys" is exactly what the French soldiers called them. In this instance it was the donkeys, instead of Saul, who carried the day, when the hope of an Egyptian kingdom had been destroyed and the expedition was driven out after only 3 years.

On July 21, 1798, just before the Battle of the Pyramids, Napoleon is said to have exhorted his soldiers with the famous line "From the summit of yonder pyramids, forty centuries look down upon you." He had another thought in his mind; if not at that time, it came to him shortly after the battle, when he announced calmly, after staring at the great pyramid for a few minutes, that the stones would make a wall 1 meter wide and 3 meters high around France. The calculation was correct.

Few think of Napoleon Bonaparte as anything but a general, a man of battle, a would-be conqueror, whose armies made Europe tremble. There is a surprising and little-known side to the man. He had been greatly flattered and pleased by his election to the French National Institute in 1797, and he was aware that

science leaves more lasting monuments than does war.

So, with his army, to Egypt, he took with him his Scientific and Artistic Commission which had in it some of the best scholars and scientists of the time. It was the commission that first uncovered the glories of ancient Egypt; first studied the mighty ruins of Luxor and Karnak; made the first copies for Europe of Egyptian hieroglyphs—and gave to the world the Rosetta Stone, that unparalleled discovery that was the key to ancient Egyptian writing—and poked into every hitherto unknown corner of that land. Egyptian history, monuments, arts geological structure, animal and plant life, flora and fauna—anything, in short, that would interest an architect, musician, painter, mathematician, zoologist, botanist, physicist, or archaeologist, all of them constantly egged on by a never-ending stream of questions from Napoleon himself.

In 3 years the institute had collected enough data to fill nine large volumes of text and 14 volumes of plates. The topics tumble over one another in profusion: formation of ammonia and the Egyptian method of manufacturing indigo; exploration of Lake Manzala and the Wadi el Natrun, the "soda lakes" south of Alexandria and, for a sideline a description of Coptic monasteries, and the living habits of the Bedouin tribes; the need to explore the sources of the Nile; studies of infant mortality and ophthalmia; treatment of bubonic plague and smallpox; mirages; capillary attraction; and even a paper on the wing of an ostrich.

One member had finished reading a paper on fish of the Nile to the assembled institute, when a visiting sheikh in the audience asked for the floor. He pointed out the vanity of such things:

Did not the Prophet Mohammed, on whom be peace, settle this for once and for all by declaring that God had created 30,000 species, 10,000 for land and 20,000 for water?

Fifty thousand men went with Napoleon to Egypt; only 23,000 returned and of those 3,000 were invalids, crippled for life by wounds or disease. It may well be that if Napoleon's commission had not done its work, others would have followed, and done it for them. This is beside the point; Napoleon Bonaparte was, to be sure, the man of Marengo who tried, at Waterloo, to wipe out Agincourt. His name is indissolubly linked with events that caused great loss of life, destruction, turmoil and upheaval in Europe. But it is also the name of a man whose initiative literally opened up Egypt, the Ancient Egypt with 4,000 years of unplumbed and unwritten history, who created the science of Egyptology and built for scholars to come a base and a platform upon which to work. History should treat him better, and remember him for this, as well as and probably above, all else.

"DRY BONES"—IN THE ANTARCTIC

Cut India and the southern continents out of a map; put their outlines together. South America fits into Africa; Africa's northwest coast fits into the eastern coast of the United States. The Antarctic and Australia snuggle together. None of this is with the precision of a jigsaw puzzle, but it is close enough to have given birth to the theory of continental drift. In Permian times—beginning about 250 million years ago, and lasting 55 million years—the theory holds, there was one great land mass, known to geologists as Gondwanaland, which later broke up and drifted apart, to form continents as we know them today. To prove this, it would be necessary to find traces of identical species of reptiles and mammals in continents now wide apart.

Ten years ago, New Zealand explorers on the South Polar plateau, on Antarctica's northeastern rim, gave the name "Coalsack Bluff" to a 4-mile-long stone bluff, pointed at one end and open at the other, with the "mouth" of the sack gaping 800 feet up and a mile wide. It has seams of coal 27 feet thick, but this is not unusual for the Antarctic. The continent once was tropical and coal is merely tropical vegetation of an incredibly ancient age.

Now, in 1901, when the first Antarctic coal deposit was discovered, explorers also found in the coal a fossil of a tongue-shaped leaf of a fern which had grown profusely, 200–300 million years ago, in South America, South Africa, Madagascar, India, Australia, and New Zealand. This seemed to give substance to the Gondwanaland theory, which had been put forth 15 years previously.

The Gondwanaland idea was tugged back and forth for over 50 years. Circumstantial evidence, plenty of that, but the existence in the Antarctic of plants and primitive organisms, also found elsewhere, simply wasn't enough. Plant seeds could have been brought there by winds, so the search went on.

Beardmore Glacier, in the Antarctic, has been described as one of the most awesome frozen rivers on the entire planet. There, on Graphite Peak, along the glacier's western shore, in December 1967, a New Zealand graduate student found a skull fragment which was identified as belonging to a labyrinthodont, an amphibian that was common to all the southern continents, about 200 million years ago.

The animal could not have swum to the Antarctic because it could not tolerate salt water. Again, it was a tropical creature; it must have lived there when the Antarctic was other than what it is today. And where amphibians had lived, their earliest descendants, reptiles, might have lived also. The National Science Foundation is charged with Congress for overseeing all Antarctic research, and in 1969 a team of vertebrate paleontologists were sent to look further.

The team checked the type of rock the skull fragment had been found in and mapped out two overlapping circles around adjoining mountain ranges, which included Coalsack Bluff. Coalsack Bluff hand not been any special choice, but on the first day of the expedition, for lack of anything more interesting to do, a team member had climbed to the top. At his feet was an ancient riverbed, loaded with fossils.

Digging fossils out of rock is difficult enough in any circumstances and in the Antarctic is a truly miserable job. One member of the team did not take any particular notice of the tooth he found one day. It was, he noticed, 2 to 3 inches long and three-eighths of an inch thick. It had occupied the right side of some animal's jaw, and the root was there, as well. He was more concerned at the time with his own face; the entire right side and his nose were frostbitten and it was beginning to feel like a lacerated boil.

But the tooth was immediately recognized by another member of the team as belonging to a lystrosaurus, a snub-nosed reptile, with only two teeth in its head, which the same member had once dug up in Africa. The Coalsack Bluff discovery was to be shortly called "one of the truly great fossil finds of all time."

The linkage of Africa to the Antarctic was definitely established, and fossil bones of a dozen other animals, also brought back, have been interpreted to mean that for at least 60 million years the Antarctic was connected to Africa, South America, India and Australia. And just how does that spiritual about "Dry Bones" end? "Now hear the word of the Lord!"

THE MONSTER OF THE ISHTAR GATE

The Ishtar Gate of Babylon, buried for centuries, was uncovered in 1902 and is one of the major wonders of archeology. An enormous, semicircular arch, flanked by gigantic walls, it opens on to a processional way of considerable length which is also flanked, right and left, by walls. The material is brick, glazed bright blue, yellow, white, and black, and the walls of the gate and procession way are covered with bas-reliefs of unusual artistical beauty, showing very lifelike animals.

Rows of stately lions grace the processional way. The gate walls, top to bottom, are covered with alternating rows of two other animals. One is a strong and fierce bull, known as the re'em, since identified as the wild and vicious ancestor of our own domestic cattle. The other—the secret may still lie in the Rain Forest and Congo Basin regions of Central Africa, where, it is just possible, what the Babylonians called "sirrush" still lives.

Babylonian and Assyrian mythology are full of winged bulls and man-headed birds and it would seem the sirrush belongs with them. A slender body, covered with scales, a long scaly tail and a slim scaly neck bearing a serpent's head, with a forked tongue. Flaps of skin are attached to the back of the head, which also has a pair of horns. And, to this, hair—three corkscrew ringlets, on the head near the ears, and a long row of curls on the neck. The forefeet are those of a large catlike animal, like a panther, but the hind feet are four-toed, like those of a bird, and covered with strong scales.

But it is not so easy to dismiss the sirrush as a mythological animal. For one thing, the picture of the sirrush appears in Babylonian art from the very earliest times up through the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, about 604–561 B.C. Also, the Babylonians knew nothing of paleontology; the sirrush is either a direct portrait of something they knew existed, and

had seen, or a wildly impossible miracle of correct imagination. The conception of the sirrush fits in perfectly with known characteristics of extinct saurians, and there are any number of fossil examples which very closely parallel the mysterious Babylonian animal.

Now, today, such an animal could exist only in one spot on earth: The Congo Basin and the Rain Forest region of Central Africa. This is assuming one does exist and this is not an assumption all that wild. The white rhinoceros is the second-largest land animal on earth, the closest living relative to the tanklike creatures of prehistoric times—and was not discovered until 1900. The giant Komodo dragon, largest lizard known to zoology, existed in solitary and unknown splendor on the Komodo Islands, off Indonesia, completely overlooked by everyone until 1912. The coelacanth, a prehistoric fish, flourished 180 million years ago and was believed to have become extinct at the end of the cretaceous period, 60 million years ago. Yet, a 5-foot-long specimen was caught by a fisherman off East Africa in 1952, and there are indications they may also be off the Florida coast, in the Gulf of Mexico.

Is there a sirrush in Central Africa? A German naturalist went into the area soon after the beginning of the 20th century in search of the "legendary and extinct" pigmy hippopotamus—which was neither legendary or extinct, but very much alive—and returned with native tales of a lizardlike animal, living deep in inaccessible swamps.

Just prior to World War II, a German woman who had lived for 10 years in Eastern Angola wrote of the unknown animal which, according to the natives, killed hippos. The native name is coje ya menia; every other known predatory animal in the region has a different name, and this name alone is reserved for what—the sirrush?

WHEN NATURE PLAYS TRICKS

Nature gives us the characteristics of our ancestors; "Who does the baby look like?" Is the first game played immediately after birth by both sides of the family. It is not at all unusual, in cases of families with long and well-detailed histories, also fortunate enough to have passably good pictures of long-dead forebears, to have children born in the 20th century bearing an almost uncanny resemblance to a descendant buried for over 400 years. This is especially true if the family has a higher than usual percentage of intermarriage between cousins.

But is there something else nature gives, as well as physical traits? Is there a weird, almost frightening phenomenon, little known and almost impossible of detailed study, that indicates nature can preserve memories over the centuries, as well? Can something seen, hundreds of years ago, that made an unusually sharp impression on the mind of the viewer, somehow be transmitted down through generations, to suddenly appear, as clear and alive as yesterday's events, in the mind of a descendant?

"Ancestral memory," this is called, and there is a case on record, not too many years old, that to many serious authorities presents a strong argument for its existence. One case does not make a certainty, that is for sure. But at present there is no other satisfactory explanation for the following story:

James Fraser was a simple Highland Scottish cartmaker, of Beauly, and the same recurring dream, time and again, troubled him. Shortly before the Second World War, Fraser described the dream to a prominent, meticulous, and highly respected Highland scholar. It was no ordinary dream; the scholar realized, much to his amazement, that what a relatively uneducated cartmaker was telling him was an extremely detailed, precise, and accurate account of a major battle between two clans—400 years before, in 1544.

Few Scots scholars could have put together such an account as Fraser told. Some of his details were noted to be obvious—but they had never occurred to anyone before. Some other details could be backed up, but from certain obscure, hard-to-find sources, that were not available to Fraser nor to his acquaintances. And Fraser's description of the costumes, equipment, and methods of fighting could hardly have been surpassed.

Why should an obscure Scotsman of the mid-20th century know so much about the battle of Blar-na-Leine, as it is called in Scots history? His name was Fraser and it was in this battle, between Clan Fraser and the powerful Clanranald, that almost all the Frasers, including their chief, were slain. Clan Fraser is much interbred in its own clan country. James Fraser was very probably descended, over and over again, from a Fraser eyewitness of and participant in the battle.

Of course, all this proves absolutely nothing—except that a Scotchman had a dream, a dream that he kept having over and over again—how many times have you dreamed exactly the same thing, twice?—that he should not have had in such precise detail in the first place.

More things in heaven and earth.

Man's footprints mark the dust of the surface of the moon. His planetary probes send him TV pictures of the face of Mars. Yet, earth itself is still full of enough secrets and mysteries to tantalize many generations yet to come.

Nature is strangely fickle and unpredictable. What should be obvious remains concealed for centuries. Angkor Wat, the long-dead city of the Khmers, slumbered for 400 years in the Cambodian jungles, a marvel of stone covering more land area than Minneapolis and Milwaukee combined. But a French naturalist, looking for rare butterflies, literally walked into it, in 1861.

The Pi Tong Luang, a tribe of primitive people numbering in the thousands, lived in the jungles of Thailand for no one knows how long. No one knows, mainly because no one knew they were there until they walked out on their own accord one day in 1932, to astound the scientific world.

Pontius Pilate, in his own way, is probably the most famous Roman of all. But for 20 centuries there was no inscriptional evidence or testimony to his existence. In 1961, during excavation of an ancient theater in Caesarea, in Palestine, a workman dislodged a 2 by 3 foot stone beneath a flight of steps. On the buried, bottom, side, lettering was seen. The left one-third of the letters had been chipped away, but it was easy to reconstruct and read the Latin inscription:

Ceasariens. Tiberieum Pontivs Pilatvs Praefectvs Ivdaeae Dedit.

"Pontius Pilate, Prefect of Judea, has presented the Tiberieum to the Caesareans." The "Tiberieum" may have been a temple or a civic structure; this is not known. But the term "Prefect" is significant. For centuries Pilate has been called "Procurator." Both, freely translated, mean "Governor," but Prefect denotes more military responsibilities than does Procurator.

These mysteries "solved" themselves, so to speak. But the following still seek an answer:

The tomb of Alexander the Great.

Ancient accounts of the career of Alexander the Great are strangely and mysteriously silent on one all-important detail: his burial place. The place and manner of his death, the last hours of his life, as his hardened Macedonian veterans filed past his deathbed for one final review, his funeral cortege—all these are matters of record. But where was he buried?

There is the story of an Italian who, spurred by rumors whispered to him in the Egyptain streets and bazaars, made his solitary and dangerous way past the guards into the vaults and crypts, far under the ground, of a Cairo mosque. As the story goes, he came to a passageway, choked with heaps of papyri, and beyond the rubbish he could see a heavy wooden door, with an opening. A flashlight beam through the opening in the door showed the figure of a richly dressed man, lying in an alabaster coffin with a crystal cover. This all happened, according to the story, sometime between the two World Wars. The Italian vanished shortly after that and was never seen again.

Curious footnote to this: the story was told me by an acquaintance, who had heard it and pursued it further, on his own, to the point of asking a close friend, a cultured, highly intelligent Egyptian scholar. As my friend told me—

Dr. G____ looked me full in the face, glared silently for a moment, turned on his heel and strode away. He was never really friendly to me again.

BEFORE COLUMBUS—THE TALE OF HOEI-SHIN

Chinese chronicles tell of a Buddhist priest, Hoei-Shin, who journeyed far to the East, across the ocean, around 500 A.D. The chronicles are quite explicit on certain matters, and on circumstantial evidence alone it would seem Hoei-Shin reached Mexico and Central America.

Go to the Museum of Natural History, in New York City, and look at the intriguing little carving known as the "Laughing Head." It comes from Totonac, near Vera Cruz, and was carved centuries before Columbus sailed. Why the laughter on the little face? Is it because no one can quite explain why a

head carved by Indian artists, hundreds of years ago, should have such distinctly and unmistakably Chinese features?

BEFORE COLUMBUS—THE MASSACHUSETTS ROCK

The thrill of exploration was sweeping through Europe in the 16th century, and around 1560 Niccolo Zeno of Venice published some old letters that have been a source of argument ever since. According to the letters, two of Zeno's ancestors had sailed to the New World with the Scots Prince Henry Sinclair, Jarl of the Orkneys and Baron of Rosslyn, some 100 years before Columbus' time. Again, the evidence is primarily circumstantial, were it not for a disturbing carving on a rock, near Westford, Mass.

The stone and its carving were there when the first settlers came and it was always assumed to be Indian in origin. But not too many years ago one investigator thought he could discern the outline of a Viking sword. A picture of the carving went to the Curator of the Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, in Cambridge, England, and he confirmed the sword was indeed of the 14th century style.

Back to the rock; this time, it was completely cleared of brush and vines, to reveal—a 6-foot figure of a knight in armor, bearing a shield. The design on the shield was faint, but discernible. An eminent Scots expert, bearing the wonderful official title of Unicorn Persuviant, declared the heraldry on the shield to be, beyond doubt, that of Clan Gunn—a branch of the Sinclairs.

Doubts to be solv'd, the map incognita, blanks to be fill'd,
The foot of man unstay'd, the hands never at rest . . .

From a flower to a star—the list of marvels and mysteries is endless—knowing something happens is one thing, but knowing the "why" of it is something else again.

We know that birds in flight navigate by the sun and the stars, making calculations in a split second that a human could not possibly duplicate.

We know that bats have an incredible, highly developed form of built-in radar by which they can fly through complex mazes of obstacles, at high speeds, and avoid each and every obstacle.

We know bees have a marvelously intricate "clock" in their systems. A swarm kept in New York City was "trained" to always feed at 3:30 p.m. They were packed up and flown overnight to California; the first day, they came out for their food exactly 24 hours after their New York feeding, at 12:30 California time. But within 2 days, they gradually delayed until they were right back on schedule at 3:30, once more.

But we do not really know "why" to any of this.

The solid, iron discipline of an ant colony is a marvel of the natural world. The observation has been made, based on somewhat grim but probably accurate logic, that, if man ever disappeared from the face of the earth, ants would succeed him. Of all living things, only man—and ants—organize to make war.

We wonder, with more than a little trace of some primordial feeling of fear, at reports and accounts of strange creatures in remote corners of the globe. Just what is that mysterious being said to roam the slopes of the Himalayas? What caused the "Devil's Footprint," that curious semihoofmark in a blanket of newly fallen snow that appeared one morning and stretched for some miles in a single line over an area of rural England?

Are there, living still, creatures thought extinct millions of years ago? What is in the icy waters of Loch Ness, in Scotland? Sonar tracked an "object," far below the surface, moving at about 20 miles an hour. Could it be that, deep beneath the peat-stained waters of the Loch, the "Great Orm of Loch Ness" is a creature bearing still in its sluggish brain some dim prehensile memory of its brothers of the Cretaceous period of 65 million years ago?

Creation is a great, never-ending cycle that continues, on earth and in the farthest reaches of space. Gravity calls into being planets and stars, out of clouds of dust and gas. It ignites their nuclear fuel, and when that fuel is consumed, crushes them into glowing white dwarfs, or pulsars.

And on earth, this same force is measured and detected, as great, 4-ton aluminum cylinders, delicately suspended and balanced, gently pulse and resonate as this same gravity passes in waves through them.

In truth, ". . . thou canst not stir a flower without troubling a star . . ." Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, the great second century philosopher-emperor of Rome, wrote so movingly and for all time of the man/nature relationship:

All that is harmony for thee, O Universe, is in harmony with me as well. Nothing that comes at the right time for thee is too early or too late for me. Everything is fruit to me that thy seasons bring, O Nature. All things come of thee, have their being in thee, and return to thee.

It is discovery of the highest order: discovery of ourselves and of our nature and of our relation to our Creator. In a way, it leads us right back to where we started, as the poet Eliot wrote:

We shall not cease from exploration
And the end of all our exploring will be
To arrive where we started
And know the place for the first time.

"The course of Nature is the art of God," wrote Edward Young. The voice that speaks to each and every one of us through nature, through this art, is always there, and never still, and if we listen, we will be sure to hear it. The American poet William Cullen Bryant expressed it so well in his eloquent and moving "Thanatopsis" and especially in the opening lines. For nature, after all, is the whole, and we are part of the whole, and it is only right that the whole speaks to the part:

To him who in the love of nature holds
Communion with her visible forms, she speaks
A various language; for his gayer hours
She has a voice of gladness, and a smile
And eloquence of beauty, and she glides
Into his darker musings, with a mild
And healing sympathy, that steals away
Their sharpness, ere he is aware. When thoughts
Of the last bitter hour come like a blight
Over thy spirit, and sad images
Of the stern agony, and shroud, and pall,
And breathless darkness, and the narrow house,
Make thee to shudder and grow sick at heart;—
Go forth, under the open sky, and list
To Nature's teachings, while from all around—
Earth and her waters, and the depths of air—
Comes a still voice: . . .

The voice of joy; the voice of affection; the voice of hope that will forever ride over man's frustration and despair. And all we have to do is look, and listen.

---

## COMPLIMENTING OUR SECRETARIES

### HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, this is National Secretaries Week and once again we have the opportunity to pause to give public recognition and appreciation to our secretarial staffs. I am pleased to join with others throughout the country in applauding the efforts of those behind the scenes who truly make the operation go.

This week of recognition provides a fitting occasion to compliment my secretaries for making my tasks ever so much easier. I welcome this opportunity to pay this small tribute to "my girls."

I am especially grateful to my staff for their unending willingness to help and for their warm cooperation in the most difficult and pressured of situations. When the "chips are down," when the deadlines are nearing, when crises occur—and they do on the average of three times a day—I know who I can count on!

To Mrs. Rita Keating, my personal secretary, who has done yeoman work in attempting to keep me on some semblance of a schedule, while at the same time competently keeping track of a myriad of office detail, I say a humble thank you.

To Arlene Wiggins, whose affability and capability is not diminished by her early rising hour, my appreciation and gratitude for all her efforts.

To Mimi McGee, who has attempted to put "piazazz" in my rhetoric and for researching my speeches and for adding a sense of feminine logic to my legislative section.

To Kathy Dunn for her competent and thorough work on the most complicated cases, and for keeping "cool" under fire.

To Jane Foulkrod and Julie Stauffer who have operated efficiently in spite of constant job "reclassifications" and for their valuable and incisive comments on all issues.

To my district staff, Abby Sanders and Florence Hall, for helping to keep local matters under control and for their tireless efforts in coordinating my work at home with my work here in Washington.

To secretaries all over, I extend my best wishes on this—your week.

To my staff, I extend a special commendation and my warm and sincere thanks for their continuing efforts.

## NAVAJO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DESERVES SUPPORT

### HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see the editorial in this morning's Washington Post entitled, "Higher Education for the Navajos." From what I have learned about Navajo Community College, I agree with the Post's assessment of it as "one of the most exciting attempts at innovative education in America."

I first contacted Representative JULIA HANSEN about this school last spring to let her know that she has my full support for her efforts to secure Federal assistance for this school. I hope this editorial will provide a boost to her plans for Navajo Community College.

I would like at this time to include the editorial, "Higher Education for the Navajos":

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 23, 1970]

HIGHER EDUCATION FOR THE NAVAJOS

Deep in the mesa and cactus country of northeast Arizona, near a quiet trading village called Many Farms, is a Navajo Community College. As the first college ever created and run by Indians on a reservation, the school is one of the most exciting attempts at innovative education in America. The need, assuredly, is great. Dropout rates among Indians are twice the national average in both public and federal schools. Navajo children, who are raised in what is perhaps the most severe poverty in America, leave school before graduation at a 60 percent rate. Only one percent of those who went off to college ever stayed for a degree.

The community college has been operating for 18 months. Students ranging from eager 17-year-old freshmen to illiterate and jobless fathers and mothers take courses in vocational training, teaching, health, care, law, Navajo culture and English. The success of the college is well known nationally, thanks to coverage by the press and television, as well as visits by many congressmen. The Bureau of Indian Affairs says the school has "tremendous importance." Originally funded by tribal money, plus foundation aid, the college has been temporarily housed in BIA buildings at Many Farms. It will be forced to move shortly.

For the past two years, Navajo leaders and students have been coming to Washington to seek federal funding that would let the college move permanently on nearby land. Total cost would come to $13 million. Over and over, the Navajos have been given official encouragement, consideration, moral support, and back slaps—everything but money. The appropriations subcommittee for interior is unable to authorize funds for planning and construction of the new buildings until the Bureau of the Budget makes a decision. The fiscal men, apparently under no pressure from the White House to get moving are taking their own good time.

The Navajos are beginning to have serious doubts that the government will back its words with money. For the older tribesmen, this letdown will be nothing new. But for the young Navajos the blow will be heavy indeed. As Rep. Julia Butler Hansen (D-Wash.), a longtime supporter of the college, told a federal official last week. 'It is very important that you do not literally break the hearts of the people who have put so much into the Navajo dream of better education."

## EARTH DAY PLUS ONE: THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE

### HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday millions of Americans dedicated themselves to continuing and strong efforts to attain environmental quality. Yesterday was exemplified by rhetoric—much of it by politicians and other national leaders. Today, Earth Day plus one, I feel it is fitting that we as public officials sit and listen to the voices of those we represent and those people who we talked to yesterday.

For that reason—and in lieu of any more longwinded harangues condemning pollution and polluters while praising the "new believers" in environmental quality—I would like to insert in the RECORD a series of letters picked from among the thousands I have received calling for strong Government action in this field.

These letters come from all over America, from many students and teachers, from all income levels. The nine letters reprinted today are typical and poignant; eight of them were sent directly to me, the other being a copy of a letter sent to the President of General Motors Corp.

The voice of the people follows:

LA MESA, CALIF.

DEAR MR. BROWN: We have moved to California recently, and we will be voting here for the first time. We have a number of relatives who have lived here for many years. All of us will be searching our hearts this year when we vote. We are looking for someone to represent us who will be dedicated to fighting desperately the greatest battle man has ever faced: to avoid his own death as a race.

We are convinced that unless the United States begins immediately to devote its whole energy to restoring our polluted earth, drastically cutting our consumption of key resources, and reducing our population and that of the earth, mankind is finished. Dr. Paul Ehrlich, population biologist at Stanford, says that many of his colleagues believe that it is already too late for us to save ourselves. (*National Wildlife*, April/May 1970.)

Have you thought about this? Seriously? You owe it to yourself and your fellow men to make an honest decision about this and report it publicly. Your decision on this matter alone will and must determine whether we vote for you. By decision we mean a public commitment to specific, massive action. We are not cranks who believe every announcement of the end of the world. But we believe this one, because it has solid and sober scientific support.

There is no time left. Where do you stand?

FRANK, ALICE, AND GARY REED.

SAN LEANDRO, CALIF.

DEAR SIR: I am an eighth grade student that is very interested in the growing problem of pollution. The pollution that I am especially interested in is litter along shorelines and public beaches. I think you should try to organize a volunteer committee to clean the shorelines. I am sure that enough people are interested to clean up the shores.

Thank you for your kind attention to my letter.

Sincerely yours,

MISS JUDY COOK.

CORAL CANYON, MALIBU, CALIF.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: I started this letter to you Jan. 21, when we received your questionnaire about pollution. In the interim, the questionnaire is lost and the letter was misplaced. I feel I should get it off quickly and let the format stand as is. First let me say we answered your questions in a very positive way. We've got to do something about the filth we live in! The problem goes beyond the rights of individuals now. People do not have the right to destroy, pollute our oceans, streams & air for their own gain. Their own gain, being what they think it is money. $ $ $ $.

The basic problem is to bring about a reversal in the thinking of big and little business men. The goal is and has to be recognized, as one of getting our environment clean enough to stay alive—all of us. The goal has to be fresh air, clean water, room to breathe, not millions and billions of dollars in the greedy's bank accounts. So, Education, propaganda, if you will, must be used.

If the consumer would refuse (or if the government could forbid) the use of paper or plastic to wrap every pair of socks, shirts, toys, etc.; if every consumer would carry his own shopping bag and refuse the extra bags for a head of lettuce, ¼ pound of mushrooms, etc. the amount of rubbish to be gotten rid of would be greatly reduced. But ah, the almighty chemical and lumber companies wouldn't make as much money, so they would fight it—and win, because they are still the ignorant, greedy who want money first and foremost.

The power companies say, we the consumers are demanding more power, so we must have atomic reactors which will pollute our air, soil and water.

I say the consumer should be educated (by Federal Government) *against* electric can-openers, garage door openers, electric pencil sharpeners, toothbrushes, shoe polishers, knife sharpeners, electric razors, any form of electric appliance which replaces muscle action, should be outlawed for the able-bodied. We can return to the good old days of *muscle* use instead of power use. And, what's wrong with the good old fashioned blanket, instead of an electric blanket? The list of nonsense electrical gadgets go on forever. We should allow electricity for basic necessities only—by law.

You legislators must be aware of the threat of over-population. Yon can pass laws which will help the problem.

1. A woman has the undisputed right to have abortion. The consequences would be positive.

a. Fewer people.

b. No unwanted children, which would reduce the cost of welfare, orphanages, foster homes, etc., plus a great reduction in juvenile delinquency and even crime and child-beating (to death).

c. Since people still love the almighty dollar. Money can be the incentive. Pay a woman on welfare an amount to have an abortion. (There must, however, be a limit to the amount of children she conceives for this purpose). Some way, tax enormously the people who insist on more than two children. (Remember, we have come to a place in our world crises, where individual rights have to give way to rights of humanity.)

d. A realistic eye to the death penalty.

*Pollution.* We are told it will cost a great deal of money to clean up pollution. Perhaps it will. The question is, where does the money come from? Let us look at the situation. The world, not too long ago, was not polluted, so we started with "a clean nest." Now, let's ask the question. Basically, who is dirtying our nest? The waters off Vancouver Is. B.C., are Mahogny black for miles and miles from shore, due to the lumbering industry. They should pay for cleaning up their mess, and not pass it on to the public. The oil companies see a polluting product.

They should pay for cleaning up their mess. The litter on the hi-ways and streets are the result of thoughless, careless people. We shouldn't have to pay taxes for others to pick up our mess, we can do it ourselves by education and propaganda and rigid, heavy monetary fines. If the laws were written to protect the innocent, instead of the guilty, the average citizen could police his own environment. I have in mind the hundreds of cars I see, spewing excessive fumes from tail-pipes. In one day of free-way driving, I noted the licenses, make of cars, color, location, direction and time of 8 gross polluters—i.e. *excessive* fumes coming out of the tailpipes. Any citizen should be able to note this information on a postcard and mail to an agency which then bans the offending car until repaired. There would be no cost to the citizen noting the citations, for the offender would also have to pay an extra $5.00 for additional postcards which could be distributed free. (They would be pre-addressed to the proper authorities).

*But*, the present law states that the citizen has to make his complaint, in the county in which he sees the car spewing smoke! (I may never get to Orange County again) and also identify the driver! How ridiculous! The *owner* of the car is responsible for its condition, regardless of who is driving. The average citizen should be able to report, the same way, litter bugs, cigarette discarders, etc. Everyone would get more involved, if it wasn't so time consuming with red tape.

We, the people have nothing to say about forking over our money to r n the government; the same should be true for paying for rapid transit. If a census was taken, it would show that a great percentage of poor people do not, for one reason or another, register to vote, or vote if they are registered. The more wealthy of course do vote and vote for their pocketbook. So, rapid transit is voted down. We, the people should have to pay for a rapid transit and have t use it. However, the politicians will also have to recognize that there is a limit to the amount of money which can be squeezed out of the taxpayer. They would have to forgo the luxuries to which they have become accustomed to since joining the political club. The new, fancy buildings will have to be discarded and the political ego salved some other way that a four room suite with bath and gilded names on doors, house only by magnificent furnishing and a hard working underpaid secretary. (I have many, many times had occasion to call an official's office. Without exception, they are never in "at the moment.")

A money incentive will get people out of their cars and into public conveyances. Let the Big Egos call attention to themselves in ways which will not harm the health of others. Outlaw Cadillac, Continentals, which contribute more smog per person to the air than smaller cars. They take up more parking space, too.

I am now looking at your number 5 ("open space increasingly filled with urban sprawl") I can't fathom President Nixon's desire to build new cities (there goes more open space and agricultural land). Again use the pressure of money on absent owners to clean up their mess—not the taxpayer.

Use another incentive. New Zealand does. Property tax gets reduced with the additional amount of care given over property. There would no longer be slums.

For Christ's Sake, relieve the property owner! I was gathering signatures for the property tax initiative. Do you think I got *one* signature from a *non*-property owner? Hell no. They know they have a good thing, when others have to foot the bill.

Use a sales tax—a *high* one especially on electrical luxuries and we'll kill two birds with one stone.

Drugs. Take the profit from the crooks and *give* drugs to those needing it, at a low price—or free. This will eliminate the need for getting more people hooked, to pay the first guy's drug bills. Two birds again—the drug users (who are hooked) have their needed drugs and the crooks are out of luck. Crime declines.

I'd better begin to close this letter on the 12th day of March, 1970.

Let me voice one last gripe.

Space is getting smaller. The good earth needs help, let's relieve the *dying* taxpayer from the clutches of the funeral lobby. I want my ashes buried in my *own* rose garden. I shouldn't have to pay some guy in the burial business $50 to $100.00 to get my ashes buried at sea—or *his* rose garden. I've looked at these "Rose gardens"—the soil hasn't been spaded for years So I pay $100 to get my ashes flushed down the toilet. They'd do more good revitalizing Mother Earth and besides I'm delicate about where my remains go.

Since starting this letter, I've read *The Silent Spring, Population Explosion.* Am about to read *The Frail Ocean* and am gagging on *The Rich and Super Rich* by F. Lundberg.

Keep up the good work—no one else seems to be doing it

Mrs. RASLEIR BIRDSELL.

---

EL CAMINO COLLEGE,
*Torrance, Calif.*

DEAR MR. BROWN: Though your cause against pollution is noble the situation is really hopeless since the local politicians really pull the strings. For instance in our county (Los Angeles) the oil companies would pollute the channels daily leading into the ocean and gladly pay their monthly fine of $100; the fine has been increased somewhat since last year but what the hell its cheaper to pay this fine than spend a million dollars to eliminate pollution from the true source, their plant.

Drive past any oil company processing gasoline or a chemical company in our area making chemicals and the air paralleling a passing road is suffocating with acid and other fumes.

Power companies on the coast (El Segundo, Redondo Beach etc.) burn crude oil at certain times of the year which further pollute the air.

As the air lines zoom in on our International airport they leave tons of black pollution streaks spiraling through the basin.

Los Angeles and other local cities dump raw sewage into the ocean upsetting the ecology of marine life. Suddenly sardines on our coast have disappeared. Accusations have been made that the professional fisherman simply overfished. Actually that's a crop of bull. Being a sportfisherman myself I have seen all fish disappear as the pollution from the sewage gets worse and worse. In a storm the pollution from the sewage is rather obvious in Manhattan beach and other beach cities.

Just off our coast oil tankers dump their excess oil after unloading their cargo. Only last week Catalina Island was inundated with black oil on their shoreline causing major expense to sports boats. It's obvious that these foreign tankers were at fault. There's no law that control their activities though, and if there was it is never enforced.

As for offshore drilling, the oil companies have Mr. Hickel, and his name spells exploitation and the public and pollution be damned. Watch him wreck Alaska with the hot oil pipes. He's fattening his pockets with green bucks from the oil companies rather obviously. Sure in California we are against oil drilling off our shores. Just what can we do though. Even our Governor closes his eyes to oil pollution.

Personally the odds are against the public. What we need is a student revolt against pollution and you will really see something.

I wish you luck but I don't expect to see anything coming out of your committee. It's like Kefauver's anti-crime committee. The man was terrific but the system is totally corrupt. Our only hope is that about 5,000,000 people die due to pollution; this would really start the ball rolling.

Yours truly,

PROF. MARTIN YEZ,
*Engineering Department.*

(NOTE.—One way to reduce the pollution by cars is to reduce the horsepower of all cars to below 150 HP and change the gasoline so that no car burns leaded fuel. I am seriously worried about jet engines in cars and trucks since they burn such an excess of oxygen; they are a true threat to future breathing.)

---

IDA PRICE SCHOOL,
*San Jose, Calif., Feb. 23, 1970.*

DEAR MR. BROWN: Since our Eighth Grade history class is now involved in the study of government, I thought it only fitting that a discussion of the questionnaire recently sent to me should take place in the classroom.

Enclosed please find, not only my responses to your questionnaire, but the response totals from two classes totaling 66 students. We all learned a great deal in attempting to respond, and I thought you might be interested in the students' point of view.

Sincerely,

Mrs. RUTH STEPHENS,
*Eighth Grade Core Teacher.*

IDA PRICE SCHOOL STUDENTS VIEWS ON ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

1. Do you favor proposals to ban the internal combustion gasoline engines unless it meets stringent exhaust emission standards? Yes 47; no 5.

2. Do you feel that the oil companies and automobile manufacturers should be required to act more quickly to solve the problems of air pollution? Yes 53; no. 3.

3. Do you favor a Federal Regulatory Commission on Environmental Quality? Yes 38; no 5.

4. With 95% of the 8,000 miles of the nation's shoreline in private hands, do you favor stronger government efforts to regulate shoreline use, in order to substantially increase the amount of beach property available for public use? Yes 46; no 12.

5. With the state's open spaces increasingly filled by urban sprawl and unplanned development, would you support stronger government efforts to regulate use of undeveloped open spaces, including advance acquisition of land for public use? Yes, 32; no 10.

6. Would you support a complete ban on all Federal offshore oil drilling except in national emergency? Yes 46; no 3.

7. Do you favor much stronger governmental efforts to educate the public as to the problems of overpopulation? Yes 47; no 7.

8. We consider our national priorities for 1970 as number one, pollution; number two, Vietnam; and number three, integration.

9. Do you approve of the citizens of this state being given the opportunity to express their opinions through this questionnaire? Yes 46; no 1.

---

LONG BEACH, CALIF.

DEAR SIR: Please do something about enzyme detergents. I understand they are not bio-degradable and are killing plankton in the sea. As you must know, plankton is responsible for the production of over 75% of the earth's oxygen. Therefore, these enzyme detergents pose a deadly threat and must be investigated, at least.

Furthermore, "Consumer Reports" magazine made a study of enzyme detergents and found the effects of the enzymes to be negligible, if present at all. So they apparently serve no practical purpose except as a sales promotion gimmick.

I also have been told there is arsenic in these detergents that causes many people to develop skin irritations. Don't we have enough problems without that?

Sincerely,

MRS. ARTHUR E. ALVISO.

---

WOODLAND HILLS, CALIF.

Congressman GEORGE BROWN.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: I appreciate what you are trying to do about the environmental problem. I see one flaw in your approach: why should the automobile corporations be given *five years* more of making profits and ruining our air at the same time? Are we really to believe that it will take *five years* of research to solve the problem?

If our government officials would back a nation-wide boycott of any American-made automobile that does not meet emission standards, beginning *now*, Detroit would accomplish the feat within months. Why is our government more interested in protecting corporate profits than in protecting the national physical geography and the welfare of the people?

Love of country begins with the land and the people.

Why is it taking two years to "phase out" DDT? It should have been banned in two days. Everybody knows that the government is giving the chemical companies two years to adjust to the shock of profit loss. Meanwhile how much more damage to world-wide ecological balance?

How about detergents which we all now know is causing water pollution? We got along without detergents before 1946, and we can get along without it now.

And no-return bottles? We got along without those until the last three or so years.

You in government want to help. Well, start campaigns to do without harmful products like you started campaigns to economize on consumption during World War II. The people cooperated gladly during the last war. We saved everything the government asked us to. Is our government now so dedicated to corporate America it will sell out the people, the landscape and the future?

I will tell you that the people are losing faith in the government on the environment issue already. We don't care about moon flights. We want things right, here on this planet.

I personally will boycott every harmful product I learn about and will urge everyone I know to do the same.

Five years is ridiculous and you know the people of Los Angeles will never hold off that long.

Yours sincerely,

CAROLYN J. HOLLAND.

---

CHAMPMAN SCHOOL,
*Gardena, Calif.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: We are a third grade class who is concerned about air pollution. We want a law passed against people who cause air pollution. We think these people should have heavy fines.

We want better smog devices on all transportation! We want service stations to clean up all kinds of engines better!

We want to breathe; we want to live!

Thank you,

Mrs. T. Coy; Daniel Delagado; Kelly Webb; Cheryl Afhar; Jay Ganske; Lynda Toyasaki; Johnny Asbury; Tammie Ackroyd; and Ronald Bond.

Patricia Kenoshita; Dennis Wright; Lynn Pellerin; Paul Perez; Doug Kelly; Mark Perrin; Richard Yamashita; Doming Perez; Theresa Toone; and Craig Inouye.

Allan Pearson; Monica Derry; Greg Pringle; Mary Anela; Frank Dudas; Rochelle Lubman Steven Mayer; Lori Tesdale; Monica Winningham; and Dale Reed.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

DEAR MR. BROWN: Knowing your sympathy for modern conservation efforts you may feel inclined to give a small contribution to the Save the Redwoods League, whose letterhead shows many familiar names.

For a greater effort we would like to see the Cohelan Bill which lost out in the last Administration, reintroduced. It was backed by about 40 Representatives and Senators. It provided for a respectable size redwood park. The Administration bill which passed was a token measure.

For a source of revenue, how about an excise tax of one dollar on each thousand board feet of redwood lumber, to be paid by the company cutting the trees and passed on all the way to the retail lumber yard. Redwood is a luxury wood. The main lumber for construction comes from Douglas fir, Ponderosa pine and the southern pines. (There should be some cutover areas reseeded to Longleaf Pine.) Revenue from the tax might be credited to the cost of the land purchase or to help finance the next moon expedition.

Yours very truly,

H. M. SEVERANCE.

---

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.

Mr. EDWARD N. COLE,
*President,*
*General Motors Corp.,*
*Detroit, Mich.*

DEAR SIR: I am writing you as a General Motors stockholder.

I have just exchanged my 1968 Buick Riviera for a 1970 VW Bug. My Buick had 13,000 miles on it.

What has prompted this highly uneconomic action is the urgency I feel personally to do something—no matter how small or "pound foolish"—that will help cut down pollution in our atmosphere. Since I'll now be using less than half the gas for the same mileage, I will reduce by at least that much the automotive pollutants that I am responsible for—assuming, as I am, that the top condition of both Buick and Bug renders them somewhat comparable as polluting mechanisms.

By my gesture I hope to set an example among the big car owners I know, notwithstanding the admonitions I've been hearing that compacts are unsafe on the freeways and that good big cars are the least of the polluting culprits. I am not much impressed by either argument.

If GM and other leading automakers took their responsibilities to the whole human race as seriously as they take their responsibilities to their profits-oriented managers and stockholders, they would drastically reduce over-all automotive gas consumption by beginning at once to limit private automobile production to small vehicles. As the small car population on the highways increased, their factor of safety on freeways—by the force of their numbers—would also rise (provided, of course, that producers of such cars made them as safe as possible to begin with).

I am aware that GM intends to bring something out pretty soon called the "Gmini" [Wouldn't "Gmidi" be more fashionable now?] However, I've also read that GM is somewhat reluctant to plunge too deeply into the small car field for fear of "cannibalizing" sales of larger autos. This sounds like letting humanity be damned if it means reducing profits.

As a GM stockholder, I am very unhappy. It seems to me that the management of GM has been less than creative when it comes to envisioning its part in our nation's automotive future. It seems that you have been measuring small car necessity solely by the force of foreign and domestic competition, with little regard for human needs—except insofar as you have been prodded by government authority or [Ralph Nader]. I am highly dissatisfied with what I can interpret only as callousness—granting the astuteness of your management—in the face of an environmental crisis of asphyxiating proportions, about which you could do a great deal *if you had the will and the courage.*

In the past, as a protest against war and whatever GM may have to do with defense contracts relating to U.S. involvement in Vietnam, I have been contributing all of my GM dividends to peace and humanity causes. In the future, in addition, I shall be using some of this money to campaign against the limousine-for-private-use syndrome with which our fat-bottomed upper middle-class is afflicted. I hope to get a few "gas-guzzling dinosaurs" of the Luxury Buick-Cadillac-Continental class off the road to make room for more less rapacious bugs that I feel are more seemly in the picture of our already prejudiced future. A man doesn't have to move in majesty at ten miles per gallon in order to be safe and happy.

I am aware that my campaign will not, for the present, even touch the deeper problem of all the old, second-hand poison puffers on the highways, which probably—second to trucks—do most of the polluting. Perhaps, if you and other automotive executives would direct your advertising departments to cut out the emphasis on high power and bigness as status symbols, people who can't afford new big cars wouldn't settle for them second-hand but would buy newer small cars for the same money. This would do a lot toward clearing the air we breathe, and incidentally put the brakes on some aspects of our compulsive living today.

Please let me know what you intend to do for humanity in the near future. My GM dividend offering for 1969 was $1,100.00.

Very truly yours,

MRS. IRVING F. LAUCKS.

---

## A BETTER ERA FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

---

### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, for more than a year the modernization of the Post Office Department has been before the Congress. The intensive hearings held by the postal committees in both Houses revealed the apprehensions and fears of reform held by the leaders of some postal unions and other organizations speaking for these Government employees.

As a result of these hearings and the negotiations between the administration and the major postal unions, I am confident that the basis for their concern has been eliminated in the drafting of the Postal Reorganization and Salary Adjustment Act of 1970.

The legislation now before us provides that all postal employees would retain their full benefits under the civil service retirement system. The provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act and the workmen's compensation system for Federal employees would continue to apply.

The retirement credits postal workers have earned would continue to be a responsibility of the U.S. Government.

The annual leave and sick leave provisions offered all Government workers would continue to apply.

In fact, all existing *rights* and benefits are protected.

I am confident that these protections, plus the opportunities postal modernization can bring, will usher in a new and better era for our 725,000 postal employees.

## THE ENVIRONMENT AND US


### HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES


*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, across the country this week was designated as Environment Week. Yesterday, April 22, in over 1,000 universities and colleges and over 2,500 high schools, young people cooperated in "teach-ins" on "Earth Day" to arouse public opinion to the need of protecting our environment and acting now. It is to their credit that they have recognized the challenge of preserving the earth and have taken action to rid our environment of the manmade causes of pollution. Their concern and their commitment give hope to all of us.

It is unfortunate that we as a Nation have slowly and only recently become aware of the dangers of pollution. Journalists and the press have given wide play to the foretellings of scientists and ecologists. The amount of material on the subject inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the last few months by Senators and Congressmen exceeds the material on any other issue. The volume of mail reaching my office on the problem of pollution exceeds, in numbers, the mail on any other subject.

This awareness is good, for it signifies a marshaling of public opinion, but the realization of the magnitude of the pollution problems was long in coming. Pollution and the decaying of the environment have crept slowly and silently while the machines of technology and production increased significantly. Marshal McLuhan, the noted expert on communications and the masses, has said:

> If the temperature of the bath water rises only one degree each half-hour, how will the bather know when to scream?

Because pollution has accumulated so imperceptively for years, we are now hearing the scream. Because of the silence of its growing pollution now is revealed as a serious threat and a monumental problem.

It is easy to become discouraged by the pervasiveness of "dirty everything." We are discouraged when we look at once blue-green waters which are now brown and lifeless. We tend to despair when we realize that some 40 species of birds and mammals have been lost in the United States in the last 50 years and twice as many are presently on the "endangered species" list. We know that the problem is acute when over 1¼ million of our stately Ponderosa pines are choked and dying from smog in mountains 85 miles from Los Angeles. When we realize the massive sanitation problems and become emotionally "up tight" because of noise and congestion, we might join with Henry Gibson of Laugh-In fame by saying:

> I used to like fresh air
> When it was there.
> And water—I enjoyed it
> Till we destroyed it.
> Each day the land's diminished
> I think we're finished.

Like Henry Gibson, it is easy for us to become discouraged. We can easily foretell to what end our continued raping of the environment will lead us.

Why have we reached such a state? Perhaps because we have become somewhat complacent in our richness of resources and take our technological wealth for granted. We are enormously successful in producing beautiful automobiles, elaborate apartment dwellings, and mass numbers of colored televisions, but we are failures in preserving the water we drink, the air we breathe, and the countryside we travel. We are choking on our richness because of our desire for status living and wanting the best of everything. We who enjoy a high standard of living are polluters in our demand for the best. Perhaps our attitudes toward production, privacy, space and civic responsibility—to ourselves and succeeding generations—will have to be changed. "Evil," as someone recently wrote, "is leaving a polluted and mangled planet to your too many children because you wanted to make a buck."

We do not want to talk the issue to death. To reveal the problems, to make others aware of the evil condition of the environment, and to discuss the plight, is beneficial and necessary. However, the need for action is pressing. We must do something drastic now.

Yesterday, the young people of our Nation participated in the first continentwide organized effort to halt the degradation of our environment which threatens the very existence of humanity and the survival of the earth. They perhaps recognize this problem best since it is they who will inherit the poisonous gases and deadly water. Almost every day our eyes smart from the smog in the air; our ears throb by the noise about us; our sense of smell is assailed by garbaged waters and rubbished air; we see unsightly heaps of trash, and brush ashes and soot from our skin after a walk in "the great outdoors." The younger generation sees these threats to health and life as a frightening legacy for themselves and their children.

To gain the inspiration we need for a total commitment, we ought to look to the spirit of Earth Day and Environmental Week. These days are a turning point of the national spirit from despair to hope-filled action. It is a period of establishing the national pace. We are getting down to brass tacks, focusing attention on the problems of our environment and resolving to do something to solve them now.

How do we go about changing attitudes and who must make the changes? First of all, it will take a total commitment of the Federal Government and its political leaders. Massive Federal expenditures will be required. Senator GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin estimates it will cost $25 to $30 billion a year in Federal money over the next few years to begin an environmental clean-up program. Says Senator NELSON:

> Until this Nation makes the same kind of commitment to environmental preservation that it made in building the most massive defense machine in history or in sending men to the moon, the battle cannot be won.

In order to bring more Federal resources to bear upon solving the problems which contribute to pollution of our environment, a revision of national priorities must come about.

It will also take an awareness and strong action on the part of State and local governments. We must demand that they enforce existing laws and regulations and crack down on major industrial polluters. Governments must require everyone's cooperation in cleaning up the environment.

The resources of private industry, those who are perhaps the most unwilling to make a total effort, must be called upon. It will be difficult for them to make serious economic adjustments and prepare the economic system to meet the problems. But they must realize the role they have played in contributing to environmental decay and take relative action to prevent it in the future. The productivity system must yield first place to environmental preservation. Technology helped produce the crisis and technology can end it.

Now that the national conciousness has been aroused and more people are aware of the problem, there must be a cooperative venture involving all citizens. The effort of concerned and dedicated individuals will be the greatest contribution to the battle. We must begin working together in individual efforts to bring solutions to the problems.

There is much an individual can do to resolve environmental problems. The first thing is not to add to the problem through our actions. The real problem, as Pogo has said, is "us." We all must be willing to make personal commitments and sacrifices to protect the environment.

In this regard, I recommend for the perusal of my colleagues a pamphlet entitled "Guidelines for Citizen Action on Environmental Problems" which the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH) has made available to me. This pamphlet, which is published by the University of Michigan, is a useful tool which outlines in a few pages what individuals can do in the fight against pollution.

The environmental crisis is both a great challenge and a great opportunity. By the proper use of the means at our disposal and by a wholesale, cooperative effort, we can clean up our environment and bring nature back to its rightful role. We must urge people to take advantage of this vital awareness by forming groups to fight for their own interests.

The quality of the demonstration of this week and the planning which follows will have a great impact on institutions and leaders. Now that we are alerted and activated, we will respond, not with despair, but with action. A student at San Francisco State College, Pennfield Jansen, perhaps voices the sentiment we must instill in ourselves:

> The naivete, enthusiasm and idealism of young people are not to be scorned, for they are the raw material of constructive growth. We will stop the destruction of this planet

even at the cost of our futures, careers and blood. The situation is simply like that. If you are not going to live for the Earth, what are you going to live for?

If we can present such a good case, we can enlist public support on the side of programs needed to achieve meaningful policies on our environment. We are beginning to respond to the need to prevent man from committing his own suicide.

A better future will be the result of our acting in unison to cope with the problems.

## WELFARE SYSTEM DISCOURAGES WORK

### HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday's Evening Star carried an article which should be of interest to every Member of this body. Mrs. Marie Beverly's experience provides a microcosm of the failures of our current welfare system, particularly the incentive to stop working. I do not think the Family Assistance Act passed by the House last week would be a panacea for these failures, but I do believe the FAP would offer hope to people like Mrs. Beverly.

The article "Mother of Five Can Not Afford To Keep Working," by Harvey Kabaker, follows:

MOTHER OF FIVE CANNOT AFFORD TO KEEP WORKING

(By Harvey Kabaker)

When you boil it all down, Mrs. Marie Beverly can't afford to keep working.

Since her husband left two weeks ago, it seems her $1.80-an-hour cashier's job in a Peoples Drug Store won't support her five children and stay the marshal at the door.

So with great reluctance, on the advice of the D.C. Welfare Department and her lawyer, she intends to quit working for a few months and apply for public assistance. And she most likely will move into public housing.

Mrs. Beverly, attractive at 37 and scarcely showing any sign of strain, spoke yesterday in her far Southeast apartment of her plan for self-help.

She said all she needs is a cash grant for two months' rent, until her 18-year-old daughter, Veronica, graduates from high school in June and begins a full-time job. Food stamps and Medicaid would supplement their incomes, and they could get by, she believes.

Her story of the past week might have been composed by critics of the present welfare system in America:

During several stops at various offices, it was always another office that might help, and one official even gave her the brush-off, before she finally encountered a Welfare Department supervisor sensitive to her plight, and aware of the built-in problems of government procedures.

ENCOURAGED TO STOP

Hardest for Mrs. Beverly to accept was that the system encourages the poor to stop working and move into public housing, because rents are cheaper and the income is higher.

"I was really hurt when they said I would have to quit my job to get public assistance," she said. If she could keep working, by July they could subsist on the $50 a week extra her daughter will earn, she predicted.

At the same time, the family would keep the bright, well-kept four-bedroom apartment they have had since 1967—after a two-year wait.

But the welfare people already are applying subtle pressure for her to move into a cheaper place: The monthly rent of $154 is too great a proportion of her $250 net income, or even the combined $475 she and her daughter will net beginning in June, the supervisor fears.

If Mrs. Beverly decides to apply for the aid to dependent children money, she'll get $317 a month, still not enough to keep the apartment. If she can be placed in a training program, as the supervisor has urged, Mrs. Beverly will get another $65, plus free day care for Valerie, 5, who won't go to school until the fall.

YIELDING TO SUPERVISOR

Yesterday, learning that the training program probably would include refresher courses for a high school equivalency exam, Mrs. Beverly, who finished only elementary school in rural Virginia, began to accept the welfare supervisor's point of view.

Her lawyer thinks the public cost of $308—April and May rent—would be cheaper than the tax-free $317 a month the family will get from the Welfare Department for several months while Mrs. Beverly is in training. The welfare supervisor thinks the training will help Mrs. Beverly get a better job later, since she already is motivated to get off welfare within a few months.

Normally, the rent grant would be made from a $70,000 fund the department allots for emergencies every month. But Mrs. Beverly's husband has already drawn from the fund, the department found, and she may not do so herself this year.

All of this might not have come about, if the Nixon administration's welfare reform plan, passed last week by the House, were in effect. The program for the first time would benefit the working poor by giving cash grants without requiring the head of the household to be unemployed.

These figures were calculated for Mrs. Beverly's situation: The federal government would contribute $57 a month, and the D.C. government would pay another $121, to add to her $312 salary (before taxes).

HER GROSS INCOME

Her gross income, then, would be $490 a month, and she would be working. If her daughter chose to keep her own salary, the allotment would be unaffected (present law requires a reduction in the welfare payment if a minor is working).

The Senate Finance Committee has scheduled hearings on the bill next month, and liberals are expected to push for increased allotments.

But none of this will affect Mrs. Beverly, who must appear tomorrow in landlord-tenant court, may have problems with bill collectors trying to satisfy a note she cosigned with her husband and, reluctantly, will apply for public housing by the end of the week.

## A BE-INVOLVED FINALIST

### HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention the nomination of Miss Doris Reid, a resident of Rogers City, Mich., as one of the finalists in the American Nurses' Association Be-Involved Nurse Search. Miss Reid is one of 39 nurses throughout the country who have been selected to compete for the honor of the Nation's most socially involved nurse.

In receiving this honor, Miss Reid was noted for her contribution to the community through her participation in social and health services. Miss Reid recently started a pilot project for the purpose of medically evaluating children enrolled in special education classes in the Rogers City area. She has been active in the Cheboygan Community Club, 4–H Clubs, child guidance clinics, and an association for the mentally retarded in Cheboygan County. At the present time, Miss Reid teaches in the local family and home living classes and is initiating a program for expectant parents.

The outstanding contribution that Miss Reid has made merits recognition. Indeed it is the efforts of such individuals on the local level that generate involvement on the national level, and better our society as a whole.

## MONTHLY NEWSLETTER

### HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I send a monthly newsletter to every citizen in the Eighth District who requests a copy and am inserting a copy of the April newsletter in the RECORD at this point for the information of the membership:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN BILL SCOTT REPORTS

COMMUTER TRAINS

Some time ago we had a conference attended by the Administrator of Urban Mass Transportation and the Deputy Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration to promote the establishment of commuter trains in the Northern Virginia area over existing railroad tracks. The matter has been presented formally to the Secretary of Transportation who has it under consideration. Since that time, we have talked with the Chairman and Executive Secretary of the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission who have also been promoting a plan of this nature and agreed to coordinate our efforts. The pilot project would be funded primarily with a federal grant based upon an application of the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission and would be at least partial relief to the commuter. Of course, it would not be a substitute to the completion of the interstate highway system or the subway system, but we have rail lines now passing through Manassas and Fairfax Station over the Southern railroad, and Woodbridge, Franconia and other points over the RF&P railroad. I am hopeful of favorable action.

METROPOLITAN POLICE

In the last issue of our newsletter a bill was discussed to remove the existing requirement for Metropolitan Washington policemen to live within a 21-mile radius of the Capitol building. In response to an inquiry by the Chairman of the House District Committee, the Chief of Police replied that he had no objection to eliminating this residence requirement. I am, therefore, hopeful that this proposal will be enacted and have suggested to the Chairman of the Committee that a similar restriction be removed with regard to members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia.

MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS

Justices of the Supreme Court hold office during good behavior and may be impeached in the House of Representatives for high crime and disdemeanor and removed from office by the Senate. Before assuming office, they agree under oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. The attention of Congress was drawn to the activities of Justice William O. Douglas most recently by his book entitled "Points of Rebellion", although a Resolution for his impeachment was filed as early as 1953 after he issued an order for a stay of execution for Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, who had been condemned to death for passing atomic secrets to Russia. This book is critical of numerous government agencies and compares the present Establishment with George III, who was King of England at the time of the American Revolution. More important, however, are news stories of income received from business sources while serving as a member of the court and possible conflicts of interest. Resolutions have been introduced in the Congress providing for the creation of a bipartisan committee to investigate the various charges made against him and to recommend whether or not he should be impeached. In my opinion, the House Committee should fully investigate all charges and Justice Douglas should be afforded an opportunity to be heard before any decision is made. A total of 116 members of the House have now joined in co-sponsoring one or more of the resolutions.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' HEALTH BENEFITS

The Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance and Health Benefits of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has approved legislation which would be effective next January 1 and evenly divide the costs of health benefits for Federal employees between the government and its employees or retirees. At the present time, the government contribution averages about 24 per cent and employees or retirees pay the balance. The cost of health programs has increased over the years and regretfully may continue to increase. However, this measure will provide for a 50–50 sharing. No doubt the full committee will approve the measure at our next executive session. It should be helpful to the employee and fair to the government.

PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE

The following bulletins are available for distribution. Please check the ones you would like to receive and return the slip.

—Family Fare.
—Keeping Food Safe to Eat.
—Potatoes in Popular Ways.
—Food for Fitness.
—How to Use USDA Grades in Buying Food.
—Growing Pansies.
—Better Lawns.
—Summer Flowering Bulbs.
—How Much Fertilizer Should I Use?
—What Young Farm Families Should Know About Credit.

Name _____
Address _____

WOODBRIDGE ARMY SITE

Many persons had hoped that after the Army inactivated its Radio Transmitter site at Woodbridge it might be declared as excess of Army requirements. Prince William County officials and some individual citizens visualized it as a County recreational and educational site. The Secretary of the Army has informed us, however, that the U.S. Army Mobility Equipment Research and Development Center has been selected as the agency to continue to use the facilities at Woodbridge and that the Secretary of Defense had approved this use.

WASHINGTON STAFF

Another member of the Congressional staff who has been with me since the office opened is Grace Scott of Centreville in Fairfax County. Grace and her husband, Arthur, a Senate photographer, are long time friends and neighbors but not relatives. Her mother, Mrs. C. L. Ladson, lives in Lancaster County in the Northern Neck. A case worker, who primarily looks after Post Office and Civil Service matters, Grace has handled all phases of the office work at one time or another. She is an excellent stenographer who worked at the Pentagon for 16 years. When away from the Hill, Grace and Art are active in the Lions Club and the Baptist Church. They enjoy accumulating their leave so that they can travel as often as possible to some foreign country. A completely loyal staffer, I still remember to say something nice about her grandchidren from time to time.

AID TO EDUCATION

The Federal appropriation for education for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1970, was recently passed by the House. This is the first time that appropriations for the Office of Education have come up so early. Normally, education appropriations are a part of a combined appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare. However, educators have requested earlier consideration to assist them in planning their overall budgets. The appropriation totals $4.1 billion, $313 million more than the available appropriation for 1970. As passed by the House, school districts in federally-impacted areas would get $440 million—$80 million less than for 1970. The bill also contains provisions which forbid both forced busing of students and infringement of free choice in picking a school to attend.

VOLUNTEER FIREMEN

93 Members of the House have joined in co-sponsoring a joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week of September 19 as National Volunteer Firemen week. I believe this bipartisan resolution is one manner of paying tribute to the volunteer firemen who do contribute their services to communities throughout the country.

LATEST POSTAL PROPOSAL

The Postmaster General appeared before our Post Office and Civil Service Committee on April 22 and submitted his latest postal reform measure which grew out of conference between postal officials and union leaders after the recent strike. It has most of the provisions contained in the first three measures submitted by the Post Office Department but does add an 8 per cent raise for postal workers in addition to the 6 per cent raise authorized by Congress a few weeks ago. The bill would remove postal employees from the Civil Service merit system and have pay and working conditions determined by collective bargaining. Labor-management features might compel government employees to join a union to retain federal employment. It also provides that postal rates would be set within the Department subject to a Congressional Veto on a two-thirds vote of either House of Congress. Of course, I favor improving postal service but have reservations about a number of provisions of the bill.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT

The House passed a 15 per cent increase in railroad retirement monthly benefits. This increase, however, is not across-the-board as with the recent social security benefits as the railroad retirement system has been constantly shrinking because of the decline in railroad employment. Benefit increases are restricted to a maximum of $50 for employees and $25 for spouses or survivors. Also the increase is reduced where the beneficiary is receiving increased social security benefits by the amount of such increase. In no case will this be below $10 monthly for employee annuities or $5 monthly for spouses or survivors. The Senate is now holding hearings on this measure.

CHESAPEAKE BAY BRIDGE REPAIRS

The Virginia Congressional Delegation has co-sponsored a bill to authorize the federal government to settle and pay claims of the Chesapeake Bay Bridge and Tunnel District resulting from a Navy vessel colliding with the Chesapeake Bay Bridge last winter. Without such legislation the liability of the federal government could be limited under Admiralty law to the value of the Navy ship involved in the collision. This result would seem to be unfair as the Navy ship of World War II vintage is worth only a fraction of the damage it caused. The bill, if enacted, will reimburse the Bridge-Tunnel District for considerable expense only part of which was covered by insurance.

SOMETHING TO PONDER

"The man who monopolizes the conversation monotonizes it."

---

## JOHNNY HORIZON AND GEMS AND MINERALS: PUBLIC SPIRIT TO CLEAN OUR ENVIRONMENT

---

## HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, government alone will not bring about environmental quality. It is up to each and every American to do his utmost as an individual to stop polluting whenever possible and to do even more—to clean up and keep clean our precious countryside and cities.

One of the most valuable drives encompassing these objectives is the Johnny Horizon program instituted by the Bureau of Land Management 2 years ago.

Johnny Horizon is BLM's symbol for the campaign to clean up our public lands. His motto is short and to the point: "This land is your land. Keep it clean!"

Since the Johnny Horizon program was launched in 1968, through the efforts of both public and private organizations, results have been extremely encouraging. And one of the main factors for this success stems from the diligent organizing and work by publicly spirited citizens across the country.

Today I would like to commend these citizens and the organizations which put so much time and effort into the Johnny Horizon program. And specifically, I would like to congratulate the California Outdoor Recreation League and Gems and Minerals magazine who combined in setting up the first Johnny Horizon "Clean-Up Days" held last fall.

The "Clean-Up Days" idea originated with CORL and gained widespread publicity through Gems and Minerals, and by last October, the proposal had been adopted by proclamation in eight Midwest and Western States. Over 10,000 citizens were involved in the 3-day operation.

Now, the emphasis is to make the "Clean-Up Days" an annual event, and to expand it throughout America. I endorse this program, and I hope that we in Congress can put our full support behind this endeavor.

For its outstanding contribution in helping to keep public lands clean, Gems and Minerals was honored with the first Johnny Horizon National Award last summer by the Bureau of Land Management. At this time, I, too, would like to congratulate Gems and Minerals, and its managing editor, Jack R. Cox, for the fine work and public spirit the magazine has developed. I only hope that the pioneering efforts by CORL and Gems and Minerals can serve as a model for more of our citizens.

At this point I would like to insert in the RECORD a series of articles from Gems and Minerals describing the Johnny Horizon program, the "Clean-Up Days," and related matters. The articles follow:

CORL PROPOSES—JOHNNY HORIZON CLEAN-UP DAYS

In previous issues of Gems & Minerals (Dec. '68 and Feb. '69), we carried news of the activities of California Outdoor Recreation League (CORL). Although it is a fairly new organization, this group has already made an impressive record. To mention just a couple of accomplishments—through its efforts an unfair state law prohibiting after-dark parking of campers was repealed. This past December, some of its officers represented rockhounds and other outdoor recreationists at a special meeting of the National Advisory Board Council in San Francisco.

Now, CORL is proposing something that will again benefit all rockhounds and everyone who loves our great outdoors—an intensive litter pickup campaign, tentatively scheduled for this coming October 10, 11, and 12. According to the organization's executive secretary, Hildamae Voght, coordinators are being appointed in different parts of California and preparations are being made to rid many of our public lands of unsightly trash.

The purposes of this campaign are to conserve outdoor beauty and call to the attention of the American public the great need to stop littering. It is further hoped that those groups, who have already held clean-up trips, will be stimulated to continue them, and will be encouraged to participate additionally in CORL's state-wide effort. Such projects will show everyone that outdoor recreationists are public-spirited citizens who use their lands in a responsible manner.

The Bureau of Land Management has greeted the campaign proposal with great enthusiasm. A BLM spokesman pledged support and said that his Bureau would work with county and municipal governments to arrange litter dumping sites and pickups at various locations.

To say the least, this is a big project. Its success depends on the cooperation of all users of the outdoors—rockhounds, campers, fishermen, hunters, four wheelers, cyclists and many, many others. Rock hobbyists have already shown concern for the litter problem and many have done something about it. Now, there is a chance for us to unite with other outdoor recreationists and show the whole country that we consider the use of our public lands a valued privilege.

Since CORL is a California based organization, its campaign is confined to that state. However, it is hoped that similar organizations in other states will also decide to sponsor clean-up days. Wouldn't it be great if we could say that October 10, 11 and 12 are going to be Johnny Horizon's National Clean-up Days?

ABOUT CORL

The purposes of CORL are:

1. Representing all persons interested in outdoor recreations and facilities.

2. To prevent restrictive legislation not in the best interests of outdoorsmen.

3. To work with governmental agencies to develop more and better recreation areas in California.

4. To educate the public in safe driving habits, cleanliness, anti-littering, curb destruction of public facilities, and work for better recreational use of our natural resources.

Annual dues for this organization are only $2.00 per person. If you would like to join, send your check to: CORL, 4263 East Florence Avenue, Bell, California 90201. Both California residents and those outside the state, who would like to see California public lands retained for public use, are invited to join.

Anyone wishing to participate in Johnny Horizon Clean-up Days, please write CORL. If you belong to a similar group in another state which plans to join in the campaign, send details to GEMS & MINERALS. We would like to give you some publicity. With a little coordinated effort this could bloom into a national project.

---

PLAN NOW FOR JOHNNY HORIZON COUNTRYSIDE CLEAN-UP DAYS

California Outdoor Recreation League (CORL) originated the idea—an intensive campaign to educate the public of the appalling litter problem by putting on a massive cleanup. We first notified our readers of this idea in our April '69 issue (pg. 11). Since that time CORL and we have received much favorable comment on the proposal, and now we find that organizations in two other states, Arizona and Oregon, plan to participate.

CORL proposed that rockhounds and other outdoor recreationists unite in a statewide drive next Fall to collect as much litter as possible. It was stated that we hoped similar organizations in other states would join in and make it a nationwide campaign. With the encouraging progress so far, it's just possible that's what is going to happen.

October 10, 11 and 12 were chosen for the campaign for two reasons. First of all, Summer will be over and we know that during that time a great amount of two-legged trash will have deposited tons of inanimate trash on our lands. Fall is a good time to get rid of as much of this litter as possible and it is an ideal time of year. In many parts of the country, it will be Indian Summer, one of the most beautiful seasons of the year. In the desert, the time of extreme temperatures will be past.

The Bureau of Land Management, California Department of Parks and Recreation and other government agencies have greeted the proposal with great enthusiasm. BLM will help arrange dumping sites and trucks for picking up the litter. This bureau has also pledged assistance in getting TV, radio, newspaper and other media coverage and publicity.

In addition to educating the public about the litter problem, the publicity we will receive is very, very important. Some of the special interest groups who would like to take away our public lands and put them in private hands have been doing a thorough job of blackening our character, screaming litterbugs, vandals, destroyers of the lands, etc. What better way to show them that the majority of us are responsible citizens who love our outdoors, and to teach our irresponsible hobbyists and sportsmen the right way?

CORL has now appointed its chairman for the California Campaign. He is: Elvin L. Funder, 3571 Los Almos Way, Sacramento, California 95825.

Mr. Funder is a CORL director and is employed by the California State Controller's Office. At present he is appointing regional chairmen who will be contacting organizations soon.

A member of the Maricopa Lapidary Society and Arizona Sportsmen's Coordinating Council has agreed to be the contact in Arizona: J. C. Cronin, 1705 East Granada Road, Phoenix, Arizona 85006.

Be sure to read Mr. Cronin's report on his group's recent clean-up drive.

In Oregon, members of the Oregon Environmental Council (see editorial, this issue) have joined the campaign. The contact there is: Harold M. Dunn, Mowhawk Star Route, Springfield, Oregon 97477.

This beautification program need not be restricted to federal public lands. It's needed in state and national parks and private collecting sites. If you want to protect your collecting areas, contact one of the people listed above.

If you live in another state and have a group that plans to join in, let us know and send us the chairman's name. We'll publicize it.

Let's all help Johnny Horizon save our lands.

---

ARIZONA CLEAN-UP DRIVE A GREAT SUCCESS

On page 10 of the April G&M we announced a clean-up drive being organized by Arizona recreationists. J. C. (Jim) Cronin, Phoenix, Arizona, a member of the Maricopa Lapidary Society reports that the drive was a success in more ways than one.

Members of the Maricopa Society, National Campers and Hikers Association (NCHA) and Webelos (first stage boy scouts) turned out in force to beautify the area adjacent to a seventeen-mile scenic drive near the towns of Cave Creek and Carefree. In just one weekend, these dedicated outdoor recreationists collected 12,000 pounds of litter.

Speaking of the Scouts, Jim said, "How those kids worked! The group was split into seven parties, each covering about 2½ miles of the seventeen-mile drive area. The parents of many of the boys are NCHA members and the fathers and mothers were out doing their part. . . .

"The Bureau of Land Management furnished litter bags and each member brought along potato sacks. The Salt River Project, an agency that provides the irrigation water and electric power to a large area surrounding Phoenix, also donated litter bags and many of these, as well as the BLM bags, were passed out to motorists as they drove by.

"The town of Cave Creek reserved its parking area, situated at the beginning of the Scenic Drive, from Friday evening through Sunday for the exclusive use of those participating. There were a number of trailers and campers of every variety (including my own homemade sleeping rig, which will be described in a future issue of G&M).

"The Cave Creek school bus transported each party to its allotted starting point and brought us back to camp. At night, under a starry sky, we had a huge campfire. Two officials, representing the twin towns, came out to proclaim their thanks and presented a check to NCHA for furthering the scouting program. . . ."

This is another fine example of rockhounds and other outdoor recreationists working together to preserve the beauty of the lands we love. The cleanup is a worthy service, but of even greater value is the education of the public in the need to stop littering, and the public relations for our people.

Jim Cronin has consented to be an Arizona contact for Johnny Horizon Countryside Clean-up Days this coming October (see the article elsewhere in this issue). Drop him a note today and let him know you will help make this important Fall beautification campaign a success.

JOHNNY HORIZON COUNTRYSIDE CLEAN-UP DAY—LOTS OF ENTHUSIASM GREETS ANNOUNCEMENT OF FALL CAMPAIGN

Members of California Outdoor Recreation League (CORL) and other outdoor recreationist groups say they are no longer going to tolerate visual pollution, nor are they going to continue taking the blame for the acts of irresponsible motorists and unscrupulous users of our open space lands. Across the nation, there has been much enthusiasm and response to the announcement of Johnny Horizon Countryside Clean-Up Days (G&M June '69, p. 12). There have been offers of help and support and requests for information.

Another area that is joining in is southern Nevada. The chairman there is: Joseph Haddad, 1213 Palm Terrace, Las Vegas, Nevada 89106.

Mr. Haddad will contact rock clubs, Scouts, the Beautification Committee and others. If you live in his area, please contact him; like any public spirited chairman, he can use help.

Set October 10, 11 and 12 aside on your calendar now and plan to help restore the beauty of the outdoors we love. Here is a public service that will direct public attention to the litter problem and generate the best of public relations for rockhounds and other outdoorsmen. There are many people and groups who, for a variety of reasons, want us off the public lands. One of their favorite tactics is to call us "destroyers of the land," litterbugs, vandals, etc. If we work together and make Johnny Horizon Countryside Clean-Up Days a success, we can throw those words right back in their teeth.

See the Johnny Horizon ad in this issue for a listing of area chairmen and contact your chairman now. If there is not yet a chairman in your state, how 'bout you?

---

MANY STATES PLANNING FOR JOHNNY HORIZON COUNTRYSIDE CLEAN-UP DAYS

To say the response to Johnny Horizon Countryside Clean-Up Days, October 10, 11 and 12, is gratifying is an understatement. The names of volunteers who will handle the campaign in their states are coming in thick and fast. There were many fine comments and more volunteers came forward at the recent AFMS convention in Salt Lake City.

The states that have joined in since our last report and the people who have volunteered as contacts are:

IDAHO

Lowell Fields, 229 Wyoming Street, Gooding, Idaho 83330; phone, (208) 934–5441. Mr. Fields is the Public Relations Chairman of the Northwest Federation.

NEBRASKA

Chairman, Claud Clary, 3743 Woods Avenue, Lincoln, Nebraska 68510; phone, (402) 435–8743. Cochairman, Charles Schafer, 3229 North 60th Street, Omaha, Nebraska 68101; phone, (402) 558–0469. Mr. Clary is the president of the Nebraska State Association of Earth Science Clubs and Mr. Schafer is the Association's editor.

WASHINGTON

Albert Ockfen, 13811 86th Avenue East, Puyallup, Washington 98371; phone, (206) 845–5527. Mr. Ockfen is Federation director for the Tenino Rock Cruisers, and he will be in the field trip booth at the Northwest Federation show.

WYOMING

W. H. "Bill" Guthrie, 318 South Fenway, Casper, Wyoming 82601; phone, (307) 237–7212. Mr. Guthrie is past president of the Rocky Mountain Federation.

CALIFORNIA AREA CHAIRMEN

In California, CORL's state chairman, Elvin Funder is appointing area chairmen. The areas and chairmen appointed so far are:

Inland Empire—Kemper Schrader, P.O. Box 667, Crestline, California 92325

Los Angeles Basin—Mrs. Jean Hazleton, 11071 Bettes Place, Garden Grove, California 92640

Northern California—Ed Dietz, Route 1, Box 32, Corning, California 96021

Tehachapi to Sacramento—Herman Sharp, Route 1, Box 941, Shingle Springs, California 95682

In addition to the states and areas listed above, we understand that plans are being formulated in Florida, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas and Utah. More about this when we learn the details.

CLEANUP DETAILS

California Outdoor Recreation League (CORL), the originator of the idea for Johnny Horizon Countryside Clean-Up Days is fortunate in having members who have participated in anti-litter projects, and we are sure that other state groups joining in also have past experience. In talking to some of these people at Salt Lake City and discussing the matter with CORL and BLM officials, some basic needs to avert problems are becoming evident.

First of all, it must be remembered that this is the first time for many groups. The actual cleanup will be a fine public service, but the greatest value is alerting the public to the litter problem. The anti-litter experts in BLM and other organizations have a good point when they say that our goal is to convince John Q. Public he shouldn't throw down trash in the first place. Also of great importance is educating our own in outdoor ethics, and the public relations we can generate for outdoor recreationists.

It is already apparent that to accomplish these goals, it is better to have a large gathering of rockhounds and other outdoorsmen working in a few areas than a few in many locations. CORL's battle plan for California is to clean two or three BLM areas plus a few state parks and a few sections of state highway. Thus far one area definitely has been decided upon in Southern California—the Calico Hills (Tin Can Alley, Odessa Canyon and Mule Canyon). Area chairmen around this location are working together in hopes of bringing together 1,000 or more people to do a thorough job. A campout, with campfire fellowship, and some rock hunting after the cleanup are planned.

To avoid confusion and assure a good cleanup, a command post will be set up. BLM will supply maps so that groups may be detailed to the spots that need cleaning. In preparation for all this, area chairmen and BLM officials are going out to survey the area well in advance of the cleanup.

PUBLICITY

To accomplish the purpose of the campaign, good publicity is a must. Chairmen should see to it that newspapers, magazines, TV and radio are notified of the project. Be sure that somebody takes pictures, and if someone has a 16 mm movie camera, a film of the cleanup is great for submitting to television studios. If you have nobody available with publicity experience, you have:

ASSISTANCE

The Bureau of Land Management has qualified information officers who can help with publicity. Chairmen should work closely with BLM, not only for publicity assistance, but for expert advice, locating areas that need cleaning, arranging for dumping sites, etc. Therefore, be sure to contact your BLM state office at:

Alaska—555 Cordova Street, Anchorage, Alaska 99501.

Colorado—Federal Building, Room 14023, 1961 Stout Street, Denver, Colorado 80202.

Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota and Minnesota—Federal Building, 316 North 26th Street, Billings, Montana 59101.

New Mexico and Oklahoma—U.S. Post Office and Federal Building, South Federal Place, P.O. Box 1449, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

There are also BLM offices in Arizona, California, Idaho, Nevada, Oregon, Utah and Wyoming which we understand have been contacted or will be contacted by the state chairman listed here and in the Johnny Horizon ad elsewhere in this issue.

In addition to BLM, California Outdoor Recreation League will gladly send information to organizations in other states. Write: CORL, 4264 E. Florence Avenue, Bell, California 90201.

A listing of chairmen previously reported plus the new chairmen will be found in the ad for Johnny Horizon Countryside Clean-Up Days in this issue. Be sure to contact your state or area chairman. If there is none in your state, now is the time for volunteering. When chairmenships are established, please let us know so that we may report it.

---

MORE STATES JOIN JOHNNY HORIZON CLEAN-UP CAMPAIGN

Last Spring when California Outdoor Recreation League (CORL) proposed the idea for Johnny Horizon Countryside Clean-Up Days it was stated that the CORL people hoped that other states would join in. But none of us envisioned the terrific response that we are now seeing. At present, most of the western states have chairmen and groups working hard at making October 10, 11 and 12 three days long to be remembered.

Since our last report, four more states have joined in. These states and the people to contact are:

NEW MEXICO

Mrs. Eldon Fleck, 5760 Piedra Road N.W., Albuquerque, New Mexico 87114; phone (505) 898–2256.

OKLAHOMA

Lynn Billau, 5764 East 24th Street, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74114; phone (918) 835–1481.

TEXAS

Miss Eleanor Moak, 4405 45th Street, Lubbock, Texas 79414.

UTAH

Mrs. Clare N. Beagley, 112 West 200 North, Spanish Fork, Utah 84660; and Boyd Williams, 645 Aaron Avenue, Springville, Utah 84663.

In addition to being the contacts for Utah, Mrs. Beagley and Mr. Williams have been appointed Anti-Litter Chairmen for the Rocky Mountain Federation of Mineralogical Societies. They will be happy to help anyone in their Federation who would like assistance or information on litter prevention projects.

PROGRESS REPORTS

We have heard from several chairmen in different states and plans are moving along nicely. Jim Cronin, the contact for Arizona, has advised us that his state's governor will proclaim October 11 through 19 Johnny Horizon Countryside Clean-Up Days. Jim, a member of Maricopa Lapidary Society and Arizona Sportsmen's Council; Bill Schuh, National Campers and Hikers Association and cochairman of the clean-up campaign; and Fred J. Weiler, Arizona director of the Bureau of Land Management, have held a meeting with representatives of recreationist groups, businessmen, civic leaders and government officials. These people are working with Boy Scouts, public schools and various outdoor recreationist groups to get as many people in the field as possible. They received some very good publicity in an Arizona newspaper, the *Phoenix Gazette*.

Oklahoma contact, Lynn Billau, reports that their governor has been contacted and he feels certain that a proclamation will be made. In Wyoming, Bill Guthrie has talked to the governor who plans to issue a proclamation. Mrs. Fleck, a member of the New Mexico Gem and Mineral Society, reports that her organization has contact with rock clubs throughout the state and that she has obtained lists of other outdoor recreation groups from her Federation's advisory land

chairman. All these various organizations will be contacted.

In California, CORL has now made plans for several areas. Last month we reported that the Calico Mountains had been chosen as one of the localities. Now there are confirmations for several other areas. West of Santa Maria is Oso Flaco County Park and nearby Sand Dunes Beach. Fifty miles east of Merced is the Merced River Basin, long a fisherman's favorite and badly in need of cleaning. The North Yuba Hiking Trail just out of Grass Valley, about 75 miles north of Sacramento has been chosen.

It is planned that San Francisco people will have two areas available. Already confirmed is a campout at Samuel P. Taylor State Park from which outdoorsmen may go out to clean up Francis Drake Highway and the Park Mill Creek area. CORL representatives are now working on plans for a location south of the Bay Area.

In San Diego County there are plans for Toy Pines State Beach, South Carlsbad Campgrounds, and San Elijo State Beach, three areas that are within 25 miles of each other. Possibly there may be a clean-up at a state beach in Orange County. Also, CORL members in the Ukiah district are checking out an area.

Hildamae Voght, executive secretary of CORL, reports that news releases are going out to newspapers, TV, radio, county supervisors and wherever they will do the most good. It can't be said too often that this type of publicity is needed so that the public may be educated about the litter problem and that rockhounds and other outdoor recreationists may create a favorable public image.

A SHOW-ME TRIP

Officials of the Riverside District (California) took some of the CORL people on a tour of the Calico Mountains to show them what needs to be done. It was decided that people on foot and with four-wheel vehicles will clean draws and small canyons, bringing the litter out to dumping sites along main roads for pickup. One outdoorsman is going to take a cutting torch to cut up a car body that now reposes in a scenic area. After being cut up it can be hauled out or buried.

In addition to litter, there is the problem of the idiots who have painted their names, obscenities and other moronic messages on many of the scenic rocks. An attempt will be made to obliterate these outrages. One BLM employee has found that Pittsburg Sunproof House Paint can be mixed to the color of the rocks and used to cover up the painted words. This is a water-base paint and at distances of 6 feet or more it cannot be detected. However, one hobbyist who hates to see more paint on the rocks has suggested obtaining a sand blasting outfit. It would remove the paint and within a few months the rocks would weather to their natural color.

The Calicos will be cleaned on Saturday, October 11. There will be a command post on the campgrounds above Tin Can Alley. This campground will also accommodate the many people who will bring their campers, trailers, tents, etc., and it will be the scene of a Saturday night get-together with a campfire, singing, tall tales and other fun. The Johnny Horizon puppet (see *Our Cover*) will be there to present a puppet variety show.

Perhaps these plans will be helpful to people in other states who will be participating in Johnny Horizon Countryside Clean-Up Days. Be sure to set aside October 10, 11 and 12 so that you may join in a campaign that will be a fine public service, great publicity for our hobby, exciting and a lot of fun.

Are there plans for your state to participate? Remember this campaign is for public lands, state and county parks and highways, national forests, and even private lands where we are allowed to collect. If we haven't heard about preparations in your state, drop us a note today. There's still one more issue of G&M before the cleanup and we want to give everybody some publicity.

Let's all H.E.L.P. Johnny Horizon.

---

JOHNNY HORIZON COUNTRYSIDE CLEAN-UP DAYS—WEREN'T OUR PEOPLE GRAND?

October 10, 11 and 12 are now a part of history—and what history! In a time when riots and anti-American demonstrations are common, dedicated rockhounds, campers, hikers, four wheelers, and other outdoor recreationists rolled up their sleeves and did something for their country. To quote one of our cleanup chairmen, this was a project of ". . . people who still have a deep regard for the well being of our country and have no qualms about getting their hands dirty to prove it."

We regret that we do not yet have all the final reports on how many people were out, how much litter was collected, etc. State and area chairmen are still gathering this data which will then be compiled into a report that, hopefully, will be ready for the next issue. And to the list of participating states previously published we can add two more. Mrs. Maynard Knutson of A&M Enterprises, Minneapolis, Minnesota, has started a Johnny Horizon campaign in her state. Mrs. Ree Rinehults, Niagara Falls, New York, sent notification that the Niagara Falls Rock and Mineral Club had joined in.

To give an idea of just what was accomplished, preliminary figures gathered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) indicate that in the states involved, more than 10,000 people turned out and saved the taxpayers over $200,000! Governors of eight states—Arizona, California, Colorado, Nebraska, Nevada, Texas, Utah, and Wyoming issued proclamations for Johnny Horizon Countryside Clean-Up Days. Also, the governor of Oklahoma sent a congratulatory telegram. The goal of getting the word to the general public was accomplished with publicity in newspapers and on television and radio.

Johnny Horizon was created a little over a year ago by our Bureau of Land Management. Just eight months ago, Hildamae Voght, executive secretary of California Outdoor Recreation League proposed the October cleanup. From this proposal came what, to the best of our knowledge, was the biggest effort of its kind. And, rockhounds were involved in every state that participated. In the majority of these states it was rockhounds that got the ball rolling.

Most encouraging of all is that our people consider this a beginning. Letters and questionnaires received from chairmen relate that they are planning future cleanups. They won't be satisfied until every state in the nation is involved.

We've said it before and we'll say it many times again. You people are the greatest! Congratulations and thanks to all of you. We'll do our best to have a complete report in the next issue.

---

LET'S MAKE JOHNNY HORIZON CLEAN-UP DAYS A TRULY NATIONAL PROJECT

*Editor's note: Kenneth Zahn, the writer of this item is, in our estimation, one of the unsung heroes of the rock hobby. Ken lives and works in the Washington, D.C., area and on behalf of our hobby, he has attended many hearings on public land issues and he has spoken for the rockhound. He has also supplied valuable information from Washington that has required many hours of research.*

*One of Ken's projects has been the promotion of the Johnny Horizon campaign in the East. Now that he is chairman of the AFMS Conservation and Public Relations Committee he has an important message and appeal for all American rockhounds—club members and independents.*

The National Space Agency will count 1969 as an historic year in space achievements. We here on earth can point with pride to an earthly achievement. Last Fall several regional Federations working with the California Outdoor Recreation League, Bureau of Land Management, Scouts, campers and many other recreational groups got behind Johnny Horizon Countryside Clean-Up Days and made a significant start in cleaning up our lands and improving our public image. Jack Cox, Managing Editor of Gems and Minerals Magazine, and many others can be proud of the land pollutions cleanup started in October 1969.

Reports indicate that Rockhounds in 15 States contributed an estimated 93,000 manhours to clean up 6,000 cubic yards of litter. If we can double these figures every year the public will soon be aware of the acute problem of land pollution. Hopefully a dent can be made in the vast accumulation of trash of all kinds which threatens to inundate us.

The Bureau of Land Management is working on several plans. Some of these are: A national TV Show with prominent singers and music composed for the Johnny Horizon Program (See item about Burl Ives, elsewhere in this issue); top level sponsorship of trucking companies, motor car manufacturers and large corporations; assistance from state institutions, government agencies such as the Forest Service, Department of Defense, Planning Commissions and a host of others.

The American Federation and all its member clubs have much to gain by joining the effort and planning a program of our own to repeat Johnny Horizon Clean-up Days on a national scale this coming September and October. This will be a banner year.

---

THE FINAL REPORT—JOHNNY HORIZON COUNTRYSIDE CLEAN-UP DAYS

Last month we were enthusiastic about how much our people did for their country during Johnny Horizon Countryside Clean-Up Days, October 10, 11 and 12, 1969. But, if we were enthusiastic, we were also conservative when we gave the estimated figures of how many people turned out and how much they saved the taxpayers.

For over a month, reports have been filtering in from state and area chairmen. We've heard from almost everyone now, so the data has been compiled into a 21-page report that shows this campaign was successful far beyond our wildest dreams. Space does not permit us to list the results state by state, but we can give you the national totals. That's the important thing anyway—it was a national project.

As with any countrywide effort, you learn that there is no time when the weather is perfect everywhere. Most of our people report that they worked under sunny skies, but not everyone was so lucky. In some areas they collected litter in the rain, and at least one group was rained out completely. In Colorado and Wyoming many were unable to participate because of an early snow storm. Some states found they did not have enough time this year to get much done, but they are already working on plans for next year.

Regardless of a few problems in a few areas, the overall picture is tremendous. This year, the states that joined in and their chairmen were: Arizona, J. C. Cronin; California, Mrs. Hildamae Voght, Elvin Funder, Kemper Schrader, Mrs. Jean Hazelton, Kent Sperber and other CORL members; Idaho, Lowell Fields; Minnesota, Mrs. Maynard O. Knutson; Missouri, Mrs. Lee McGroarty; Nebraska, Claud Clary and Charles Shafer; Nevada, Joseph Haddad; New Mexico, Mrs. Eldon Fleck; New York, Mrs. Ree Rinehults; Oklahoma, Lynn Billau; Oregon, Harold M. Dunn; Texas, Miss Eleanor Moak; Utah, Mrs. Clare N. Beagley and Boyd Williams; Wash-

intgon, Albert Ockfen; and Wyoming, W. M. Guthrie.

These chairmen and their helpers managed to get more than 36,500 people out to collect litter! We have confirmed reports of 36,516 and still a few chairmen to hear from. The reports received thus far show that the value of the cleanup work done by these people is $961,600! With more reports to come, we know the total value is in excess of that—it's getting close to a million dollars.

THE JOHNNY HORIZON NATIONAL AWARD

At the awards banquet of the American-Rocky Mountain Federations' Convention, Salt Lake City, June 21, there was a very great surprise and honor for GEMS AND MINERALS. We received the beautiful placque shown above which is the first Johnny Horizon National Award.

The award was presented by John Mattoon, Information Chief of the United States Department of Interior's Bureau of Land Management. Receiving it for GEMS AND MINERALS was managing editor, Jack R. COX.

In making the presentation, Mr. Mattoon said, "Jack Cox and GEMS AND MINERALS Magazine have performed exceptional service by encouraging anti-litter efforts by rock collectors. The American Federation of Mineralogical Societies has some 60,000 members, and they use the public lands extensively. We are delighted at the responsible manner in which they have undertaken a role in protecting the environment that we all cherish."

Mr. Mattoon went on to say that the Johnny Horizon National Award is the Bureau's highest recognition for volunteer efforts in behalf of keeping the public lands clean. Only one award will be presented each year, and if nothing of significance is done, it will not be presented at all.

Naturally, we're floating on the clouds because of this great honor. Seeing the fine response by our readers to the Johnny Horizon campaign has been a reward in itself. Being selected out of the whole country to receive the first annual award means more to us than any words could ever express.

Johnny Horizon just had his first birthday. It was just a little over a year ago that we learned of him when we talked to Jim Ruch, BLM Assistant State Director for California, at the California Federation Convention in Lancaster. Our first article about him, *Meet Johnny Horizon*, appeared in the August '68 issue. Since then we have endeavored to keep his campaign before our readers, through articles and advertising, working up to the current stories about Johnny Horizon Countryside Clean-up Days, October 10, 11 and 12.

Another of our projects was the construction of two Johnny Horizon marionettes (string puppets). One was sent to the Bureau of Land Management in Washington, D.C.; the other is at the G&M office for photography and other publicity purposes. You'll hear more about him next month.

All this would have been of little value if we had not been sure of good reader response to the anti-litter campaign. In accepting the award, Jack Cox told the people at the banquet that we had been informed by one of the regional BLM offices that rockhounds were the primary group assisting in the Johnny Horizon Campaign. This is no surprise to us because we can truthfully say that we feel that you rock-hounds are the finest group of people there is. It has been shown again and again that you love the lands you use and that you are willing to do whatever you can to protect them. Therefore, we feel that this award is for all of us.

This is just the beginning; we have a long road ahead of us. A major step will be Johnny Horizon Countryside Clean-up Days this coming Fall, which we hope will become an annual affair. Be sure to read the current progress report in this issue. Although the cleanup will be a great public service, our primary need is to alert the public to the litter problem and, above all, convince them they shouldn't throw it down in the first place. That's a big order, but the encouraging results so far show that it's worth it.

OUR COVER—JOHNNY HORIZON IN 3-D

As we've said before, Johnny Horizon is a symbol for the United States Bureau of Land Management's campaign to improve our environment by combatting the litter problem. He appeared first as a black and white illustration, later in 2-color and 4-color artwork. Several Federation and local shows have featured the BLM booth with a painting of Johnny. Soon, he will be seen in color posters that are to be displayed on some 60,000 postal trucks.

But, until recently, there were only 2-dimensional Johnny Horizons. Now, here he is in 3-D as a marionette (string puppet).

The idea for a puppet was conceived last year at the California Federation Show when Jim Ruch, BLM's Assistant to the State Director for California, told us about the Johhnny Horizon campaign. Some of the readers already know that Jack Cox, managing editor of Gems and Minerals, in addition to being a rockhound, participates in the puppet hobby with his family. So, the project was a natural.

Actually, there are two Johnny Horizon puppets. One was sent to the BLM office in Washington, D.C.; the other is at the G&M office for photographs and other publicity purposes. Mel Anderson, G&M's advertising/art director sculptured the heads and did the painting. Jack Cox and his wife, Shirley, took care of making the body parts, assembly and stringing.

The puppet in Washington was presented to Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Harrison Loesch, and the BLM employees at a special meeting June 3. He was manipulated by David Malhoyt of the Repertoire Theater, Alexandria, Virginia.

In the meantime, our California based puppet has traveled to the National Show in Salt Lake City and the California Federation Show in San Diego. He will join the rockhounds and other outdoor recreationists for Johnny Horizon Countryside Clean-Up Days, October 10, 11 and 12, and plans to make a personal appearance in the Calico Mountains, one of the areas to be cleaned in Southern California.

Johnny asks everyone in every state to join in this beautification drive. It will do much to let the public know that we must protect the lands we love by preventing litter. For more details about Johnny Horizon Countryside Clean-Up Days, including the people to contact in your state, see the article, *More States Join Johnny Horizon Clean-Up Campaign* and the Johnny Horizon advertisement in this issue.

BURL IVES JOINS JOHNNY HORIZON CAMPAIGN

Burl Ives, renowned folk singer, actor and entertainer, will lend his talent in the nationwide effort to improve the American environment. He met with Secretary of the Interior, Walter J. Hickel in Washington, D.C., January 27, to declare his active assistance in promoting the Bureau of Land Management's Johnny Horizon anti-litter campaign.

Mr. Ives plans a series of radio and television public service announcements and personal appearances to aid the Johnny Horizon Program. He stated, "The brightest thing in the history of this country is the land itself, its magnificence, its generosity. It is the root of everything we are; taking care of it is a matter of utmost importance."

Secretary Hickel noted that public participation in the Johnny Horizon campaign had begun to assume the proportions of a widespread citizen movement, with numerous clean-up drives and days held last year in various parts of the West where BLM lands are principally located. He went on to point out that Burl Ives' musical interpretations of our national folklore clearly reflect his love and respect for the land.

Mr. Ives immediately began enlisting people in the program. His schedule for the day included leading a group of Washington area school children in singing a new song about Johnny Horizon. He pointed out that this program provides concerned citizens with a way to make personal commitments to conservation by actively taking part in litter clean-up campaigns and other action programs on behalf of a better environment.

Elsewhere in this issue you will read the appeal from the chairman of the AFMS Conservation and Public Relations Committee for all rockhounds to join in another Johnny Horizon Clean-Up Campaign next Fall. Considering the terrific job rockhounds and other outdoor recreationists did last October, we have no doubt that this coming campaign will be a tremendous success. Now, with the support and publicity from a great entertainer like Burl Ives who is, himself, a dedicated outdoorsman, we can really get the word to the public. Let's start making plans now.

## CRISIS IN EDUCATION

### HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently spoke before this body on the urgent need for a reordering of our national priorities. At that time I stressed my deep concern over the critical problems facing our education system. Education is the heart of every nation. In educating our young, however, we must prepare them to carry on in all areas, in all occupations, with proper training and with dignity.

In this regard I would would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following statement by Mr. John G. Nealon. Mr. Nealon, visiting industrial professor at Rutgers on leave from Lockheed Aircraft Corp., is very active in the New Jersey vocational education program. I certainly feel that Mr. Nealon's remarks as to the growing need for interaction in our manpower and education programs deserves our utmost consideration.

It is my pleasure to submit his statement as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN G. NEALON

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, I am John G. Nealon, Visiting Industrial Professor, Department of Vocational-Technical Education, the Graduate School of Education, Rutgers University. I am on leave-of-absence from Lockheed Electronics Company, a subsidiary of the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation, where I am Senior Manufacturing Research Engineer.

It is in my capacity as a member of the Executive Committee of the N.J. Section of the American Vocational Association that I appear here today and I wish to thank you for the privilege of testifying on the comprehensive manpower legislation.

I wish to state at the outset that vocational education in New Jersey supports manpower programs. And indeed, it is from the ranks of vocational education that the manpower programs have traditionally drawn their professional staffing. But once having stated our support, I think it would be well to consider the *raison detre* for manpower programs in the first place.

THE FAILURE OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman, we must face boldly the proposition that the secondary educational system of the country, and the generalist educators responsible for it, are failing an unacceptably large percentage of high school age children. The statistics which lead me to this conclusion are frighteningly evident. Aside from the small percentage of students enrolled in vocational programs in either area vocational school or comprehensive high schools, the vast majority of our youth are being educated in a system which presumes that they are all going to college. But in reality, Mr. Chairman, only 18 to 20% of all of the children in our high schools at this moment will achieve a baccalaureate degree. By far, a much larger percentage are being educated to do nothing. Is it any wonder then that a high dropout rate is academic to our secondary school system, particularly in those socio-economic groups who feel alienated from society and in which the work-ethic is not necessarily considered a positive social attribute. The content of present secondary curriculums are clearly seen by many students to be irrelevant to their preparation for a respectable position in the world of work.

The argument advanced by many generalists—that we should be seeking ways of improving our secondary school curriculums in order to graduate a higher percentage of academically oriented students—is specious. For it is the very nature of the American college and university system that it provide the professional leadership needed to staff business and industry, and the governmental and academic institutions. Thus, while everyone should have access to higher education if his abilities and proclivities warrant, realistically there is only a limited demand for college graduates in the job market. Yet the technological growth of our nation demands an increasing level of skill and training to function in the service, trades and para-professional areas. Thus, in the words of our President in his recent message on education, "American education is in urgent need of reform".

HISTORICAL REASONS FOR THE DILEMMA

In the last century, the presumption of an academic or high school education was the preparation of a student for college. When, around the end of World War I, the nation shifted from an agricultural to a predominately industrial economy, an eighth grade education was quite satisfactory for the majority of jobs available, and it was not until World War II that the average job required a high school diploma. However, the high school, then as now, continues to think of itself as a preparation for college, and the egalitarian generalists who control the system, and are the products of it, maintain to this day that the thrust of secondary education should be so directed. The real trouble is that the establishment of this country, those who made use of the high school for that purpose—and that includes our legislative bodies—continue to tacitly agree with the philosophies advanced by these educators.

THE FUNCTION OF MANPOWER

We must ask ourselves, what are we really trying to accomplish with the manpower program. For if we are honest, we must admit that the proposed legislation is intended to be remedial in nature. It is designed to ameliorate the deficiencies of secondary education, and to address itself to the economic viability of those whom education has failed. We must never forget, Mr. Chairman, that the primary goal of a manpower program should be its own dissolution and to accomplish this, it is incumbent upon this committee that it adopt an attitude that treats with causative factors rather than symptomatic.

But, I submit, that this is impossible until the philosophy of secondary education changes to meet the exigencies of the time. Congress must now concern itself with the redirection of secondary education in order to obviate the need for manpower legislation. If we are to serve the educationally disenfranchised, the structure of the U.S. Office of Education must reflect this philosophy. The emphasis of federal funding must be upon vocational programs that encourage the high schools of the nation to reverse their present course and make occupational education their dominant pursuit, with academic programs relegated to an appropriate role that reflects the statistical realities.

A NEW WAY OF THINKING

When considering the educational and manpower problems of the nation, I cannot help but resort to the engineering discipline that I have followed for the past fifteen years. The technological evolution of complex scientific programs has forced engineers into thinking in terms of what we call a "systems approach" to the problem, and we have developed a new breed of professionals known as systems engineers. These engineers approach a problem in systematic terms using multi-disciplinary techniques. Unless the Congress adopts a similar outlook in considering the social problems of the nation, I despair that a truly workable solution will ever be arrived at. The problem cannot be viewed from the standpoint of manpower alone. It is inextricably tied to welfare, elementary and secondary education, vocational education, and certainly, far more comprehensive health services than are available today through legally endorsed channels.

Recently a copy of H.R. 16098 crossed my desk, "The Omnibus Postsecondary Education Act of 1970," and in reviewing that bill, I say that Title VI—Department of Education and Manpower—proposed an interested and indeed a farseeing approach to the problems to which we are addressing ourselves. In brief, Title VI supported the proposition that the U.S. Office of Education and the Bureau of Manpower should be removed from their respective jurisdictions and combined into a new cabinet-level department. While I don't delude myself that this is going to become a legislative reality in the present Congress, nonetheless it shows that someone is thinking along lines that I for one applaud. In fact, I would suggest that the provisions of Title VI do not go far enough. I would like to see, recognized in legislation, occupational education as the primary concern of the nation and that the Secretary of such department would be pre-eminent in that field.

If this legislation eventually becomes a reality, it will mean a considerable reversal in the educational priorities of Congress as expressed over the past few years. In the words of the first report of the National Advisory Council for Vocational Education, Congress has allocated $1.00 for vocational education for every $14.00 that it invests in higher education. Clearly then, if the need for manpower legislation and manpower programs is to be eliminated we must engender within ourselves a new way of thinking of educational priorities and no matter how painful, to our preconceived notions, we must face the reality that our present secondary educational system no longer adequately serves society's needs. Therefore, we must restructure; keep what is good—and it is indeed good in preparing people for an academic career—remove what is irrelevant, and replace it with programs designed to help the average student enter the world of work.

THE DELIVERY SYSTEM

If we assume that the manpower system is remedial in nature, and that Congress has a true commitment to correct our secondary educational system, then we must be concerned with cost effectiveness of the program and accountability for its operation. Traditionally the expertise in education lies in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and not in the Department of Labor. But because our administrative structure is broken up into fairly well delineated areas of authority, then the responsibility for manpower programs will inevitably rest with the Department of Labor. I urge you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, to consider well that while the Department of Labor may identify manpower requirements within various industries and geographic areas it is traditionally unable to provide the expertise necessary to structure remedial programs. I urge, therefore, that the pedigogical responsibilities be vested in the various state departments or divisions of vocational education where, in the main, such expertise exists. Do not, I urge you, leave the structure of such programs to dilettantes or novices who are ill equipped for such tasks. The real function of the Department of Labor, both at the Federal and state levels should be to identify problems areas, contract with the local departments of vocational education for their remedy and evaluate the results. But under no circumstances should they be permitted to exercise absolute authority in the educational processes itself.

VOCATIONAL ACT AND MANPOWER LEGISLATION HAVE COMMON PURPOSE

Try as I will, Mr. Chairman, I can find no substantial area of philosophic disagreement between the manpower legislation contemplated and the Vocational Act of 1963 with its two subsequent amendments. It is certainly the intent and objective of the Vocational Act to prepare people with the widest divergence of abilities and interests for entry into gainful employment. Indeed, under the vocational rubric, training is available for the most modest of entry level requirements through the paraprofessional and, under terms of the 1968 amendment, may even include 4-year baccalaureate programs. But lack of funding at both the Federal and state levels, combined with the endemic snobbery of the generalist, who controls the national educational structure, has frustrated vocational educators at every turn, and resulted in the social malaise to which the Manpower Act addresses itself.

SUMMARY

To conclude, then, Mr. Chairman, I am greatly concerned with the following points:

1. That a continuing, growing manpower program would tend to de-emphasize and supplant the already existing vocational school system, and by continued emphasis upon manpower, result in a system which would replace the already excellent programs being carried on with minimal federal support.

2. That an increased emphasis upon programs of a remedial nature would tend to de-emphasize the ongoing vocational programs and widen even further the gap that exists between our vocational schools and our academically oriented high schools.

3. That educators, not career personnel from the Department of Labor, would be responsible for formulating manpower program curriculums.

4. That the legislation fails to provide guarantees that the administration of such programs be shared conjointly by both the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education and Welfare with the latter exercising complete authority over educational structure.

5. That the legislation may tend to foster the development of a class structure within the labor force that will be totally dependent upon short term remedial instruction to the detriment of a vocational system concerned with the total educational needs of the individual.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, while the proposed manpower legislation offers a remedial solution, we must not delude ourselves into thinking that it is a final one. For only by eliminating the cause can we effect a truly permanent cure. And that cause is the failure of our secondary educational system as it presently exists. Only by expanding our present vocational school system, by building additional modern facilities in the center of our urban areas, by inculcating our people with the concept that all work is dignified, and that stimulating and rewarding careers are not necessarily the sole province of the college graduate, can we finally obviate the need for manpower legislation.

## THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

### HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, for more than 20 years the Genocide Convention has been pending before the Senate. Although it had been adhered to by most of the civilized world, the United States has never ratified it.

Mr. Maxwell T. Cohen, a noted New York attorney, has recently prepared an important and knowledgeable article on the possible application of the Genocide Convention which appeared in Prevent World War III, the publication of the Society for the Prevention of World War III.

This article should be of interest to our colleagues and I insert it herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

PARADOX OF MORALITY—THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

(By Maxwell T. Cohen)

It has been reported that the Nixon administration may review pending human rights treaties including the Genocide Convention. It would, therefore, be appropriate to urge even now that the United States Senate Foreign Affairs Committee hold hearings with respect to ratification of the Genocide Convention.

It is most tragic that in our time acts of genocide are taking place openly, in Biafra and the Sudan (remember Yemen and the Congo?)—and with complete immunity, notwithstanding that there exists a doctrine which makes genocide a crime punishable under international law.

Indeed the word "Genocide" itself has lost its initial meaning and has now become synonymous in our language with any act of warfare, any assault, any attrition or any destruction in any form.

Recently it was suggested to a United Nations' Ambassador that the Genocide Convention be applied with respect to the Nigerian-Biafran war. The Ambassador looked puzzled. "The Genocide Convention, what is that?"

His Excellency was not the only representative of his government at the United Nations who looked puzzled at the reference to the Genocide Convention and inquired as to the meaning of the Convention.

Several other Ambassadors knew of the Genocide Convention, but did not know if their governments were signatories to the Convention.

Several Ambassadors of new African States were not quite sure whether they had inherited the Genocide Convention because of the Mother Country's acceptance of the Convention.

The bitterest aspect of this tragedy is the fact that notwithstanding the constant appeals to the United States Senate by the press, American citizens, organizations and officials, the United States has never ratified the Genocide Convention.

It is a tragic fact that the singularly dedicated author of the Genocide Convention, Professor Raphael Lemkin, whose entire family was almost completely wiped out in German concentration camps, is barely remembered.

On December 9th, 1948, the Genocide Convention was adopted by the United Nations and the Convention went into effect on January 12th, 1951. The Convention consists of seventeen provisions, all exceedingly brief.

The contracting States confirm in the Genocide Convention that genocide, whether committed in time of peace or in time of war, is a crime under international law which they undertake to prevent and to punish.

The following acts will be punishable: genocide; conspiracy to commit genocide; direct and public incitement to commit genocide; attempt to commit genocide and complicity in genocide.

A unique feature is that persons committing genocide can be punished, whether they are constitutionally responsible rulers, public officials or private individuals.

Any contracting State may call upon the competent organs of the United Nations to take such action under the Charter of the United Nations as they consider appropriate for the prevention and suppression of acts of genocide. This provision if applied can avoid the veto risks in the Security Council and can also bring the issue to the General Assembly.

Notwithstanding the acts of genocide which have taken place since the Convention's enactment, there has never been a single case of genocide brought before the United Nations.

It is a paradox of international morality that the most moral doctrine in the history of international law is permitted to die in an atmosphere of blatant and banal hypocrisy.

The Genocide Convention should be resurrected and activated to prevent further tragedy in Africa, the Middle East and the Far East—now!

The atomic chain reaction is not the only chain-reaction in our troubled times. The domino theory that if one falls, all dominos will fall in the epitome of international relations today. No nation, no group of people, no economic or political system is so isolated that it can be truly unrelated to any other nation or group of people.

Any crime of genocide, if inflicted on one group of people, must be effectively prevented or stopped, otherwise there can follow reaction and reprisal. The reprisal could be militant and could lead to war.

If a precedent can be set—the first application of the Genocide Convention (Nigeria vis a vis Biafra)—we may then be able to avoid further crimes of genocide and so diminish the danger of a world war which could lead to instant destruction of whole nations.

Our advances into outer space make it possible for any plane with sophisticated weapons and even more sophisticated mathematical computations, to hurl destruction at any point in the world, even before detection or suspicion of such an intent.

The Genocide Convention if applied may very well be an inhibitory force in preventing destruction of groups, of nations and indeed, the world—this world?

The writer has just learned that a group of international jurists have prepared a report with respect to genocide in Biafra. The report is being deposited at the United Nations. However, the identity of the sponsoring nation, if any, has not been disclosed as yet.

## MERLIN DIVISION, ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, OREGON

### HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, April 20, 1970*

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Oregon.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the members of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation for their careful attention to a project which is of major importance to my section of the country. The subcommittee made it a point not only to hold hearings in Washington on this project, but also to hold field hearings so that it could learn firsthand, from talking to people there, whether or not this project was broadly accepted in and important to the affected area. The people of Josephine County turned out in large numbers when the subcommittee held its field hearings, coming from a broad variety of backgrounds and from every major section of the county. These citizens testified before the subcommittee on the very real importance of the Merlin project.

We in this section of the Nation have two particular characteristics that some of the other Members coming from other sections of the Nation know about but yet should perhaps be reminded of. This particular area where the Merlin project is situated, Mr. Speaker, is in a county more than 50 percent of which is owned by the Federal Government. There is immense Federal ownership of land throughout the entire Fourth Congressional District of Oregon which I represent and especially the particular county where the Merlin project is situated.

In areas of the east where there is very low Federal ownership, development projects are normally taken care of by the people living in the area such as private entrepreneurs. This is not the case in Josephine County, Oreg., giving us somewhat of a handicap. We feel the Federal Government has a special obligation in its consideration of whether or not Federal moneys should be invested in projects of this nature.

Second, we are in an area which is disproportionately dependent upon one particular industry. We are in an area where the product of forests, the trees that grow there, are the one strong economic leg upon which this section depends. When we find ourselves, as we do at the present time, Mr. Speaker, in a situation where on a nationwide basis homebuilding has come to a near standstill, and when we find that steps must be taken to control inflation, the impact on our particular area is magnified. This makes quite evident the weakness of an area which is so heavily dependent upon one particular industry. And, if you will, we are here in a situation where we urgently need to diversify the economy. We feel strongly that this bill is important in helping diversify our economy.

There is the highly desirable and badly needed recreation potential of the Merlin project which should be mentioned. An expanded agricultural economy would more than likely make the greatest impact as far as economic diversification is concerned. However, recreation would be a close second. In recent years thousands of people have come to southern Oregon either to spend their vacations or to build retirement homes. National trends indicate that many thousands more will follow. The potential of the Merlin area is such that recreation will become an increasingly important aspect of the local economy and recreation facilities increasingly in demand for the thousands of people coming into the area.

The Merlin project will not only diversify and strengthen the area's economy, but will provide a significantly greater degree of safety from flooding for those who live in the surrounding area. Josephine County has on occasion experienced heavy snows and for long periods of time as those snows melted, citizens in the Merlin area have lived under the constant threat of serious flooding. Control of Jump-Off Joe Creek, a tributary to the Rogue River, would help make the Merlin area a safer place in which to live.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania very much for yielding so that I might speak on behalf of H.R. 780.

## MY HOPES FOR AMERICA'S FUTURE

### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it seems sometimes today that we are completely surrounded by the dissidents, radicals, and rioters in our society who have lost faith in what America stands for and are attempting to destroy the foundations upon which this Nation was built. We need to stop, catch our breath, and reexamine the qualities and ideals of the Founding Fathers and westward pioneers. Lt. Comdr. Lewis S. Hayes of Fallbrook, Calif., won a Freedom Foundation award for the following essays which succintly outlines the greatness of America's past and need to rededicate ourselves to maintaining and strengthening of this greatness in the years ahead.

MY HOPES FOR AMERICA'S FUTURE

(By Lt. Comdr. Lewis S. Hayes)

My sincerest hope for the future of America is for her return to that position of leadership and respect from which she has been steadily retreating since the end of World War II. This can only be accomplished by a return to the basic principles by which our Founding Fathers lived and died, and upon which they laid the foundations for the greatness that is the birthright of this nation. Among these principles are Responsibility, Integrity, Faith, and Moral Courage.

My hope for America is to see her devote herself to regaining a fundamental sense of individual, fiscal, and national responsibility, without which she cannot continue to prosper.

I hope to see a strong America, that uses her strength both wisely and justly, while freeing herself of the guilt complexes that threaten to sap her of her vitality by creating a false sense of shame for her prosperity, accomplishments, and history. To fufill this hope America must have a rebirth of the moral values that gave her her strength in the past.

I hope for an America that will again produce statesmen rather than politicians—a breed of talented and dedicated men willing to place the interests of this nation, and the welfare of its people, above that of other countries. She needs statesmen who will endeavor to preserve the peace that our young men have won on the battlefield. These must be patriotic men who have the moral courage to support our positions however unpopular they may seem to some, and who, although not indifferent to world opinion, will not allow it to dictate our national and international affairs.

I hope for a strenthening of the basic freedoms upon which this nation was founded: the freedom for man to conduct his life and to pursue his livelihood without undue interference from either individuals or governments; to enjoy the fruits of his labors and to be free to accumulate wealth and property without having that wealth drained from him to support the willingly nonproductive; the freedom from fear for the safety of his person, his family, and his property from the depredations of crime, government, and those who, in the sacred name of "Freedom," would deprive him of both his property and his freedom.

My hope is for an America that will finally disavow the myth of the "Common Man". This country has attained its greatness through the dedication and sacrifice of *uncommon* men! Men may be born equal, and they are certainly equal in death, but to maintain all men as equals in the interim can only stifle incentive, subdue initiative, and create a sense of irresponsibility in the people that are the lifeblood of this nation.

My hope is for an even greater America that is reunited in national purposes, in which hope will continue to flourish for all her peoples, so that future generations will inherit a nation dedicated to offering even more opportunities for the fufillment of their dreams than we now possess.

## THE FLAP AT WETA

### HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 23, 1970*

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the fallacies behind the firing of William Woestendiek as a news editor for WETA are being recognized and condemned, by persons both outside and within the news business.

As an editorial from the Evening Star correctly states, the management of WETA had nothing on which to base this decision except the "matter of appearances," a flimsy excuse at best, considering Mr. Woestendiek's proven capability in a "succession of responsible news positions."

The editorial also points out the affront to any woman interested in a career of her own that is implicit in this decision as being "downright dangerous" in today's world. I insert this editorial in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 22, 1970]

THE FLAP AT WETA

In firing William Woestendiek as editor of "Newsroom," the managers of WETA got confused about two things: A man and his wife.

Woestendiek was discharged because his wife took a job as press agent for Martha Mitchell, wife of the Attorney General. Woestendiek's bosses were embarrassed about this, fearing for the "credibility" of the foundation-supported experiment in news broadcasting. There was no hint that Woestendiek's own handling of the news was affected or was likely to be affected by his wife's choice of employment. If Woestendiek had been regarded as so pliable, he would not have held the succession of responsible news positions he has had.

So it was the matter of appearances that bothered WETA. The controversy that Mrs. Mitchell's utterances regularly provoke was seen as rubbing off on Mrs. Woestendiek and, in turn, on her husband and the television program. WETA in this view, should avoid not the real possibility of a conflict of interests but the vague appearance of such a possibility. The better to fend off evil-minded critics.

WETA, in holding Woestendiek to account for his wife's method of earning pin money, accepted the ancient myth that wives are extensions of their husbands, doing only what they are told. It's an idea that was out of date at the time of Adam and Eve. In this age of aggressively liberation-minded women, the old-fashioned concept is downright dangerous.

The rulers of WETA should treat Woestendiek as an individual—married or not—and reconsider his status. This would be more in keeping with an effort to chart new ways in broadcast journalism.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, April 27, 1970*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Edgar Cordell Powers, retired Methodist minister of the Baltimore Conference, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-living God, like Moses at the burning bush, we stand today on holy ground. Give to these servants of Thine a competency of Thy divine wisdom, that they may know the truth in legislation, skill in framing just laws, and courage to oppose all that might corrupt or destroy the glorious heritage bequeathed to us by the Founding Fathers.

Help America to understand that danger lurks in things; to know that eyes blinded by the fog of things cannot see truth; ears deafened by the din of things cannot hear truth; brains bewildered by the whirl of things cannot think truth; throats choked by the dust of things cannot speak truth.

Whether in congressional halls or in the marts of trade, help us all to seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, assured that necessary things will be added.

May those heavenly constellations, faith, hope, love, point the true path until light eternal shall banish forever all darkness and doubt.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 23, 1970, was read and approved.