

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 expires at the end of the current crop year. The extension and revision of this legislation is of major concern, not only to wheat, feed grain, and cotton producers, but to all American farmers and ranchers and consumers as well.

The agricultural economy of our Nation has a tremendous influence on the overall economic well-being of all Americans. I know we are all concerned over the need to maintain a stable farm economy. A great deal of time and effort has been expended by members of the Agriculture Committees of both the House and the Senate toward passage of new farm legislation.

In a recent speech before the meeting of the American Agricultural Editors Association, the distinguished Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) very clearly spelled out the problems to be overcome in writing new farm price support legislation as well as some of the problems in telling the true story of American agriculture.

This speech is an excellent review of farm legislation and agricultural public relations by one of the ablest and most knowledgeable Senators in the field of agriculture. It is a discussion which should be of interest to all Members of Congress and others. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF HON. BOB DOLE

Many of our nation's citizens have assumed that technical advances in agriculture, irrigation, fertilizer and agri-chemicals have erased the risk in growing a crop.

Dr. Cecil Wadleigh, who directs soil and water research for the Agricultural Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture in Beltsville, Maryland—and is probably as knowledgeable of what it takes to produce a crop as anyone—emphasized the importance of weather to the production of a crop in a paper he prepared for a seminar at Iowa State University in 1964.

Dr. Wadleigh's paper entitled, "The Need To Evaluate Weather," discusses "iffiness" in his analysis of a heat grower in Stanton County, Kansas, who plants his grain in the fall. Dr. Wadleigh tells how the farmer can expect a bumper crop the following summer:

"If there is a good supply of available moisture in the subsoil at the end of the fallow period;

If rains occur in September and October to provide surface moisture essential for germination and seedling growth;

If leaf rust does not appear during the fall as a result of extensive dewfall or rainy weather with resultant weakening of the young plant;

If fall weather does not foster an infestation of "green bugs" which seriously weaken the young plants for tolerating winter cold;

If warm weather during the fall does not

abet an infestation of mites that transmit the "mosaic" virus which can wipe out a crop;

If the plants are not winter-killed by sudden cold snaps following warm periods in the absence of snow cover;

If the plants are not blasted by soil blowing as a result of dry surface soil and high wind velocities during early spring;

If late spring frosts during anthesis do not bring about sterilization of the flowers;

If there is an adequate amount and distribution of late spring rains to provide necessary soil moisture to carry the grain through to maturity;

If heavy dews and rainy periods in the spring do not foster an infection of leaf and stem rust, which damage or even kill the plants;

If not weather with desiccating winds does not occur during the time of filling resulting in low test weight of the grain;

If hot, dry weather does not foster a scourge of voracious grasshoppers to devour the crop;

If convective storms during late spring and early summer do not bring on a barrage of hail to destroy or severely damage the crops;

Finally, if the wheat grower could be liberated from all the preceding "ifs," he would "have it made."

The foregoing list of suppositions does drive home a formidable array of imponderables that the wheat grower must face over the course of a season in his planning of operations."

CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATION

A comparable list of imponderables could be drawn if you examine the topic assigned this panel today, "trends in agricultural representation." Let us suppose:

If you count the number of representatives from congressional districts that contain 25 percent of the farm population, you would have only 31 out of 435 House Members.

If you were to lower that figure to those districts containing 15 percent of the farm population or more, you would still have only 83 House Members.

If the food and nutrition welfare programs can be related to farm legislation, the farm program might be passed on the coattails of the popular, all important urban programs.

If the majority party could count on farm legislation support from all the Democrat members of Congress, it could pass the Democrat farm bill.

If the farm organizations of this Nation were to unite into one voice, they could certainly provide more guidance for the Congressmen trying to pass farm legislation.

If the U.S. Senate had sole authority to pass a farm bill without the concurrence of the House of Representatives, American agriculture would have a very liberal farm bill.

I could go on and on, but I am sure you see the point—wheat crops and farm legislation are affected by weather and congressional representation in much the same ominous manner.

Our farmers do face a problem today in the passage of any farm legislation by Congress. You know the score in the House of Representatives regarding agriculture. The Senate, however, is somewhat different. As a Member of the House for eight years and as a member of the Agriculture Committee then and now in the Senate, I can say agriculture has many friends in the U.S. Senate. Most of the distinguished Members of the Senate have important agricultural production within the States they represent. A general consensus is that a farm bill could be readily passed in the Senate, however, it must pass

the close scrutiny of the urban dominated House. I am sure you are more than aware of these implications after your discussions earlier today with members of the House specifically concerning farm legislation.

FARM ORGANIZATIONS

A second segment of agricultural representation is that of farm organizations. These farm organizations are trying to lobby through Congress farm legislation to benefit their constituencies. They are working hard, but at the same time they are fighting each other—much the same way farmers in history opposed each other about water rights, fence lines and other disputes. They are honest, sincere, and hardheaded. Many of us in Congress wonder who or which group really represents the will of the farmer. We must conclude they all do.

Now we are faced with the farm coalition made up of several farm organizations, several larger national organizations and some regional and State groups. This coalition has commanded new respect in an attempt to produce a unified voice of the farmer. Members of Congress appreciate this effort, but are confused when the Farm Bureau, which claims to represent more farmers than all the coalition groups together is opposed to the coalition effort.

Organizations representing producers of farm commodities are often opposed by organizations formed by processors of those farm commodities. Too often the producer gets too occupied opposing the processor and vice versa, or two farm groups argue so bitterly they lose sight of the ability to compromise toward a common goal. Agricultural representation in Congress and by farm organizations needs to rise above the battle ground, the conference table, the disputed premise to obtain an overview of agriculture in respect to all of society. This is what Chairman Bob Poage of Texas has tried to do in the House Agriculture Committee this year. I know this man and respect him. He is willing to take this overview and adjust farm legislation to meet a compromise of rural and urban interests.

FARM PUBLICATIONS

Let us look now at a third segment of agricultural representation—a segment that more accurately represents the agricultural producer of today than either Congress or farm organizations. That segment is you—the editors of this Nation's agricultural press.

Your farm publications keep us posted. You keep us on our toes. More importantly, you act as a direct voice from the producer to everyone. Your stories about the big producer, the innovative farmer, the diversity of crops today, the dreams of tomorrow's agriculture, the problems in maintaining an existence in rural America today—all these help us relate to our farm constituency.

When we have been talking to each other too long, or to farm lobbyists, reading your publications can often put us back on the right track. Most of your informative feature stories are about farmers—on the farm where you interview him while he works. It seems to me that is the best place to talk to a farmer. Too often when he puts on his suit and flies to Washington to call on his Congressman or Senator as a representative of his favorite farm organization, he becomes a "professional" farmer. He tells his Congressman what will be best for all the producers and tries to do the best job for all farmers. I think this is different than the way I read his requests in your publications.

I feel the agricultural publications of this Nation, by and large, are still reporting factually, and editorial interpretation is reserved for the editorial columns. Other segments of

your journalistic profession are not doing as well. Their objectivity is lost in their obligation to provide the reader with the full implication of the news.

An example of this occurred recently when we discussed meat imports on the floor of the Senate. Much of the furor that has surfaced in recent months was the result of a report given to a House subcommittee indicating the Nation would face a shortage of beef by 1975. When this story moved on the Associated Press wire, it was picked up by major metropolitan newspapers and headlined "Beef Shortage Predicted!" Lobby groups immediately started pressuring the President to suspend import quotas and agreements and let unlimited imports of beef into the country to assure low hamburger prices for the consumer.

Luckily the farm groups were awake and the American National Cattlemen's Association and the National Feeders Association got the word out that the reported need for 4 (four) million more cattle by 1975 was more than half way reached in 1969 alone with an increase of two and one-half million head.

Late last month the Department of Agriculture admitted an error in one multiple used in figuring the projection they had reported to the subcommittee last fall. Another Associated Press story was filed reporting the error. The corrected story assured an ample supply of beef. Very few big city newspapers carried that story, and even then the headlines were small. This is the type of representation Agriculture cannot afford.

To summarize these three segments of agricultural representation, those few members of the House of Representatives from congressional districts with some rural influence are having difficulty obtaining cooperation from urban influence in that body to pass a farm bill. The Senate, therefore, is observing and awaiting action by the House so they may interpret and possibly improve it. In essence, the Senate is backing up the House's unfavorable urban dominance.

Agricultural representation through farm organizations has come a long way in the unit several are displaying in the farm coalition. However, until some compromises can be reached that project less diverse points of view, the struggle between farm bureau and farm coalition only serves to make decision determination by Members of Congress more difficult. These farm organizations could provide more creative assistance by convincing urban America of what a bargain it is getting from the Nation's agricultural production.

Agricultural publications maintain a direct two-way link between the individual farmer and his congressional representation and farm organization representation. An example of the value of farm publications appeared in the May issue of *Top Op*. Norman Cavender takes a positive approach to a real problem in his article, "Political Power You Aren't Using." It is this type of constructive approach to agricultural representation that keeps the faith of the farmers in the congressional and farm organization segments of representation.

INFANT MURDER TOLERATED IN OUR NATION'S CAPITAL

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, infant murder continues on the increase in our Nation's Capital even as the court order striking down the abortion statute,

enacted by Congress, is on appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Those who regard slaughter by abortion as some so-called civil rights program should realize that if permitted to proceed, abortion by personal whim can develop into compulsory abortion, with the Federal bureaucracy ordering the abortions—who, when, and where—all, of course, "in the best interests of humanity and the American people."

There can be no solution by fighting effects. Murder by abortion does not curb nor cure the cause.

I include a newsclipping and a paper prepared by Dr. Brendan F. Brown, of the Natural Law Institute, Loyola Law School, in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, June 24, 1970]

ABORTION POLICY REFUSED; DOCTORS HERE CITE SENSITIVITY OF LIBERAL PLAN

(By Stuart Auerbach)

The D.C. Medical Society has refused to endorse a liberalized abortion policy, favored by 76 percent of its members answering a poll, "because of the sensitivity of the issue."

This policy, which would make abortions a matter between a woman and her doctor with the concurrence of one other physician, was recommended to the society's executive board by a special committee studying the problem.

Despite this recommendation and the results of its membership poll, the executive board refused to take a stand "since it cannot and should not speak for all members."

The official Medical Society poll was answered by 1,204 of its 2,300 members.

Meanwhile, abortions are being performed in increasingly greater numbers at hospitals in the Washington area.

D.C. General Hospital, which was attacked in a court suit for refusing to do abortions, has set up a special clinic. Medical Director Dr. John P. Nasou said the hospital performed 11 abortions in May and 12 so far this month—compared to three or four in previous months.

The hospital has hired a special doctor to operate the abortion clinic. Nasou said any woman who is medically fit and wants an abortion can get it there. "All they have to do is really want it," he said.

Washington Hospital Center doctors reported performing 300 abortions a month there. In Johns Hopkins University Hospital in Baltimore doctors are performing 200 abortions a month—61 per cent on unmarried women under 21 years old.

And in Chicago, the American Medical Society's House of Delegates is debating a new national policy on abortions that is more liberal than the one the D.C. Society refused to endorse.

The AMA trustees recommended than an abortion simply be a matter between a woman and her doctor, with no other consultation required.

Previous policy called for the concurrence of two other doctors as well as "documented evidence" of medical need. In practice, therapeutic abortions are done mostly on psychiatric grounds to protect the mental health of the patient.

The AMA trustees' recommendation was attacked at the House of Delegates meeting Monday by members of the National Federation of Catholic Physicians Guilds, some of whom linked abortion to murder.

The debate within the D.C. Medical Society also has reflected this split between many Roman Catholic doctors, who consider abortions immoral, and physicians who feel that unwanted children hurt the mental health of a mother and add to the nation's population explosion.

In language that is unusually sharp for a debate among doctors, these differences have surfaced in the *Medical Annals of the D.C. Society*.

Drs. Edward J. Connor and Orhan H. Aydinel, both of Cafritz Hospital, concluded in the March issue that "There are too many therapeutic abortions being done in the District of Columbia."

This article was attacked in other issues of the *Annals* by Dr. Leon Yochelson, head of the Department of Psychiatry at George Washington University Medical School, Dr. Zigmund M. Lebensohn, a member of the board of trustees of the American Psychiatric Association, and Dr. Edward W. Nicklas of Sibley Hospital.

Yochelson called the Connor-Aydinel article "biased" and said it "demonstrates little knowledge of the psychiatric aspects of therapeutic abortions."

While doctors have been debating the issues, courts and state legislatures have been taking action on their own. Hawaii, Alaska and New York have passed laws allowing women to get abortions on demand while Maryland Gov. Marvin Mandel vetoed a new liberal abortion law.

The U.S. Supreme Court has agreed to consider the constitutionality of the District's abortion law, which was questioned in a decision by District Court Judge Gerhard A. Gesell last November.

[From the Washington Post, May 4, 1970]
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GENERAL ABORTION WARD SLATED

An abortion clinic expected to handle 1,000 cases annually will open at D.C. General Hospital within a month, according to Dr. William Washington, associate director of the District Health Department.

Dr. Washington said the abortion ward will contain 8 to 10 beds and will be staffed by two part-time doctors.

"Our statistics lead us to believe at this time that we will have 1,000 cases a year, but there may be a hidden number that will tax our resources," he said.

He said the clinic will operate under guidelines "consistent with good medical practice and without any conflict with the court's directive."

A recent court order was issued to make abortions easier for poor women to obtain after a doctor at D.C. General Hospital refused to abort a 21-year-old because she had no history of mental illness.

Despite the order, the woman was still refused an abortion and several hospital officials received contempt of court citations.

RECENT STATUTES AND THE CRIME OF ABORTION INTRODUCTION

This paper will give an appraisal of recent abortion legislation in the United States from the point of view of Natural Law legal philosophy. Manifestly, its conclusions will differ from those reached by other types of philosophy, for example, the Realist. If a realist is convinced that man is no more than a ganglion, a baboon, or a grain of sand, then there is little if any difference between aborting a baboon and a human being, and hence abortion has no moral implications. Its social, political, and juridical implications are only a matter for determination by a majority of the voters who make the decision. But for the scholastic natural law jurist, every human being has an intrinsic, sacred dignity, not given by other men, but by the Creator of nature. Hence, abortion is not only a great moral wrong, but also a crime. This is so because it is the concern of each individual in society. It lessens the value of human life, and invites inevitable sanction as the breaking of a fundamental part of the natural law.

Until 1967, all of the fifty states of this country, and the District of Columbia, just-

fied abortion to save the life of the mother, and five for health reasons.¹ Since that time, ten states,² led by Colorado, have passed statutes purporting to justify abortion in other situations, i.e., on medical or psychological grounds, such as body injury to the mother, or the impairment of her physical or mental health, or on eugenic grounds, as where the child might be born with grave physical or mental defects, or on criminal grounds, as where the pregnancy resulted from rape, incest, or other felonious intercourse.³ These states were influenced by the official draft of the Modern Penal Code of the American Law Institute (1962), which had incorporated the Scandinavian type of abortion laws, effective in 1939.⁴ Most of these eleven states prescribe time limits for legal abortions. Some have residence requirements.

Two additional states, namely Hawaii and New York, have gone further and made abortion a private matter between physician and patient. Hawaii's statute went into effect in March of 1970. It prescribed a ninety day residence requirement. New York's statute will go into effect July 1, 1970. The New York statute establishes no residence requirements and permits abortion for any reason within twenty-four weeks of conception.⁵ The legislature of Maryland has passed a statute similar to the one in New York, but it has not yet been signed by the Governor, Marvin Mandel.⁶ If he signs it, Maryland will join Hawaii and New York in reducing the status of an unborn child to the level of an appendix, a kidney, or an aching tooth.

The action of Hawaii, New York and possibly Maryland, abolishing all laws against abortions by licensed physicians for any reason verifies the forecast that once moderate liberalization of abortion laws begins, the ultimate goal is abortion unlimited. This is the avowed objective of the American Civil Liberties Union in its model statute of 1967. This is the technique of "creeping legislation".⁷ Thus proponents of moderate abortion laws, in California and Maryland, after their enactment, suddenly became severe critics of such laws and clamored for unrestricted abortion. They have already prevailed in Hawaii, New York, and perhaps in Maryland.

In evaluating these recent statutes with reference to the crime of abortion, it is submitted that all direct abortion is unjustifiable homicide, the direct killing of the unborn child, as such, anytime from the moment of conception. Hence, homicide by direct abortion may not be justified by the legal order under the guise of reason. Such abortion is a criminal act under natural law, and hence must be punished by society through the state and its legal order for the common good. Failure to punish the crime of homicide must eventually destroy a fundamental postulate of American civilization, namely, the intrinsic dignity of the individual and the sacredness of all human personality. Finally, the recent abortion statutes must be repealed to insure the integrity of the American way of life.

I. Abortion is homicide, the killing of a human being

Pregnancy begins with zygote, a fertilized ovum, a single cell. Although this cell is neither differentiated or specialized, it is a new life. According to the new science of molecular biology, this cell is a human being, with all the gene structure of the fully grown and highly complex adult. The zygote is not just a part of the mother. It is not a parasite. It is the conviction of Dr. Hebert Ratter, physician and lecturer, and the Public Health Director of Oak Park, Illinois, that the zygote is an "independent, functioning organism". He writes:⁸

Of course, the embryo depends upon the mother for nutriment and an environment conducive to growth, but so does the suck-

ling babe. . . . From the moment of zygote formation, the characteristics of a highly individualized human organism are established by the inter-mixture and combination of the genes, chromosomes and cytoplasm contributed by the parental human egg and sperm. . . . This new, individualized human life starts to grow immediately, and after several days, begins to implant itself in the womb. The implantation process itself is not significant vis-a-vis the embryo's humanity. A bird, in or out of the nest, is still a bird.

The latest scientific research in the field of molecular biology shows that the human organism from zygote to birth is never a mere chaotic mass of cells.⁹

During the first two months of pregnancy, the unborn child is known as an embryo, and during the next seven a fetus. The principal difference is that in the period of the embryo, the basic parts are structured and their relationships established. The second or fetal period is one of growth. At no time during pregnancy is the blood of the mother and child mingled. A study of the operation of the placenta, defined as a "fleshy complex of blood vessels and membranes,"¹⁰ has shown that the blood of the mother flows into the placenta, and is drained off by the uterine veins, while the child's blood flows into the placenta through two arteries, but returns through a large vein." In the words of Dr. Granfield:¹¹

While the two blood supplies are in close contact, the fetal villi through the permeable walls of the blood vessels absorb from the maternal blood all that the fetus needs and gets rid of all that it does not want. . . . The proverbial sharing of blood between mother and child is a biological myth. Mother and child have separate blood supplies and circulation.

The zygote is not merely a genetic package. Microbiology, by means of radioactive tracers, as well as the ultracentrifuge and the electronic microscope, has revealed the intricacies of the zygote, and conclusively points to the fact that the zygote has an individuating life principle, plus a physical body, a cell unique in structure, method of unfolding, and ultimate destiny. Its chromosomes and genes differ in quantity and quality from the fertilized ovum of the organisms of other mammals.¹² Hence, the unborn child is never a fish, a protozoan, amphibian, tadpole or primitive mammal. Rather, it is endowed with a rational life principle or theologically speaking, a soul, which is "the architect of its own dwelling".¹³ Professor Noonan of the University of California has cited as authorities the famous fetologist H. M. I. Lilley and Dr. Cesell, founder of the Clinic of Child Development at Yale University for the conclusion that the "process of mental development which characterizes the ten-year-old child, or the one-year-old child, also characterizes the embryo who is only one month old".¹⁴ It follows that every one who reads this sentence was at one time a zygote, in the same sense that he or she was a baby, a fetus, and an embryo.

It is submitted, therefore, that abortion, or the killing of the unborn child, is homicide or the taking of human life. It is not obvious, therefore, why in the words of Dr. Jeffercoat, written in the British Medical Journal in 1960:¹⁵

The destruction of the living embryo offends something fundamental in human nature, and the most scientifically detached gynecologist cannot fail to approach the operation with a uneasiness which has been variously accredited to "primordial revulsion" and "subtle, archaic motives".

Obviously, neither embryo nor fetus has reached the same development as a newly born child, but neither has such a child attained the maturity of a man. Is it not inconsistent for physicians to take the oath of Hippocrates not to produce an abortion,

and yet to include abortion in their medical practice?

II. Homicide by direct abortion may not be justified by the legal order

Direct abortion is the intentional taking of the life of the unborn child, as such, as distinguished from the non-intended killing of the child, for example, as part of a necessary operation to save the life of the mother.¹⁶ Thus an abortion is direct when the sole, immediate result of the activity is to destroy the unborn child. Abortion is indirect when it is the "by-product of a procedure which is immediately directed to the cure of a pathological condition of the mother".¹⁷ Thus if during the course of an operation on account of cancer of the uterus, it became necessary to kill the child, the abortion would be indirect.

It is submitted that indirect abortion may be justified by the legal order, but not direct abortion. According to the true interpretation of the principle of double effect, indirect abortion is tolerated because the cancer operation as such is not wrong; the primary purpose of the surgeon is not to abort, indeed, he will try to avoid this effect, if possible. The end result of the killing of the child, is not the direct cause of the good, i.e., the saving of the mother's life, and the preservation of her life is as important as that of the child.¹⁸ But the principle of double effect would not be relevant to direct abortion, where the surgeon unequivocally intends the death of the child, with no possibility that he may avoid it. The respective lives of mother and child are equal, so that the end of saving the life of the mother can never justify the means of directly taking the life of the child, a concept which is embodied in the legal systems of all civilized peoples.

In so far as statutes allow direct abortion, they are contrary to the dictates of objective natural law, which not only recognizes the intrinsic sacredness of human life, but also affirms the equality of the value of the lives of all innocent human beings, whether born or unborn. At the same time, it is understandable how the conscience of the American people missed the distinction between direct and indirect abortion, which involves exact reasoning in the philosophical and juristic fields. But it is not understandable how the conscience of the legislators of certain states since 1967 have undertaken to justify abortion by law for reasons which are totally alien to the Anglo-American legal system. The privilege of self defense in that system has never been extended to justify the taking of human life because that life happened to interfere with the killer's health or socio-economic status. Innocent human life has been balanced against a criminally guilty human life in favor of the former, but never has physical life in this connection been balanced against less.

Attempts made by new abortion legislation since 1967, until the action taken by Hawaii, New York, and possibly Maryland, indicate that some value has been attached to the life of the unborn child, so that it may not be taken without some kind of an appeal to reason, however illusory. This position is to be sharply distinguished from the extreme position, which completely denies the protection of the legal order to the unborn child. Both positions are in conflict with natural law thinking, despite the fact that the greater conflict is with abortion on request.

In the first place, abortion except to save the life of the mother is not medically necessary. Dr. Eastman has written¹⁹ in his book on *Therapeutic Abortion* "that pregnancy, if properly managed, seldom aggravates organic disease". Pregnancy is a natural, normal condition. Abortion is not a disease. Dr. Murdock has stated²⁰ "that pregnant women are more apt to make a satisfactory recovery from their

Footnotes at end of article.

psychosis . . . and more promptly, than comparable patients who are not pregnant".

The subjective belief of one or more surgeons as to the necessity of an operation to preserve the physical or mental health of the mother can always be contradicted by the subjective belief of an equal number of other surgeons that it is not necessary. Indeed, today physicians and surgeons differ widely as to the medical justification of abortion. In the words of physicians Heffernan and Lynch:²¹

Anyone who performs a therapeutic abortion is either ignorant of modern methods of treating the complications of pregnancy or is unwilling to take the time to use them.

It is even more difficult to justify abortion scientifically on psychological grounds. What is mental illness, and how serious must it be to justify an abortion? Here the decision of the surgeon is even more subjective than when the grounds are medical. According to Drs. Arbuse and Schedtman,²² "an abortion may have a deleterious effect that is more harmful than the continuation of pregnancy" to a mentally ill woman. According to Dr. Gebhard, unfavorable consequences result in more than fourteen percent of the cases.²³

In theory, the recent statutes, which justify abortion in certain situations, admit the value of unborn life, but in practice, the results are often the same as those reached by abortion on request. The standard of the reasonable man who is a physician or surgeon is not required, but only a good faith subjective opinion.²⁴ In practice, the distinction between the two types of abortion statute is only verbal.

The psychiatric standards are too vague. Usually the ordinary physician, untrained in psychiatry, is incompetent to make the abortion decision. Several factors render diagnoses and prognoses uncertain, such as deception of the psychiatrist by the patient, or deception of the patient herself by misrepresentation of consequences by her family or friends, or deception of the patient by the subconscious conviction that she has symptoms which require the abortion. The chief psychiatric ground is the threat of suicide; but according to a study made in Sweden by Dr. Lindberg, sixty-two of the three hundred and four women who were refused an abortion, had threatened to commit suicide, but none did.²⁵ Dr. Barno has argued²⁶ that "psychiatrists would accomplish more by using the available modalities of their specialties in the treatment or rehabilitation of the patient instead of recommending the destruction of another . . ."

Rather often the physical and mental health factors involve a relationship to such non-medical grounds as future undue strain upon the physical or economic conditions of the mother. Since this strain would not exist in a family with a higher economic status, however, the reason for the abortion is ultimately not medical, but socio-economic.

Another ground incorporated into recent abortion statutes is the criminal, namely, where the unborn child is the result of rape or incest. Mere proof of rape or incest is sufficient under these statutes to warrant abortion. The mental or physical health of the woman, or her moral guilt are not relevant.

Statistics show that the percentage of possible pregnancies from rape is very limited. The possibility of a woman's being raped during a fertile period is only about ten percent. Dr. Granfield has written:

"Of those ten women out of a hundred, some are too old, some are too young, some are pathologically sterile, some are taking contraceptive pills, some use spermicidal measures immediately after the rape, some are raped by men . . . who are sterile."

He added that the emotional shock of rape suppresses ovulation.

Footnotes at end of article.

The so-called humanitarian purpose of aiding a woman who is pregnant as a result of rape or incest may not contradict the fact that the unborn child of the rape is not guilty of any crime. While the destruction of the sperm of the rapist before conception is allowable, because it is part of his body and hence is as much an aggressor as he is, nevertheless once conception has taken place, the zygote is no longer part of the body of the rapist, but a new human life. The interest of society in upholding the sacredness of human life must outweigh the individual interest of the woman. She has the option of giving the baby to the proper authorities for adoption after it is born.

Thirdly, the new abortion statutes have incorporated justification on eugenic grounds. These shift the emphasis from the mother to the child. It assumes that the life of an unborn child should be taken if it has foreseen defects, because life with such defects is not worth living. This is a false assumption. Who is to be the judge of whether the life of another, however handicapped he may be, is worth living? The existentialist, Victor Frankl, once wrote: "Only God can know how many saints were concealed behind the miens of idiots." Genius might also exist in the handicapped child.

However, the superman philosophy of Nietzsche, which treats defectives as non-humans, to be destroyed as social outlaws, opens the door to the next demands, i.e., infanticide, euthanasia, and genocide. It is rather well known that Governor Reagan of California told the legislature of that state that he would not sign the abortion bill which it had passed, until it had deleted the fetal defects provision. He said that such a provision was "only a step away from what Hitler tried to do." Indeed, as yet the prediction of deformity cannot be certain. Again, it might only be slight. There is the risk of killing unborn children who actually might have been born healthy.

III. Abortion is a criminal act under natural law, and hence must be punished by society through the State and its legal order

The recent action of Hawaii, New York, and possibly Maryland, of abandoning qualified abortion in favor of abortion on request raises the issue whether the destruction of unborn human life is only a moral matter, or in addition, a criminal one? Is it strictly a moral matter, within the inner forum of conscience, or is it also one within the outer forum, involving the common good of society. Objective natural law thinking places abortion in the latter category. Natural Law is that rationally discovered, objectively existing body of principles for the governance of man's conduct, geared to his nature.

Abortion is a crime because it is the refusal to respect the basic good of another human being, and hence in last analysis it is an attack on the common good of society through its rejection of human dignity. It is unscientific to state that it is a crime without a victim. The Second Vatican Council articulated natural law when it stated that abortion is an unspeakable crime. The Lutheran Church takes the same position.

Indeed, abortion is a greater crime against nature than homosexuality, because it destroys human life itself, whereas homosexuality destroys the subhuman life of the sperm. It is also a grave injustice against the father of the unborn child, opposing the abortion. He has contributed twenty-three chromosomes to the child, the same number as the mother, but she is now being legally empowered to wipe out his equity against his will. It is the duty of the State to protect the right of the unborn child to life by law. Is it not inconsistent for the law to have rather recently developed a sensitivity to the dignity of the human person in the area of racial justice, and with regard to those accused of crime, and the poor, and now in several states to have moved in the opposite

direction? Is this to be attributed to the fact that the unborn have no votes, cannot lobby, cannot demonstrate in the streets, and cannot gain access to the communication media? Or is it the result of legislative action based on error, created by misrepresentation of biological, political, juridical, and socio-economic facts. I prefer to believe that it is the latter.

It is a fundamental principle in our law that no person accused of crime may be convicted and put to death under the doctrine of capital punishment if there is a reasonable doubt that he is innocent. The reasonable doubt principle should be extended to the situation where certain physicians and surgeons are not convinced that a zygote is a man, or that at one time, they were a zygote, before becoming a baby. Even though they may not be convinced with certainty, the recent scientific evidence about the humanity of the zygote is enough to raise a reasonable doubt in their minds in this regard, sufficient to deter them from performing an abortion. When the destruction of human life is involved, men may never act on the basis of reasonable doubt.

IV. The recent statutes must be repealed

In any event, the recent abortion statutes must be repealed to assure the integrity of the American way of life. Failure to punish the crime of homicide by abortion must eventually destroy a fundamental postulate of American civilization, namely, the autonomy of all human personality. Communist civilization has long and easily accommodated itself to the doctrine of abortion on request. Would it not be ironical for this nation to adopt the communist way of life in the important matter of abortion, and yet continue to be ready to make any sacrifice to prevent the acceptance of lesser aspects of the communist *modus vivendi*?

These statutes must be repealed despite several specious arguments to the contrary notwithstanding. All of these arguments beg the question. One is that there are now many illegal abortions performed by persons who lack surgical skill so that there is a high mortality rate. It is argued that by legalizing abortion, or placing it outside the control of the legal order, this condition would be corrected. The answer is that Society may not remove obstacles in the way of criminals, just because in the commission of the crime, they happen to be injured.

Another argument is that penal sanctions should be lifted from the act of abortion, because there are many illegal abortions. The answer is that all criminal laws are repeatedly broken, some more than others. But this has never been a reason for their abolition. Laws against abortion have been and are being enforced.

A third argument is that abortion laws discriminate against the poor, especially poor Negroes, because they do not have the money to employ a skillful abortionist, while the rich do. The answer is that society has never abolished a criminal law just because some who broke it could afford to buy better outside assistance than others. Tax laws have not been abolished because some tax evaders can employ better lawyers and accountants to assist them than others can afford.

A fourth argument is that there should be no laws against abortion because they are an invasion of privacy between man and woman. The answer is that the constitutional right of privacy may protect against acts of immorality, which do not have immediate societal consequences, but never against conduct which has far reaching results against the common good, such as homicide. The sphere of the positive law extends to that part of the moral order which requires implementation for adequate social control and discipline.

A fifth argument is that laws against abortion are unconstitutional since they violate

the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, which forbids the establishment of religion. The answer is that these laws do not establish religion, which can only mean the supernatural law of a specific theology of a particular church, such as Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Mohammedan, and the like. Laws against abortion do establish or implement the objective natural law, but this is as universal as humanity itself, according to such authorities as Blackstone, and is the basis upon which the Constitution itself rests.

A sixth argument is that abortion upon request should be allowed for socio-economic reasons, either as a backup to birth control, to reduce the population, or rid society of defectives, who would be dependent upon state support. The answer is that once the doctrine is accepted that innocent human life depends for its worth upon judgments based on social utility, there is no authority to resist demands for the killing of persons suffering from incurable diseases, the liquidation of anyone deemed to be a burden to society, and finally genocide. The way leading to Hitler's gas chambers had been prepared by acceptance of the expendability of innocent human life, and of the destruction of those declared unfit to live, because they were Jews or defectives, or because there were too many people in Germany.

A seventh argument is that millions of dollars earned each year by persons performing illegal abortions find their way into the pockets of the underworld. The answer is that greater sums of money are made in such illegal activities as the numbers racket, and that this money also promotes organized crime. But there is no public clamor to legalize this activity, or even to initiate a national lottery.

An eighth argument is that a child has a right to be born into a family where it is wanted. The answer is that this right is subordinate to its right to life, upon which all other rights depend. The child may always be given in adoption. Many persons who oppose capital punishment would kill the unwanted child, but would not kill the unwanted murderer, much more unwanted than the unwanted child.

The movement for abortion is part and parcel of the over-all drive to break down the moral fabric of the nation. Other objectives of that drive is the effect to legalize marijuana, to do away with all obscenity laws, and to place homosexuality beyond the concern of the law. The movement for abortion gives aid and comfort to the permissiveness which encourages disorders on the campus and the street.

CONCLUSION

It is recognized in this paper that recourse to abortion is a great temptation to many for the solution of certain problems, and that human nature is often weak and does not resist evil. Indeed, the woman who seeks to kill her unborn child, as well as the surgeon who acts as executioner in performing the operation, may in good faith really believe that no moral or criminal wrong is being done. In that case, they are not subjectively culpable or deserving of personal censure, but on the objective level of the natural law, they are guilty of crime, although involuntarily in error.

Certainly, there are other ways to cope with the problems which the crime of abortion purports to solve. Is it necessary to adopt the easy way of crime, which is always negative and leads to ultimate unhappiness, because it is the denial of man's own rational nature? Cannot medical and psychiatric science work a little harder and come up with constructive ways of dealing with physical and mental illness? Cannot greater state involvement in removing the economic

reasons for abortion be worked out in this era of ever-expanding social justice? In the present national war on crime, the basic philosophy is to eliminate it by removing its causes. Should not this same philosophy be applied to the elimination of the crime of abortion?

FOOTNOTES

¹ Granfield, *The Abortion Decision* 78 (1969). The law of Louisiana is unique in that abortion is made a crime by 14:87 of the Revised Statutes, with no exceptions specified, but the exception is contained in 37:1285 (6) where it is stated that the procuring, ordering, or abetting in procuring an abortion will not result in the suspension or revocation of the certificate of a physician or surgeon if it is "done for the relief of a woman whose life appears in peril after due consultation with another licensed physician." According to a private survey, "virtually no therapeutic abortions are performed in Louisiana". The one or two a year that are performed, for example, in Charity Hospital in New Orleans, are carried out "incidental to other operations". Montjoy, *Abortion and the Law: A Proposal for Reform in Louisiana*, 43 Tulane L. Rev. 834 at 848 (1969).

² Namely, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Kansas, Maryland, New Mexico, North Carolina, and South Carolina. See *The New York Times*, Monday, April 13, 1970, at p. 1, and *Time*, April 20, 1970 (Medicine). For a recent summary of state laws with reference to abortion, see footnote six in *Abortion: Due Process and the Doctor's Dilemma*, by Richard D. Holper, 9 *Journal of Family Law* 301-302, 1970.

³ The abortion laws of several states have been declared unconstitutional, such as in Wisconsin. The United States District Court for Eastern Wisconsin declared the Wisconsin law of abortion unconstitutional under the 9th amendment. It held that the decision whether to abort an unquickened fetus is the pregnant woman's and not her state government's. *Babitz v. McCann* USDC E. Wis. (three-judge court) 3/5/70, 6 *The Criminal Law Reporter*, 2435-2436; No. 25, March 25, 1970.

On Monday, April 27, 1970, the Supreme Court of the United States agreed to hear arguments on the constitutionality of the District of Columbia's abortion law. That law was voided last November by U.S. District Judge Gesell, who ruled that its wording was too vague to enable a physician to determine legal right from wrong. The law had prohibited abortion except when necessary for preservation of the mother's health. The word "health" was not defined. Previously the U.S. Supreme Court had declined to hear a California abortion case in which a state law had been declared unconstitutional on similar grounds. Thus the Supreme Court has stepped into the nation-wide dispute over abortion laws. The hearings will be held next fall. See *New Orleans States-Item*, April 27, 1970, p. A, col. 8, and also the *New Orleans Times-Picayune*, Tuesday Morning, April 28, 1970, section 3, p. 2, col. 1-3.

⁴ Granfield, *op. cit. supra*, footnote 1 at 88.

⁵ *New York Times*, *supra*, footnote 2 at 1.

⁶ *The Catholic Review*, Baltimore, Md., Friday, April 3, 1969, sec. 1, p. 1—Headline.

⁷ Granfield, *op. cit. supra*, footnote 1, at 179.

⁸ Cited by Byrn, *The Abortion Question: A Non-Sectarian Approach*, 11 *The Catholic Lawyer* 316 at 317, 318, Autumn, 1965, as personal communication from Dr. Ratner. See also, The Bishops of Illinois, *A Statement on Abortion* March 20, 1969, 15 *The Catholic Lawyer*, 259 at 260, Summer, 1969.

⁹ Granfield, *op. cit. supra*, footnote 1, at 179.

¹⁰ *Idem* at 25.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Idem* at 34.

¹³ *Idem* at 32.

¹⁴ Noonan, *Amendment of the Abortion Law: Relevant Data and Judicial Opinion*, 15 *The Catholic Lawyer* 124 at 126, Spring 1969.

¹⁵ *Abortion Legislation and the Establishment Clause*, 15 *The Catholic Lawyer* 108 at 120, Spring, 1969.

¹⁶ Note: *The Current Trend to Liberalize Abortion Laws—An Analysis and Criticism*, 10 *The Catholic Lawyer* 161 at 170-171, Spring, 1964.

¹⁷ Kelly, *Medico-Legal Problems*, pt. 3 at 9 (1951), cited in footnote 108 to *The Current Trend to Liberalize Abortion Laws—An Analysis and Criticism*, 10 *The Catholic Lawyer* 161 at 171.

¹⁸ Note: *The Current Trend to Liberalize Abortion Laws—An Analysis and Criticism*, *op. cit. supra*, footnote 16.

¹⁹ Byrn, *The Abortion Question: A Non-Sectarian Approach*, *op. cit. supra*, footnote 8, at 318, quoting from Eastman, *Obstetrical Foreword to Rosen, Therapeutic Abortion* at xix (1954), (note 17).

²⁰ *Ibid.*, note 19, citing Murdock, *Experiments in a Psychiatric Hospital* in Rosen, *Therapeutic Abortion* 203 (1954).

²¹ *Is Therapeutic Abortion Scientifically Justified?* 19 *Linacre Q.*, 24 (1952), cited in Note 75, pt. 167 of: Note: *The Current Trend to Liberalize Abortion Laws—An Analysis and Criticism*, *op. cit. supra*, footnote 8.

²² *Neuropsychiatric Indications for Therapeutic Abortion*, 1 *Am. Pract.* 1969 (1950), cited in note 80 at 168 of Note: *The Current Trend to Liberalize Abortion Laws—An Analysis and Criticism*, *op. cit. supra*, footnote 8.

²³ Gebhard, Pomeroy, Martin and Christenson, *Pregnancy, Birth, and Abortion* 205 at 219 (1958) cited in note 85 at 186 of Note: *The Current Trend to Liberalize Abortion Laws—An Analysis and Criticism*.

²⁴ *The Abortion Decision* 77 (1969)

²⁵ *Idem* 104.

²⁶ *Idem* 105.

DR. BRENDAN F. BROWN, VITA

Dr. Brendan F. Brown has been Professor of Law in New Orleans at Loyola University School of Law since 1954. Previously, he had been Dean for twelve years at the Law School of the Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C. He received the A.B. and LL.B. degrees from Creighton University, and the J.U.D. degree from the Catholic University of America, and in 1932, he was awarded a doctorate in the Philosophy of Law by Oxford University in England. He is an international exponent of Natural Law philosophy, which he has implemented in several books and scores of articles. Among his many publications is the *Natural Law Reader*.

THE NATURAL LAW INSTITUTE

The Saint Thomas More Law Club of the Loyola University School of Law was established in 1935. It began an annual series of Natural Law Institutes in 1958. The purpose of these Institutes has been to provide a forum of discussion of how the Natural Law philosophy relates to the solution of contemporary problems of justice.

Traditionally, the Institute has been a forum in which representatives of the various schools of legal philosophy discuss topics of current interest. Two of the four panelists approach the solution of the problem from the point of view of Natural Law. The other two panelists apply different types of legal philosophy. The panelists who participate in the institute are invited because of their special qualifications and interest in the topic.

Dr. Brendan F. Brown has participated in all the programs of the Institute, either as a moderator or panelist.

THE CAMPUS CONFRONTATION

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the May issue of the Atlanta Economic Review contains an article entitled "The Campus Confrontation" that thoughtfully deals with student thinking and activities today on the Nation's college and university campuses.

The author of the article, Willys R. Knight, director, bureau of economic research, Georgia State University, poses the question:

Is there a group of our nation's students and faculty members who believe themselves to be an elite due special privileges and dispensations?

I found Dr. Knight's article interesting and thought provoking. 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:

IS ELITISM THE REAL DANGER?

(By Willys R. Knight)

Some time, and preferably now, this whole question has to be brought out into the open: Is there a group of our nation's students and faculty members who believe themselves to be an elite due special privileges and dispensations?

Does such a group think it can never be wrong, and that nobody else can ever be right?

Is it contemptuous of the viewpoint of the undoubted majority, which moves much more slowly but surely and steadily—and democratically!—towards desired change?

And is the elite too arrogant?

Those of us with more reason than rage (and that includes countless sincere but peaceful demonstrators) recognize that we are at another frontier in 1970. The widespread uncertainty in our people, epitomized in the wave of campus upheaval, is the mood which precedes significant social change.

It is not possible to predict what the change will be, but we may be sure that economics and business will be affected. The conduct of economic affairs is such a large part of our total society that it must be affected whenever the total culture undergoes change.

Sometimes a nation—or indeed a whole series of nations—can arrive at a new frontier without realizing it. Only later, when we take stock, does it dawn upon us that the boundary has been crossed, that no return is possible.

So it was shortly before 1930 when credit in Central Europe collapsed, share prices on the New York Exchange tumbled, world trade became confused, private investment shrank, unemployment lines formed. There was turmoil, political upheaval, talk of revolution.

In the 1940s, looking back one found New Deal type governments had taken over all countries in the Western World, ushering in the new age, that of the Welfare State.

The changes, for better or for worse, were wrought by the will of all the people. And no one needs reminding how little dissent, peaceful or otherwise, would be possible today if the elitists of that time had had their victory.

Destructive, baffling, and dangerous as they are, the violent campus upheavals of this day are uncovering some new weeds in university gardens that have been hidden from view too long. A major undertaking for the

1970s will be to understand their structure, means of nourishment and propagation.

Early investigations suggest four important features of these weeds:

1. They have sprung up worldwide, simultaneously, despite widely differing soils;
2. Their root systems extend far out drawing nourishment from both within and without the campus;
3. They can be found in gardens outside of universities;
4. Early efforts to control them were ineffective because they have unusually deceptive characteristics.

Important headway has been made in the last year in becoming aware that we are dealing with a complex phenomenon which will require inquiries in depth.

The necessary research cannot be performed in a year or two. Time is a necessary element in this kind of study because the phenomenon reveals surprising new phases from one year to the next. It may take five years before we can be quite sure what it is that we are beholding.

Our understandings in 1980 will be quite different than those we form now—but we must make a start, to try to understand.

And the words, not only of the articulate but frustrated and inexperienced young, but of the acknowledged great and controversial thinkers of the day, must be taken at much more than their face value.

Recent lecturers of note, participating in the Lyceum Series here at Georgia State University, have inevitably discussed the phenomenon. Earlier this month, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Historian and former special assistant to President Kennedy, pointed out clearly and properly that the spreading antagonism of the young must be viewed in terms of its international dimensions. Viewed this way, easy generalizations arising from the American experience will not hold water.

An international perspective undermines notions dear to elders, such as "the Dr. Spock generation" of permissive child rearing, and "children of affluence."

Equally, it renders anaemic a view cherished by the under-thirties, namely that the basic root of our bitter differences is the military draft which sends one segment of our people to a futile, "immoral" war in Viet Nam. The fact is that the widespread antagonism of the young for their various societies is found where there is not affluence or permissive child rearing or any Viet Nam involvement.

If these "reasons" for the alienation of the young are put aside, what is left? Is it something which a vocal and arrogant minority—a self appointed elite, in fact—has been able to sell to a wider youth audience in each nation? Schlesinger is one who does not think so, and warns against adopting such a view. He particularly stressed that a society must not assume an attitude of disgust for its young.

He went on to enumerate and discuss the following points as basic to the alienation phenomenon:

1. Instability in modes of living arising from the stimulus of vast new horizons opened by jet airplanes and television;
2. As instability in life-style increases (usually caused by contact with other cultures), the gap between parents and children expands;
3. The emergence of huge organizations (both public and private) possessing internal power and logic of their own, which require "organization" men;
4. Technology itself (especially television and the computer);
5. The world population boom;
6. A moral revolution, ill-defined but real.

Professor Schlesinger credited General de Gaulle as having defined the problem most succinctly: Modern society, characterized by technology and consumerism, does not offer a sense of idealism which young people re-

quire; and we must make the young real participants in the various agencies which make fundamental decisions.

What about the New Left, and its attack on the older "liberalism"? That the New Left has hold of some truth cannot be denied, yet Schlesinger disagreed strongly with a number of their views and tactics. Further, he warned that if the fabric of society is threatened, as many of them clearly intend, the result will not be the takeover which they desire, but rather a reaction in which the Right will emerge wholly triumphant. Also, he said, it is merely wishful thinking to believe that big organizations can be removed from modern life.

Since the demolishing of a "corrupt" society, as the New Left preaches, is not a feasible alternative, Schlesinger arrived at the "essential proposition of our time," namely, the necessity of bringing alienated groups into the mainstream of participation and decision-making.

Just how this is to be done he did not elaborate. However, his answers in response to student questions indicated that his chief device would be political activism of the older "liberal" sort.

Two days before Dr. Schlesinger spoke, in another Lyceum speech at Georgia State University Professor John Kenneth Galbraith related the alienation of students to the present economic and social order as he sees it: that is, large bureaucracies in government and in private industry, having a powerful logic of their own and inevitably seeking to preserve themselves and to accomplish related goals, making their own basic decisions without the participation of the broad public.

This is not the action of wicked or selfish men, nor is it a feature of capitalism—rather, it is the inevitable development as a society ascends the scale of economic sophistication.

The main point is, however, that the alienation and helplessness which students feel, is a perception of reality, not an illusion, nor a half-baked reaction of children raised under affluent conditions.

In view of his general analysis, it seemed surprising that he did not urge students to aim for positions of leadership in the big organizations because that is "where the action is." Rather, his advice to students seemed to indicate a belief that political activism is the chief avenue of hope; specifically, he advised that they exert themselves to remove certain powerful southern Senators and Congressmen from office.

I want to make these comments on the two speeches.

Both men were remarkably unbiased in their prepared presentations—and both added luster in the finest tradition of universities.

However, in response to audience questions, which were usually related to the Viet Nam war and not often to the issues discussed in the prepared papers, these excellent men revealed other viewpoints. Because their actions and writings are frequently covered in the nation's news media, these viewpoints were generally known by the audience. Being true to themselves, they could not but respond in ways which to others, like myself, seemed biased.

And, once more, a suggestion of elitism comes to mind.

I had the distinct feeling both Professor Galbraith and Schlesinger were speaking to college students as if they were an elite body. Although neither man flattered them in any overt way, nor was any reference made to any elite quality (like superior intelligence or destiny for leadership), yet an implication remained all the same.

Both had a slight messianic aura, a quality qualifying them, and the college students (with whom they have much rapport) to lead America along a true highway. Political

activism (in the Democratic Party and with a bow each morning toward Hyannisport) was assumed to be the most fruitful avenue for making the world better.

The failure of either to stress the obvious—Get a piece of the action; become a professional manager! Make big organizations serve the public interest better—is a matter to be pondered.

Other (and widely different) interpretations of campus tumult were made recently by two noted educators, at the annual convention of the American Newspaper Publishers Association. One view was presented by S. I. Hayakawa, President of San Francisco State College: "There is something very pernicious about liberal arts education."

He claimed that many liberal arts students are tinged with an "aristocratic elitist bent" and inclined toward a profound contempt for democracy. Implicit in their positions is a belief, never stated openly by either themselves or their teachers, of being educated-to-rule.

This might explain their apparent sense of moral and intellectual superiority and their unwillingness to participate actively in existing institutions unless revolutionized to meet their notions of the moment.

On the other hand, Kingman Brewster, Jr., President of Yale, called for greater sympathy and acceptance of student dissenters. He viewed them as "potentially destructive critics, skeptics and heretics" who, unless given the assurance of acceptance, would "join the ranks of those enraged destructivists who would tear down the system."

Brewster said that "most students are smart enough to know there are no easy answers, but they would like their elders to admit the questions are real."

President Brewster did not discuss the question of an alleged elite group (or an elite group of New England colleges and universities), but the great respect which he displayed for the potential of these students suggests an implicit elitism.

The whole question really has to be brought out into the open. And this must be faced too: Are the social and political views of students majoring in sociology and anthropology at Yale more significant than those of a student majoring in chemical engineering or management at the University of Wisconsin? Or in some branch of technology at Southern Tech?

Is there any evidence that professors in sociology or literature at Yale impart greater wisdom for the conduct of American statecraft than do members of the engineering faculty at Cal Tech?

There is no evidence that liberal arts students have better values or greater general wisdom for the conduct of society than have those from professional schools.

Now I turn to some very significant insights into the problem through the eyes of a Briton. They appeared in a recent *Atlanta Economic Review* article by a British professor, Archie Donald, head of the department of professional and business studies at Southeast London Technical College ("How I found the Strong Unsmiling System," April issue).

Professor Donald highlights factors which have seemingly escaped our attention, namely the difference between full-time and part-time college students. His views arise from the situation in England, but they are relevant to the U.S. scene as well.

Having jobs and career plans, part-time students, he says, reveal a commitment to existing society. They want to progress in their chosen occupations, enrolling generally in programs having some relation to their careers.

Of full-time students, he wrote: "Having no paid permanent job, they are un-integrated and therefore liable to be uncommitted to existing society. Many are taught and some absorb the academic game of 'criticism,' and I am doubtful whether this can be applied in the mass education of society."

Generally, these students attend a university on government grants studying philosophical, historical, literary, and speculative subjects. "... As the balance of full-time courses in technical Colleges increases, so the uncommitted element increases and some disruptive tendencies may occur. In my own situation in a Technical College of 10,000 students, with 2,000 full-time students, I am conscious of this pull between the aims of different groups of students."

The English professor goes on to raise a basic question which colleges and universities in the Western World have not been willing to confront to date: "I find myself reflecting on what percentage of innovative and disruptive elements a given society can absorb, and I feel to teach academic criticism of a discipline may well be best suited to the education of an elite. This is a key question in education. . . . Traditionally, all industrial societies of the present have trained an elite to lead them and probably only a fraction of this elite was a progressive element. Are such teaching methods transferable to mass education? What percentage of innovation and disruption can an on-going society absorb? Little research appears to have been done either in the U.K. or U.S.A. on this subject, it being taken for granted that a society can absorb just as much innovation and disruption as it is able to produce either internally or externally. I am not against some measure of innovation and disruption. I merely wonder as a businessman, educationalist, and accountant why we have chosen to unleash forces of large-scale technical innovation, disruption to social values, and questioning of moral values without doing any research on the amount or rate of change at which a society can absorb them."

Last year Prof. Donald traveled 11,000 miles throughout the U.S. visiting 36 universities and colleges. His observations on the unrest of the U.S. college students deserve our close attention:

I listed and counted up at least eight distinct and somewhat conflicting strands of the students' disenchantment with the existing state of society's affairs and with education. But all these points, in my estimation, add up to a single plea, a concern for the quality of life.

There was an appreciation of the shrinking of a vast land to manageable proportions and a sensitivity of the approaching need for a change in society's direction and the need to get together—regardless—and work out solutions to problems as a group rather than sitting on his own doorstep with a rifle across his knees.

Youth, for those few short years before being completely absorbed into the existing system, act as the nation's conscience, and through their protests—often confused and often conflicting—draw attention to the problems of the near future when they exhibit a growing concern for the quality of life.

Our economics and our accounting systems are all at present geared to measuring quantity: volume of sales; marginal costing which shows us that unit costs decrease as volume of production increases. Nothing wrong with that! The whole of our present day life is based on such well-known precepts. The criticism is that double-entry bookkeeping, even cost/benefit analysis, has not enough dimensions to keep account of the quality of daily life . . . and as an accountant myself I accept the criticism.

To combat this situation, I found in my travels a strong subculture of personal friendly contact; but always behind, the strong unsmiling system that occasionally breaks through and certainly cannot be influenced or beaten by the student or man-in-the-street.

Our problem becomes a paradox: Growing cities need a firmer technological

grasp on their expansion so that they remain liveable in; and

Daily lives need a gentler touch to give back the quality to life.

Our educational problem is to relate these two aspects within the same person; for unless it is the same person who carries out both these functions, then there will be some form of dictatorship.

Let us assume that Professor Donald's insights are basically true (I happen to believe they are). The implications are deeply disturbing because the questions which are basic have been virtually untouched in all the demonstrations, rallies, manifestoes, etc., to date.

Note that Professor Donald, like Hayakawa would draw our attention to the problem of an elite group—intellectuals trained to be critical of society and imbued with a great sense of importance, indignant of others who fail to appreciate their wisdom and hunger for leadership.

Socrates is a great hero of university professors because he chose to take the hemlock rather than relent for one moment from "shaking the tree." To a large degree, in academe professors make their individual reputations by challenging the conventional wisdom in their particular areas of study. Also, some research has shown that they tend to have "permissive" personalities (at odds with "authority"). This helps to explain why they are constant critics of society, which in any time or place is always "conformist" and in many instances funny or even ridiculous.

But shaking the tree of our society is a far cry from chopping it down.

Let us face now the peril of an elite who think their views are so important that they are entitled to unusual privileges—like committing acts of violence in the expectation that countermeasures should not and will not follow.

Specifically, that they can burn campus buildings, break windows, burn banks, insult other people (but show shock if the reverse should occur), and demand that they "be heard" (and obeyed).

Is America rotten if it fails to accept their views and policies?

Whether the right word is "elite," there is a peculiar subculture phenomenon involved which deserves most careful study. It is bound to raise most serious questions of educational policy and practices.

Of this we can be sure, whatever the real forces are, they go far beyond the demand "to be heard."

RESOURCE RECOVERY ACT OF 1970

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during the House consideration yesterday of the Resource Recovery Act of 1970—H.R. 11833. I am pleased that this important legislation passed the House without a single dissenting vote, and had I been present I would have voted for it.

I am very much concerned with the need to take creative steps immediately to get at the sources of environmental pollution. Solid wastes pose a particularly acute problem in the fight to save our environment, and I feel strongly that we must take action to encourage the recycling of the thousands of solid wastes modern societies produce. Simply dumping these wastes in open areas, which we

have done with most of them for so long, is no solution—it is part of the problem. The research, development, and demonstration projects on solid waste disposal, recovery, and reuse authorized by H.R. 11833 constitute a valuable intensification of our attack on this serious problem.

I certainly intend to press for appropriation of the full amount of funds authorized by this legislation, and I want to commend the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for reporting it to the House.

AGRICULTURAL LEGISLATION

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article on the present status of farm legislation, written by Mr. Jamie Heard of the National Journal in its June 20, 1970, issue.

After providing the background which explains the present logjam in the committee, Mr. Heard expresses his judgment that my amendment to limit farm subsidies to \$10,000 per crop for each producer "will almost certainly pass." This is also my own feeling.

I think it is particularly instructive to note Mr. Heard's analysis of the situation in the other body. Although in the past the Senate has failed to accept my amendments, Mr. Heard notes that, based on last year's Senate votes and recent developments, there are now at least 45 Senators we can expect to support a rigorous ceiling. With this solid base of support I am confident that this year we will succeed in putting an end to these scandalously huge payments.

I hope my colleagues will also note Mr. Heard's comments about comprehensive food stamp legislation which has been languishing in the House Agricultural Committee. Mr. Heard suggests that this unjustified delay—a tactical device designed to secure urban support for a farm bill—might not work, indeed "could even lose votes."

I have repeatedly called for the prompt reporting of food stamp legislation. This administration has done a tremendous job in expanding the program under existing legislation. The time has come for this body to accept its responsibility and provide the tools to complete the job of eliminating hunger and malnutrition in this land of plenty. The article follows:

AGRICULTURE REPORT: UPSET OF FARM PRICE SUPPORT LEGISLATION COULD LEAD TO LESS INCOME, BIG SURPLUSES

The Administration's year-long effort to win congressional and farm group approval for new farm legislation has reached an impasse.

In a surprise move, the House Agriculture Committee on June 2 overrode the objections of its own leadership, and adopted wheat and feed grains support proposals backed by farm organizations but opposed by the Administration.

Unless repaired, the division between committee and Administration could delay passage—something neither wants. Both the de-

partment and the committee leadership agree on the need for consensus before taking a bill to the House floor, where new farm legislation faces further trouble over the politically sensitive issue of windfalls for large farmers.

Without new legislation to replace the 1965 agricultural act, which expires Dec. 31, the Agriculture Department will be forced to fall back on pre-1965 legislation. This could depress farm income, trigger excess production and fill government warehouses with surplus commodities.

Committee action: For nearly a year, Agriculture Secretary Clifford M. Hardin and his principal assistants have been meeting with the committee. They have agreed on new wool and dairy legislation; the June 2 vote on wheat, feed grains and cotton was to have been the last major committee action before reporting a bill. The committee was expected to approve a program Hardin and the committee leadership had developed.

The committee instead dealt a blow to the department and to committee chairman W. R. Poage, D-Tex., the man who took primary responsibility for developing a workable consensus on the new legislation. By a 17-14 record vote on a motion offered by Rep. Thomas S. Foley, D-Wash., the committee substituted a wheat and feed grains plan known as committee print No. 4 for the Administration-backed plan, known as committee print No. 7. The committee did not vote on cotton provisions.

Reversal—The livestock and feed grains subcommittee had approved print No. 4 on Feb. 24 for full committee action; but after Hardin informed Poage and Rep. Page Belcher, R-Okla., the ranking minority member on the committee, that this was unacceptable to the Administration, the subcommittee reversed itself on April 8. Poage and Belcher, who are ex officio voting members of all subcommittees, provided the margin which sent print No. 7 to the full committee instead of print No. 4.

The full committee's June 2 action reaffirmed the subcommittee's initial approval of print No. 4.

Committee print No. 7—The Administration-backed proposal guarantees 100 per cent of parity for the 48 per cent of wheat produced for domestic consumption. Parity, a complex formula designed to assure farmers an income comparable to income individuals receive in the non-farm sector of the economy, is now \$2.81 a bushel for wheat.

The department originally wanted to sever the relationship between parity and price supports, and to support wheat and other crops at a fixed level for the next three years. But bowing to committee and farm group sentiment, it decided to retain parity for domestic wheat. This approach would allow wheat support payments to rise because, as farm costs increase every year, so does the parity figure.

For feed grains, however, the department opposed continuing price supports pegged to parity. Instead, it agreed to support 50 per cent of the base corn acreage at \$1.35 a bushel, which is 75 per cent of current parity. It also agreed that the payment will be not less than 32 cents a bushel on the 50 per cent.

Committee print No. 4—For wheat, the major difference between print No. 4 and print No. 7 is that the former guarantees a minimum "blend price" or average price of \$1.84 a bushel for 208 per cent of the domestic allotment. This, in effect, gives wheat farmers a guaranteed minimum price for their entire crop.

Another difference is that committee print No. 4 sets the payment for domestic wheat as the difference between the loan rate and 100 per cent of parity, whereas committee print No. 7 sets the payment as the difference between the market price and parity. (Commodity Credit Corporation loan rate is the price which CCC will pay a farmer for wheat and feed grains if he cannot sell his crop

on the commercial market for more than the loan rate. The loan rate is set by the Secretary.)

Since the market price is always higher than the loan rate, the payment under print No. 4 would be higher. For example, with parity at \$2.81, the loan rate at \$1.10 and the market price at \$1.15, the payment would be 5 cents higher under committee print No. 4.

The feed grains section of committee print No. 4 also places an income floor under feed grains by setting the support level for 80 per cent of the base corn acreage at 65 per cent of parity. Most committee members who voted for print No. 4 did so because it linked feed grains supports to parity, a cherished concept among most farmers. But as it turns out, the Administration's proposal provides more support: supporting 50 per cent of the base acreage at \$1.35 a bushel is the same as supporting 80 per cent of the base acreage at \$1.23 a bushel. With corn parity now at \$1.77 a bushel, the comparable figure for 80 per cent of the base acreage under committee print No. 4 would be \$1.15 a bushel. And, because the Administration plan would guarantee a minimum payment of 32 cents a bushel (committee print No. 4 does not), as soon as the market price rose above \$1.03 a bushel, the spread would be even greater.

Comparison—Despite the June 2 vote, the split between the committee and the department is not great. Hardin has promised to put the same amount of money into wheat, feed grains and cotton support programs for the next three years as is currently being spent. This comes to approximately \$840 million a year for cotton, \$850 million a year for wheat and \$1.5 billion a year for feed grains.

The differences are mainly over how to deliver program benefits. As one committee source put it, they are "more of shading and nuance than of hard substance."

Both committee prints give Hardin the two major features he has insisted new farm legislation contain. They authorize him to institute a mandatory acreage "set-aside" to retire excess farm land from production. They also authorize him to set loan rates for wheat and feed grains between 0 and 90 per cent of parity.

Hardin and his principal economic adviser, Donald A. Paarlberg, director of agricultural economics, contend that lowering the loan rates will give U.S. farmers a larger share of the world market by encouraging them to sell there rather than to the CCC. This also would save the CCC money, since it would be handling less of the total crop.

Farm group: Farm groups consider the committee's maneuverings to be a critical stage in developing new farm legislation. The House or Senate may vote new farm legislation up or down, but the odds are that whatever new legislation is adopted will be the product of negotiations between the department and the House and Senate agriculture committees.

A likely exception, however, is the issue of farm subsidies; floor amendments will be offered in both the House and the Senate to set them lower than the Administration has proposed.

Farm coalition—With the exception of the American Farm Bureau Federation—which favors massive land retirement and phasing out of price supports and payments—all major farm groups have banded together to form an ad hoc farm coalition. Led by Fred Heinkel, president of Midcontinental Farmers Association, the coalition consists of 33 farm organizations representing all sections of the country and every major commodity.

The coalition favors retention of high price support loans tied to parity, and increased payments for wheat and feed grains.

The group has strong support on the House Agriculture Committee. Rep. Graham Purcell, D-Tex., chairman of the livestock and feed grains subcommittee, which drafted committee print No. 4, is an outspoken sup-

porter. The coalition's influence is reflected in the June 2 vote: 7 of 14 Republicans on the House Agriculture Committee deserted the Administration and voted for committee print No. 4, which the coalition favors over the Administration's print No. 7.

That victory does not represent the end of the coalition's efforts for higher supports. In a June 2 statement, Heinkel called the vote "a long step toward the objectives set by the coalition to bring needed additional income into the farm economy." Yet he termed print No. 4 only "a compromise between what the Nixon Administration wants and what we believe is necessary."

Even its staunchest supporters on the House Agriculture Committee, however, are not talking about giving the farm coalition additional concessions. Foley and Purcell talk only in terms of convincing Poage and the Administration to back committee print No. 4.

The coalition has more support in the Senate. Anti-farm sentiment there has not been as strong as in the House; and Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee Chairman Allen J. Ellender, D-La., is sympathetic to the coalition's point of view.

Farm Bureau—At its June 11 regular quarterly meeting in Chicago, the Farm Bureau's board of directors announced its "vigorous opposition" to both proposals. It termed the two schemes "camouflaged extension(s) of the discredited, ineffective, and expensive" 1965 act. As it has done repeatedly in the past, the Farm Bureau called for a return to a competitive marketing system free of payments, acreage allotments and other government controls.

Although the Farm Bureau is the largest farm organization in the nation (1.8 million farm families), its proposals are viewed by House, Senate and Administration farm policy makers as too drastic a departure from current policy.

Subsidies: The biggest battle over the farm bill is yet to come: the annual effort to put a ceiling on farm subsidies.

For the last two years, the House has passed a \$20,000-per-farm subsidy ceiling. The margin was 70 votes in 1968 and 82 votes in 1969. But each time the Senate declined to accept the limitation, and the ceiling was dropped in conference.

This year, the department and the House and Senate Agriculture Committees have agreed that a limitation is needed if new farm legislation is to pass.

Hardin proposal—Hardin has proposed a limitation of \$110,000 per major crop (wheat, feed grains, cotton) for each producer. The House Agriculture Committee has not yet voted on the subsidy question, but Poage and other committee members have agreed that some sort of limitation is necessary.

However, skirmishing already has begun over a proposal to set the limit at a much lower level. Rep. Paul Findley, R-Ill., a leading subsidy opponent, introduced an amendment to the fiscal 1971 agricultural appropriations bill (HR 17923) June 9 to limit direct payments to \$20,000 a farm for each major commodity. Findley's amendment was rejected by voice vote—but only because most House members prefer to write the limitation into the farm bill rather than attach it to an appropriations measure.

Conte amendment—The real test will come when the farm bill reaches the House floor. Then, Rep. Silvio O. Conte, R-Mass., another leading subsidy critic, will offer an amendment to limit the payments to \$10,000 a farm for each of the major commodities.

Given the wide margin by which ceiling amendments have passed the House the last two years and also given that this is an election year, the House will almost certainly pass Conte's amendment.

Senate action—The Senate drive this year to make the House action stick is much better organized than in the past. Sens. Birch

E. Bayh, D-Ind., and Charles E. Goodell, R-N.Y., are spearheading an effort to impose the same \$10,000 ceiling. Bayh and Goodell maintain their amendment will save \$338 million a year. They say Hardin's will save only \$53 million.

There is wide support in the Senate for some kind of ceiling. Last year 34 Senators voted for a \$20,000-per-farm limitation sponsored by Sen. John J. Williams, R-Del. Seven Senators who did not vote on that measure announced themselves in favor of it. Three additional Senators who did not vote for Williams' amendment voted for a \$10,000 ceiling proposed by Goodell. And Sen. Ralph T. Smith, R-Ill., appointed to fill the unexpired term of the late Sen. Everett M. Dirksen, has announced he favors a \$20,000 ceiling. This comes to 45 senators who have voted for or otherwise approved of a limitation of either \$10,000 or \$20,000.

Food stamps: The other important issue to be resolved when the farm bill reaches the House floor or shortly thereafter is reform of the food stamp program. Last Sept. 24 the Senate passed a comprehensive food stamp reform bill (S 2547), sponsored by Sen. George McGovern, D-S.D., and other members of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.

Poage has refused to report the bill out of committee.

In years past, the committee chairman has traded food stamp concessions for badly needed urban votes for farm legislation. Poage may resort to this strategy again this year. But—compared to the McGovern bill—the food stamp proposal he and the committee have formulated is so unattractive to most Members who favor fundamental food stamp reform that it is unlikely to win more than a handful of votes for the farm program. It could even lose votes.

The McGovern bill authorizes free food stamps for the very poor, sets national eligibility standards, requires that the poor pay no more than 25 per cent of their income for food stamps and allows self-certification by affidavit instead of the lengthy investigations that often take place now.

Poage's bill makes few changes in benefits, provides for no free stamps and requires states to pay 10 per cent of costs or drop out of the program. It requires the unemployed to be willing to take jobs available through state employment offices in order to qualify for food stamps; and it disqualifies students for food stamps.

Whether Poage decides to bring the food stamp bill out of committee with the farm bill or after, anti-hunger lobbyists, together with their allies in the House, will try to amend it to make it as similar to the McGovern bill as possible.

Outlook: The committee has not yet resumed deliberations to report out a farm bill, nor has it resumed negotiations with the department. In the words of one committee source: "Poage has scheduled other things and has taken the position (towards the committee majority), 'If you don't want a farm bill, that's all right.'"

After the June 2 vote, Hardin issued a statement expressing his disappointment, but said he hoped a compromise still could be worked out.

If agreement is not reached and a new farm bill is not passed, the department will go back to pre-1965 legislation. The likely result would be lower farm income and excessive production: The older legislation does not provide for direct payments and it lacks strict production controls.

Hardin told the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee March 3 that if new legislation is not adopted, feed grains production next year would outrun use by 20 million to 40 million tons; cotton production would exceed use by 6 million bales, and wheat production could exceed use by as much as 300 million bushels. He estimated

that farm income could fall as much as \$1.3 billion next year without new legislation.

Already the department is preparing for a wheat marketing quota referendum, which must be held by Aug. 1 if new legislation is not passed. Wheat farmers voted down quotas by a 2-1 margin in 1963, the last time a referendum was held.

CAPTIVES FOR 30 YEARS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it now has been more than 30 years since the Soviets invaded and occupied Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

It was in June 1940 that the Soviets invaded the Baltic States, and the brave Baltic peoples have been suffering since under the burden of Russian Communist slavery.

These three peoples have been victims all these centuries of the accident of geography which placed them between the Russians and the Germans. They are ethnically related to neither.

After the Nazis and Soviets smashed Poland in September 1939, the Kremlin moved troops into the Baltic republics and annexed them in June 1940. So-called elections were held under Red army guns and the Kremlin then claimed that Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia voted for inclusion in the Soviet empire.

This was the start of one of the most brutal occupations of all time. Hundreds of thousands of Balts were dragged off to trains and jammed into cars without food or water. Many died from suffocation. The pitiful survivors were dumped out in the Arctic or Siberia.

Since June 15, 1940, these three nations have lost more than one-fourth of their entire population. The genocidal operations and practices being carried out by the Soviets continue with no end in sight.

Despite Soviet Russian occupation the Balts have waged an intensive fight for freedom. During the period between 1940 and 1952 alone, some 30,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters lost their lives in an organized resistance movement against the invaders.

The cessation of armed guerrilla warfare in 1952 did not spell the end of the Baltic resistance against Soviet domination. On the contrary, resistance by passive means gained a new impetus.

The case of the Baltic States is not a question about the rights of self-rule of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, since this is established beyond any reasonable doubt. The question is how to stop the Soviet crime and restore the freedom and independence of these countries.

At a time when the Western powers have granted freedom and independence to many nations in Africa, Asia, and other parts of the world, we must insist that the Communist colonial empire likewise extends freedom and independence to the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Congress took a step in the right di-

rection in 1966 by adopting House Concurrent Resolution 416 that calls for freedom for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. All freedom-loving Americans should urge the President to implement this legislation by bringing the issue of the liberation of the Baltic States to the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, for reference, following is the text of House Concurrent Resolution 416:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effect to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

A TOP SPELLER

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed heartening to see a revival of interest in this country in spelling contests among students. The following editorial from the June 6, 1967, Indianapolis News, pays deserved tribute to an Indianapolis champion, Terry McCarthy:

A TOP SPELLER

We venture an opinion that not many people could have advanced as far as Terry McCarthy did in a contest in Washington, D.C.

The youngster from St. Lawrence Catholic School here spelled "polyglot," "noblesse," "jingoist," "superannuate" and "harrier," as well as other tough words, before he slipped up on the comparatively simple "homburg."

Terry was in a national spelling bee, representing a 24-county area in Central Indiana. He had spelled down entrants from 445

schools to win the trip to Washington and the right to compete against other winning spellers from all parts of the nation.

His visit to Washington, on which he was accompanied by his mother, Mrs. Fred McCarthy, 4513 Edmondson, was the climax of the annual spelling bee which is sponsored in this area by The News. It is a revival of an old-time event that meant much to school children in early days in Indiana.

In recent years the spelling bee has attracted increasing interest and spectators have found it to be exciting. They have cheered, just as in an athletic contest when a contestant has completed his performance successfully.

An ability to spell correctly is as important an asset in modern life as it was in pioneer days. If the spelling bees sponsored by The News have helped to stimulate an interest in spelling, they are worthwhile.

Terry McCarthy has already found that knowing how to spell is helpful. It won him his first flight on a jet plane, a visit to the nation's capital and at least \$50 in prize money. We congratulate him on his championship.

WASTE AWAY

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent discussion by Russell McKee on the problems of solid waste disposal. The article entitled "Waste Away" appeared in the Michigan Natural Resources publication of May-June 1970:

WASTE AWAY

(By Russell McKee)

If you own a hole in the ground, don't throw it away—you have a valuable piece of property. And the bigger the hole, the more value it has. Holes these days are hard to find, most having been filled in recent years with garbage and litter from nearby communities. As a matter of fact, because of new laws, holes in the ground are now in demand more than ever before. Here's why:

Open burning at municipal dumps is coming to an end because of air pollution control laws—both state and federal—that have been passed in the last few years. That means the enormous quantities of paper, trash, bottles, cans, and other garbage constantly being produced by our society can no longer be reduced in bulk through burning. It means that we are now filling more holes faster, and that the search for new disposal areas will be intensified in the years ahead. Also, laws controlling water pollution require burial of all garbage and trash in locations where it will not contaminate ground water supplies. That means many lowlands and marshes formerly scheduled as dumping grounds will now be spared that fate. Instead, deep holes located where contact with ground water can be kept to a minimum are now the prime targets for solid waste disposal areas. There, all the cast-off material of our rich society can be herded together and covered with dirt in what is euphemistically called a sanitary landfill. That phrase does not mean that the material is sanitary, merely that the surrounding air, land and water will remain more or less uncontaminated after the material is buried.

On the other hand, if you have a hill, that too is valuable, and can with diligence and large amounts of garbage be changed from an ordinary Michigan hill into a modestly large mountain, useful for skiing, toboggan-

ing, and sledding. Riverview, Michigan, is creating just such a winter sports area out of waste material.

Elsewhere around Michigan, however, solid waste disposal is more a problem than an opportunity. Many local dumps have had to close because costs of operating a sanitary landfill are too high. It was one thing to have one man stationed at a dump to collect fees and set fire to the trash that accumulated each day; it is quite another to keep a bulldozer operating, to import dirt by trucks, and to engineer the operation in such a way that pollution and health hazards are prevented.

"We used to run the Meridian township dump for about \$2000 per year," said Robert Robinson, former supervisor of the Ingham county township, at East Lansing. "But last year it cost the taxpayers of Meridian \$30,000 to operate that dump as a landfill, and it wasn't entirely satisfactory at that." Robinson, who is now director of legislative affairs for the Michigan Townships Association, says that other townships throughout Michigan are experiencing the same rising cost problems.

State Department of Public Health and county health authorities have been enforcing the new pollution control laws with increasing vigor, believing that there has been ample time for local officials to adjust to these laws, most of which were passed in the last three to five years. The impact of such control efforts, however, are just now being felt in the form of new costs for many residents and increased costs for others.

At present, the pattern of waste disposal efforts is varied. However, nearly all waste materials generated in Michigan at this time are being buried. Some open dumps are still operating, some open burning continues illegally, some incinerators are still in use where temperature and smoke emission controls are borderline. But most such operations have been discontinued, others are being closed down, and most waste material is now simply being buried.

The City of Marquette has a fairly typical community program. Superintendent of Public Works James Palmer says that two city trucks make two runs each day to the city-owned landfill southwest of town. There the material is dropped into a hole and covered with sand. A large tractor with caterpillar treads and a front end scoop moves the sand for the fill work. This tractor also flattens junked autos by the simple practice of driving over them. The dump gets 4 to 6 cars per week. The cost of this operation is about \$58,000 per year for day-to-day operation, plus equipment. For the 21,000 people of Marquette served by the system, the cost will be somewhere around \$3 per person per year.

At the suburban town of Riverview, southwest of Detroit, enterprising community leaders decided they could solve their own city garbage costs, create recreation, and control community growth in a desirable way through the unique ski hill program mentioned above. They sought, and got, voter approval of a \$3.5 million bond program to purchase a total of one square mile of land inside the city, to be used for garbage disposal, school development, parks, and other community purposes. Then they negotiated garbage contracts with nearly 50 neighboring communities, industries, and private collection companies, and with that flow of garbage began to build a recreation area on part of the land. Their ski hill is growing and this fall they will open a 45-foot high sledding and toboggan hill on one part of the area. When completed, the ski hill itself will be 220 feet high and have a 1200-foot downhill run. The money obtained from the garbage contracts is offsetting costs of developing the area, plus adding a small amount to the total project. Jack Shoup, coordinator of special projects for the city, says the program is

about two years old, and that it will take about 15 years to complete. The recreation area will include a 30- to 40-acre lake, a 240-acre golf course, and lodge, and the ski and toboggan areas—all built on garbage.

Success of the Riverview project, however, depends on sufficient local population to provide the bulk of garbage and trash necessary for the development, on support for the local bond proposal, and on later heavy use of the ski hill to offset development and operation costs. Outstate, where the population is more scattered, the picture is far different. Van Buren County, for example. There the county board of health and the county department of public works have in recent months had to close down half a dozen local dumps that had been operating in violation of state and federal laws. A few others in the county will be closed soon, or will shift to sanitary landfill operations.

To remove the flood of waste materials which can no longer flow into those dumps, a county wide system of "containerization" will be set up. That is, special garbage containers will be located at several points in the county. Each will hold 40 cubic yards of material. Residents will take their trash to these containers and dump it in. When full, a trucking firm, under contract to the county, will exchange an empty container for the full one, carry off the full one by truck, and dump it at a sanitary landfill in a neighboring county.

"We certainly don't believe this is the end of the problem," says Les Brown, Director of Environmental Health for Van Buren County. "It's only a stopgap. Within three to five years, the nation will be moving rapidly toward recycling and re-use of these waste products. We simply have to. People already resent having landfills near their residences, and anyway we're running out of places to put the stuff."

Fred Kellow, of the Division of Engineering for the Michigan Department of Public Health, agrees with Brown. "I think this is mainly a matter of money," Kellow says. "The people of Michigan are either going to have to pay for waste disposal through local taxes, or through some system of local per-capita use fee. In the past, most local governmental units in Michigan have operated open dumps, where waste materials collected in their community usually have been burned. Of course open dumps and burning are outlawed now, and so those that can afford it have gone to sanitary landfills. Other units of government are going to transfer stations or are banding together to support central county-wide landfills."

Transfer stations, Kellow explained, are locations where 20-yard garbage trucks may dump their loads into 40, 60, and 80 yard containers which can be removed to an outlying landfill on a single large truck. Transfer stations are particularly useful in large cities where space is at a premium and distance to the closest burial site is great.

"The real sting in this entire situation," Kellow notes, "is that people are now being forced to face the fact that control of environmental pollution is going to cost money. In the past, local officials have operated open dumps at low cost. Now they simply can't do this any longer, and the public wonders why."

"The plain unvarnished truth of the matter is that we are going to have to pay more if we want to enjoy a clean environment."

Kellow, however, believes the present direction is only an emergency solution. "We have got to re-use many, if not all, of these waste materials," he says, "and I think we are already moving in that direction. I also think the public will become accustomed to these higher costs as we begin to see improvements in the environment. Our collection techniques will have to be streamlined and improved, but most of all, I think industry will take the lead in moving toward programs

that will re-use many if not most of these waste materials. Industrial leaders want to control their own development, and they see restrictive federal legislation coming at them if they fail to make better use of packaging materials and waste products."

Federal legislation already is in the works. Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin has introduced a bill into Congress designed to establish national standards for all packaging. The bill also would require industries to pay a solid waste fee for product packaging that is not recycled into the economy or is not easily disposable. A fund would be established under the bill to provide local governmental units with money to handle solid waste management programs. Called the Packaging Pollution Control Act of 1970, the bill would direct the secretaries of HEW, and Treasury to set packaging charges that reflect the effect of each type of packaging upon the environment.

Already, a number of recycling experiments are proving interesting. Glass jars and bottles have been crushed and used as a highway paving material called "glassphalt." Garbage has recently been used as one important ingredient in production of writing paper. Old autos are increasingly being chopped up and used in the manufacture of new autos. Aluminum beverage containers can be melted down and reused if collection techniques can be worked out. And of course, waste paper has been used for many years as one component in new paper and cardboard production.

A key difficulty in recycling of such waste materials, however, is collection and separation. Autos cannot be chopped up until motors, transmissions, gas tanks, and tires have been removed. Bottles must be separated from cans, and all hard material must be separated from garbage. Even here, a research technique using a form of upright wind tunnel is being investigated. It works like this: All garbage, bottles, papers, and cans are chopped up into small pieces. This mix is then dumped in the top end of the tube-shaped wind tunnel. At the bottom a powerful blower drives a blast of air against the material as it falls through the tube. Lighter material such as paper is driven out of side doors at one level; heavier garbage is driven out at a lower level; tin cans and glass being heaviest fall closest to the blower before being driven off at lower levels.

It remains to be seen how effective such re-cycling techniques can become, yet most specialists in the waste disposal field are convinced that re-use of materials is the only final solution to the problem. Of course re-cycling will also cut down on the rapid and heavy depletion of critical natural resources, particularly basic metals, and will lead to an entire new philosophy of industrial production.

Waste products have been termed "resources out of place." Getting them back into their proper places looks like a big job, but it also looks as though Michigan—and the nation—will be moving in that direction in the very near future.

ACTION NEEDED ON AIR BAG

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, large numbers of Americans continue to be killed and maimed each year on our Nation's highways. This is an intolerable situation. In an effort to eliminate these senseless deaths and injuries, the De-

partment of Transportation, under the leadership of Secretary John Volpe, has proposed that all new cars sold after January 1, 1973, be equipped with an inflatable occupant restraint system, known as the air bag.

This restraint system, according to auto safety experts, is one of the most effective safety devices ever perfected to protect passengers from injury in automobile accidents. It can, these experts say, save 20,000 Americans each year from highway deaths.

As an expression of support and great interest in this effort, 79 of my colleagues, whose names are listed below, have joined me in writing to Secretary Volpe and National Highway Safety Director Douglas Toms, in support and praise of their work in curbing this needless loss of life.

Our letter follows:

GENTLEMEN: Congress has been gravely concerned with the intolerable toll of deaths and injuries on our Nation's highways. There is strong Congressional support for your proposal, announced in the Federal Register May 7, 1970, to require the automobile industry to equip all cars sold after January 1, 1973 with the inflatable occupant restraint system, popularly known as the air bag.

I am joined by my colleagues listed below, in this expression of interest and concern.

We are informed that your office has studied both the prospects and possible problems associated with the use of the air bag system, and that you have arrived at the following conclusions:

That the air bag system, in its present state of development, has high reliability and will be effective in protecting occupants in most crash situations.

That at least 20,000 lives will be saved annually, when the system is installed in all vehicles in use.

That while the proposed installation timetable places members of the auto industry under considerable pressure to design, produce and test the system in a short period of time, the projected benefits of the system far outweigh these short-term costs to the industry.

In view of these conclusions, any further delay in the effective date of the air bag requirement is without justification. You should stand firmly by your current timetable.

Moreover, we hope that your investigation into the possibilities of retrofitting the system into vehicles sold before January 1, 1973 will point to the feasibility of a requirement that all cars on the road be equipped with the air bag system by 1975 or before.

We appreciate the new vigor you have brought to the task of reducing the senseless loss of life and property on our Nation's streets.

Sincerely,

Senators Birch Bayh; Alan Bible; Edward W. Brooke; Howard W. Cannon; Alan Cranston; Thomas F. Eagleton; and Charles E. Goodell.

Senators Vance Hartke; Warren G. Magnuson; Walter F. Mondale; Frank E. Moss; Edmund S. Muskie; Thomas J. McIntyre; and Gaylord Nelson.

Senators John O. Pastore; James B. Pearson; Abraham Ribicoff; Joseph D. Tydings; Harrison Williams; and Stephen M. Young.

Representatives Joseph P. Addabbo; Glenn M. Anderson; Jonathan B. Bingham; Richard Bolling; John Brademas; Frank J. Brasco; and George E. Brown, Jr.

Representatives Phillip Burton; Daniel E. Button; James C. Corman; Emilio Q. Daddario; Dominick V. Daniels; Bob Eckhardt; and Don Edwards.

Representatives Joshua Ellberg; Leonard Farbstein; Donald M. Fraser; Samuel N. Friedel; James G. Fulton; Kenneth J. Gray; and Seymour Halpern.

Representatives Michael Harrington; William D. Hathaway; Augustus F. Hawkins; Wayne L. Hays; Ken Hechler; Henry Heistowski; and James J. Howard.

Representatives Andrew Jacobs, Jr.; Harold T. Johnson; James Kee; Robert L. Leggett; Allard K. Lowenstein; Richard D. McCarthy; and Spark M. Matsunaga.

Representatives Abner J. Mikva; William S. Moorhead; Bradford F. Morse; Robert N. C. Nix; James G. O'Hara; Arnold Olsen; and Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.

Representatives Richard L. Ottinger; Bertram L. Podell; Adam C. Powell; Roman C. Pucinski; Thomas M. Rees; Henry S. Reuss; and Howard W. Robison.

Representatives Peter W. Rodino, Jr.; Fred B. Rooney; Edward R. Roybal; Phillip E. Ruppe; William F. Ryan; James H. Scheuer; and Robert O. Tierman.

Representatives John V. Tunney; Morris K. Udall; Lionel Van Deerlin; Charles H. Wilson; Sidney R. Yates; and Benjamin S. Rosenthal.

STATEMENT OF THE LITHUANIAN CONSTITUTIONAL ASSEMBLY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is necessary that we reemphasize the fact that the Soviet Union is a colonial power maintaining control over peoples and nations that have been deprived their rights of self-determination. The Baltic States have been subject to extreme Soviet-Russian domination and I insert into the RECORD a statement issued on May 15, 1970, by members of the Lithuanian Constitutional Assembly and also a memorandum prepared by the Americans for Congressional Action To Free the Baltic States which traces the enslavement of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Soviet Union over the past 30 years:

DEAR SIR: May 15, 1970 was the 50th Anniversary of the Lithuanian Constitutional Assembly. We are enclosing, for your information and files, a Memorandum prepared by the last living members of that important body. We hope that you will find this material useful on any occasion you discuss Soviet Russia and the injustices it has done to its neighbors, especially the freedom loving countries of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia.

Sincerely yours,
EUGENE A. BARTKUS,
President, Lithuanian American Council,
Inc.

To the Members of Upper Houses and the Senates of Respective Countries.
To the Members of Commons, Houses of Representatives, Parliaments or similar Institutions of Democratic Representations of Respective Countries.

GENTLEMEN: On the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the historic first meeting

of the Lithuanian Constituent Assembly we, the undersigned, its former members living in the free world, submit the following to your kind attention:

The Lithuanian Constituent Assembly, elected in 1920 by popular vote and endowed with the mandate of the Lithuanian people, proclaimed on May 15, 1920, the accomplished fact of the restoration of an independent and sovereign Republic of Lithuania, free from any ties whatsoever with Russia or any other state. The Constituent Assembly also ratified the Lithuanian Peace Treaty with Soviet Russia, whereby the latter proclaimed that she "recognized without reserve the sovereignty and independence of the Lithuanian State with all of the judicial consequences resulting from such recognition, voluntarily and forever renouncing all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory."

In 1939, however, the USSR joined with Nazi Germany in a conspiracy against Poland, Rumania, Finland, and the Baltic States. As a result of this Soviet-Nazi collusion, the so-called "mutual assistance pact" was imposed upon Lithuania, several Soviet military bases were established there and, on June 15, 1940, the armed forces of the Soviet Union invaded and occupied the country.

Seeking to camouflage these acts of unprovoked aggression against Lithuania the USSR, after banning all non-Communist parties and arresting over 2,000 prominent Lithuanian leaders in the political, cultural, and economic fields, staged on July 14, 1940, the so-called "elections to the People's Diet," whose candidates were selected by the Kremlin. With the Red Army omnipresent and non-voters exposed to overt threats, the electorate had no choice but to "vote" for the "proposed" slate of candidates.

On July 21, 1940, one hour and three minutes after the opening of its first session, the "People's Diet" adopted a resolution introducing the Soviet system into Lithuania and declaring Lithuania a Soviet Socialist Republic. After a brief intermission, to permit the translation of the next resolution from Russian into Lithuanian, the "People's Diet" adopted a second resolution petitioning the Supreme Soviet of the USSR to admit Lithuania into the USSR, as a constituent republic.

However, all the attempts by the USSR to disguise its aggression have not deceived the world. In its conclusion, the report of the Select Committee of the United States House of Representatives (83rd Congress, H. Res. 346) states:

"Any claim by the USSR that the elections, conducted by them in July 1940, were free and voluntary or that the resolutions adopted by the resulting parliaments petitioning for recognition as a Soviet Republic were legal,—are false and without foundation in fact."

And in its Report on the Baltic States (August 23, 1960, Doc. 1173), the Council of Europe revealed that:

"Moscow is trying to persuade the free world that the Lithuanian nation has joined the group of Soviet-enslaved peoples by its free volition and that the Lithuanian people have made appreciable economic and cultural progress under Soviet domination. . . In fact, however, Soviet propaganda has failed to produce any international legal act or contractual provision in support of its contention. The statements made by the Soviet rulers are misleading and contradict the factual situation in Lithuania."

We express our deepest gratitude to the Governments and the parliamentarians of all those countries, which firmly adhere to the policy of non-recognition of the forcible and illegal annexation, however camouflaged, and which support the right of self-government for all nations. We also extend our thanks to the Governments, parliamentarians, and

individuals in the free world who support the Lithuanian people in the defense of their human rights and in their fight for Lithuania's freedom and independence.

At the same time we appeal to the Governments, parliamentarians, as well as to all freedom loving people to exert their influence on every appropriate occasion to:

(1) insure that no international institution, conference, or treaty explicitly or implicitly lend recognition or international legality to the Soviet acts of aggression;

(2) demand that the USSR withdraw its military and police forces as well as its administrative apparatus from occupied Lithuania and the other Soviet-occupied countries, enabling their respective peoples to exercise their rights of self-determination and the free choice of government.

Members of the Lithuanian Constituent Assembly:

ELIZIJEUS DRAUGELIS,
Farmers Union.
MAGDALENA GALDIKIENE,
Christian Democratic Party.
MYKOLAS KRUPAVICUS,
Christian Democratic Party.
KAZYS SKIRPA,
Peasant Populist Union.
ANTANAS MILCUS,
Labor Federation.
JONAS PAKALKA,
Social Democratic Party.
JUOZAS PRONSKUS,
Peasant Populist Union.

NEW YORK, May 15, 1970.

RED TERROR IN LITHUANIA, LATVIA AND ESTONIA (ENSLAVEMENT OF THE BALTIC STATES BY THE SOVIETS FOR 30 YEARS)

The Kremlin is fond of saying that Russian imperialism died with the czar. But the fate of the Baltic nations—Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia—shows this to be a cruel fiction. The Communist regime did not come to power in the Baltic States by legal or democratic process. The Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia by force of arms. The Soviets invaded and occupied the Baltic States in June of 1940, and the Baltic peoples have been suffering in Russian-Communist slavery for 30 years.

The Balts are proud peoples who have lived peacefully on the shores of the Baltic from time immemorial. For instance, 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.

The Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians have suffered for centuries from the "accident of geography." From the West they were invaded by the Teutonic Knights, from the East by the Russians. It took remarkable spiritual and ethnic strength to survive the pressures from both sides. The Balts, it should be kept in mind, are ethnically related neither to the Germans nor the Russians.

After the Nazis and Soviets smashed Poland in September of 1939, the Kremlin moved troops into the Baltic republics and annexed them in June of 1940. In one of history's greatest frauds, "elections" were held under Red army guns. The Kremlin then claimed that Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia voted for inclusion in the Soviet empire.

Then began one of the most brutal occupations of all time. Hundreds of thousands of Balts were dragged off to trains and jammed into cars without food or water. Many died from suffocation. The pitiful survivors were dumped out in the Arctic or Siberia. The Baltic peoples have never experienced such an extermination and annihilation of their people in their long history through centuries as during the last three decades. Since June 15, 1940, these three nations have lost more than one-fourth of their entire population. The genocidal operations and practices being carried out by the Soviets continue with no end in sight.

Since the very beginning of Soviet Russian occupation, however, the Balts have waged an intensive fight for freedom. During the period between 1940 and 1952 alone, some 30,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters lost their lives in an organized resistance movement against the invaders. The cessation of armed guerrilla warfare in 1952 did not spell the end of the Baltic resistance against Soviet domination. On the contrary, resistance by passive means gained a new impetus.

The Government of the United States of America has refused to recognize the seizure and forced "incorporation" of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia by the Communists into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Our Government maintains diplomatic relations with the former free Government of the Baltic States. Since June of 1940, when the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, all the Presidents of the United States (Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, and Richard M. Nixon) have stated, restated and confirmed our country's nonrecognition policy of the occupation of the Baltic States by the Kremlin dictators. However, our country has done very little, if anything, to help the suffering Baltic people to get rid of the Communist regimes in their countries.

The case of the Baltic States is not a question about the rights of self-rule of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, since this is established beyond any reasonable doubt, but the question is how to stop the Soviet crime and restore the freedom and independence of these countries. The Select Committee of the House of Representatives to Investigate the Incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R., created by the 83rd Congress, after having held 50 public hearings during which the testimony of 335 persons were taken, made a number of recommendations to our Government pertaining to the whole question of liberation of the Baltic States. According to the findings of this House committee, "no nation, including the Russian Federated Soviet Republic, has ever voluntarily adopted communism." All of them were enslaved by the use of infiltration, subversion, and force. The American foreign policy toward the Communist enslaved nations, the aforesaid House committee stated, must be guided by "the moral and political principles of the American Declaration of Independence." The present generation of Americans, this committee suggested, should recognize that the bonds which many Americans have with enslaved lands of their ancestry are a great asset to the struggle against communism and that, furthermore, the Communist danger should be abolished during the present generation. The only hope of avoiding a new world war, according to this committee, is a "bold, positive political offensive by the United States and the entire free world." The committee included a declaration of the U.S. Congress which states that the eventual liberation and self-determination of nations are "firm and unchanging parts of our policy."

At a time when the Western powers have granted freedom and independence to many nations in Africa, Asia and other parts of the world, we must insist that the Communist colonial empire in the world. By timidity, we independence to the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia whose lands have been unjustly occupied and whose rightful place among the nations of the world is being denied. Today and not tomorrow is the time to brand the Kremlin dictators as the largest colonial empire likewise extends freedom and invite further Communist aggression.

Recently the U.S. Congress has made a right step in the right direction by adopting H. Con. Res. 416 that calls for freedom for Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. All freedom-

loving Americans should urge the President of the United States to implement this legislation by bringing the issue of the liberation of the Baltic States to the United Nations. We should have a single standard for freedom. Its denial in the whole or in part, any place in the world, including the Soviet Union is surely intolerable.

THE PHYSICIAN'S ASSISTANT PROGRAM

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, for the past 5 years, Duke University has been developing a physician's assistant program as part of the long overdue answer to today's problems of medical care delivery. With the cooperation of all clinical departments at Duke, this experiment is breaking new ground in the operation of health care services.

The basis of the program is the training of personnel to relieve physicians of some of the more mundane parts of their massive workloads, thus freeing them for more specialized responsibilities.

There is no single category of assistant, for a number of new varieties have emerged in the last few years. Neighborhood health aides, office assistants, or independent assistants serving in the public health system all form parts of this growing profession. Such people can be crucial. In a disadvantaged central city neighborhood, a neighborhood aide who can serve as an educator and medical expediter might be the most valuable person possible. In a small isolated rural community with no physician in residence, a weekly prenatal and well-baby clinic conducted by a nurse-practitioner might best serve the community's needs. In the office of an overworked primary physician, a physician's assistant might best serve the needs.

Drs. E. Harvey Estes, Jr., and D. Robert Howard of Duke have delivered a paper on this subject at the annual meeting of the Association of American Medical Colleges last November. I believe with them that if we see the need for extended, improved, and more equitably distributed physicians' services, we must be willing to modify health care delivery patterns in order to accomplish these objectives. It is difficult to envision any such modification that does not include the new classes of health manpower. I include the doctors' paper at this point:

POTENTIAL FOR NEWER CLASSES OF PERSONNEL:
EXPERIENCES OF THE DUKE PHYSICIAN'S ASSISTANT PROGRAM¹

(By E. Harvey Estes, Jr., M.D.² and D. Robert Howard, M.D.³)

In speaking about the potential for new-

¹ Delivered by Dr. Estes at the Plenary Session on "Some Educational Solutions" at the 80th Annual Meeting of the Association of American Medical Colleges, Cincinnati, Ohio, November 2, 1969.

² Professor and Chairman, Department of Community Health Sciences, Duke University Medical Center.

³ Assistant Professor, Department of Com-

er classes of personnel in delivery of health care, we speak from experience with the Physician's Assistant Program, a truly cooperative effort involving all clinical departments at Duke. It began in the Department of Medicine, and now resides in the Department of Community Health Sciences, with major input from Surgery, Medicine, Pediatrics, Radiology, Pathology, Psychiatry, and Obstetrics. Any program that can evoke cooperation between this number of departments can't be all bad!

A presentation of the Physician's Assistant (P.A.) Program always evokes a variety of responses and guarantees a vigorous discussion period. Some view it as a dangerous throwback to pre-Flexnerian times and visualize poorly controlled or non-controlled journeyman practitioners as a result. Others view it as an obvious and long-overdue answer to a real need, and an obligatory part of tomorrow's medical practice pattern. Some say "be careful," and others say "full speed ahead."

The answers remain for the future to determine, but the answers will never come until the experiment is performed. We can raise questions and speculate about effects, but in order to settle the issues, such individuals must be trained; they must operate in the health care system; and the effect must be determined.

This is the context in which we view the Duke P.A. Program. The program has been under way for five years, and we have recently graduated our third class. We now have twenty-nine graduates. The program has now reached the point at which the real experiment can begin. We must study the acceptance of this new manpower category by both physician and patient. We must study the effect of such persons on both the numerical output and the quality of services offered by physicians. We must study the economic impact of such individuals on both physician income and patient cost. We must study educational methods, educational standards, certification, licensure, academic degrees, and many other matters. Such studies are already under way, and a few answers are beginning to emerge; but these answers should still be viewed as early and tentative. In some areas the signals are so strong that we feel we can predict outcome, but please don't forget the present stage of the experiment.

Assistants are by no means a recent addition to the medical scene. Indeed, delegation of tasks to competent persons is the mark of a good organizer. All of us in this room are here because we have delegated our duties to others, some of whom are not qualified by formal training to make decisions which they will be called upon to make in our absence.

The physician has traditionally utilized secretarial assistants, professional nurses, and on-the-job trainees in his office environment; and in the hospital he has utilized hospital based nurses, technicians, and house officers. In the patient's home, he has usually had no assistants. These assistants are of variable quality, and some are completely unknown to the physician, yet each performs tasks which enable the physician to function more efficiently. The question is not whether an assistant will be utilized. It is: can a person be specifically trained to assist the physician in all these geographic areas, and to assume tasks which have not traditionally been delegated in order to further increase his efficiency?

There is no single variety of assistant to the physician. A number of new varieties have emerged in the last few years. The neighborhood health aide is one such category. This person is generally drawn from the neighborhood to be served, trained for

Community Health Sciences and Director, Physician's Assistant Program.

about six months, and returned to his neighborhood to serve as an interface between the health care system and the people served.

Another fairly distinct category is the dependent assistant, such as the physician's assistant. He works with the physician and under his authority, yet he assumes some tasks, such as physical examination, which have traditionally been the exclusive province of the physician. The training is somewhat variable but generally includes at least four years of work (two years of college plus two years of professional training, or several years of previous experience plus two years of professional training). The exact duties of this category vary with the physician-employer, but generally they include history taking and examination of the patient, plus patient instruction and directed treatment.

Some institutions are also training independent assistants who usually serve within the public health system, extending medical services to areas in which no physician services are available. The Colorado nurse-practitioner is such an individual. She has received additional instruction, and is able to carry out routine well-baby examinations, referring abnormal findings to the next level of the system. The Labrador frontier nurse is another example of this type assistant.

It is our opinion that all these types of assistants will be needed and will be a part of tomorrow's health care system. In some locations one will be more suitable and others less suitable. In a disadvantaged central city neighborhood, a neighborhood aide who can serve as an educator and medical expediter might be the most valuable person possible. In a small isolated rural community with no physician in residence, a weekly prenatal and well-baby clinic conducted by a nurse-practitioner might best serve the community's needs. In the office of an overworked primary physician, a physician's assistant might best serve the needs.

If one believes, as most do, that physician services must be extended, improved, and more equitably distributed, then one must be willing to modify health care delivery patterns in order to accomplish these objectives. It is difficult to envision any such modification which does not include several classes of new health manpower. We again emphasize that careful research must be done on each of these manpower innovations, and that this research requires that health care delivery systems be established using these innovations. This requires that such individuals be trained, and this establishes a mandatory time lag of three to five years. We are already several years behind, largely because some are unwilling to concede that change is required.

We would next like to describe the Duke Physician's Assistant Program, and tell you of some of our experiences with the program.

The program is now in its fifth year. It recruits its students from those who have had previous health care experience, either in the armed forces as medical corpsmen, or in civilian life as practical nurses. About ninety percent are men, and the large majority of these are from the armed forces. This experience requirement is important in our opinion. Our candidates are older men and women—usually mid-twenties or older, and most have families. They are mature, have worked with patients, and have decided they want to pursue a career in the health field. They are hungry for an opportunity to contribute and to be rewarded a living wage for their contribution.

Recruitment has never been a problem. We have always had many times more qualified candidates than we could accept. A high school diploma is the minimal educational requirement, but most have had one or more years of college. The candidates are carefully selected. Transcripts of all high school and college work are reviewed, and letters of recommendation from teachers, employ-

ers, and others are reviewed in order to reduce the applicant pool to a workable number, usually two to three times the number eventually accepted. These come for interviews and a battery of tests, including both psychological and intelligence tests. From these the final selection is made. We have deliberately included candidates from varying educational backgrounds. It would be possible to fill most classes with students who have completed two or more years of college, but this has been resisted.

The course is two years in length, with a total of about one month off during the period. It leads at this time to a certificate, not a degree. We hope to achieve a degree option within the next few months, giving the graduate the option of completing work for a B.S. degree after the awarding of the certificate.

The first nine months of the course are primarily didactic. Six weeks are spent in lectures in medical terminology, medical history and ethics, and basic laboratory procedures. Six months are spent in an integrated series of lectures, arranged by organ systems and covering anatomy, physiology, disease states and principles of therapy. During the last half of this period, instruction in history taking and physical examination is begun. The last six weeks are spent in an introduction to radiology and electrocardiography, plus an introduction to the public health system.

The remaining fifteen months are spent in a series of clinical rotations. An inpatient ward rotation, an outpatient rotation including emergency room experience, and a rotation in the office of a community practitioner are all required. The remainder are arranged to fit the interests and career choice of the trainee.

Instruction is carried out by faculty members of the School of Medicine, except for the laboratory instruction, which is done by a graduate physician's assistant with many years experience in laboratory procedures. The clinical instruction is also done by medical school faculty, but instruction is coordinated in each clinical service by a graduate P.A. who makes certain that each student learns those procedures and diagnostic techniques which are felt to be important in his future work. Each clinical service has one faculty member designated to assume primary responsibility for physician's assistant training.

They are taught to take a history, to do a physical exam, to record their findings, and to present them in an organized way to the physician. They are taught to do technical procedures and to instruct patients. They are also able to carry out emergency cardio-respiratory support procedures, intubations, venepunctures, arterial punctures, minor suturing, and many other tasks. They know how to approach the patient, to gather data, and to organize the data so as to make the physician's job easier, then to follow his instructions regarding treatment.

To date we have graduated twenty-nine P.A.'s. We have twelve students who have completed one year of work and forty who have just begun training. Of the twenty-nine graduates, fourteen remained at Duke and fifteen have gone elsewhere. We encouraged the first classes to remain in the medical center, so that we could study performances more carefully and resolve some of the legal problems. We are now encouraging our graduates to seek employment with outside physicians. Ten of the twelve most recent graduates followed this advice.

Two of the fourteen P.A.'s remaining at Duke work in research laboratories, conducting clinical research. The rest work in combined administrative-patient care activities. Their patient care activities, though not full-time, are similar to those of their counterparts in physicians' offices outside the medical center.

In practice settings, the P.A.'s duties vary with the activities of the physician. In a typical internist's setting he performs and records histories and physical examinations, helps with patient instructions, records laboratory data, completes forms, follows patients in the hospital, etc. In a general practice setting, he may also suture minor lacerations, change dressings, and remove casts. In an endocrinologist's setting he might assume responsibility for arranging and performing complex tests involving precise timing and precise methods of sample collection. Any duty which the physician does repetitively might be assigned to a well-trained assistant. The assistant works long hours, usually fifty or more a week, and his beginning salary is about \$10,000 per year.

The acceptance of this concept by physicians can only be judged indirectly, through the reaction to the idea in meetings and personal contacts. Those whose are using such persons have obviously accepted the idea, so they are, by definition, a biased group. We do have the distinct impression that physicians are much more supportive and enthusiastic today than they were one or two years ago. This attitude is presumably related to the fact that they now realize that there are no other solutions in sight. Acceptance by nurses has been more reserved than that of physicians, but this too seems to be improving. Most objections have arisen from organizations rather than from individuals and have centered on a concern that nurses might be asked to take orders from an assistant rather than from the physician himself.

Acceptance by patients has been uniformly good. There have been no known instances in which a patient has rejected the P.A. A study by Dr. Louis Pondy and colleagues at Duke has revealed that the economic status of the patient has some correlation with the degree of acceptance. The lowest and highest income groups were more reserved in their acceptance than the middle income group. The lowest income group is suspicious that the assistant is being utilized because of his inability to pay, while the highest income group tends to feel that they should receive the services of the senior physician exclusively. Educational background also correlates with acceptance, the higher levels being more positive in acceptance than lower levels.

Several related observations have led us to the opinion that a decision to utilize a P.A. must be followed by a well-laid plan for public and professional education within the community, plus a planned "shakedown" period for both physician and P.A. First, the P.A. is better accepted when his role is clearly known and understood by the patient. Second, the introduction of a P.A. into the medical community always causes questions and concerns on the part of the physicians, other hospital medical staff members, hospital administrators, hospital trustees, local liability insurance underwriters, and others. This may require newspaper articles, meetings with civic clubs, meetings with hospital boards, telephone calls to individuals, etc. These activities are time consuming but extremely important at this stage of the program.

Optimal utilization of the P.A. must be learned by the physician, and weeks or months may be required for this initial period of adjustment. The most important process for the physician during this initial period is that of learning the capabilities of the individual assistant. The physician must check his work repeatedly so as to become familiar with his qualifications and insure his reliability. The assistant must learn the techniques and the preferences of the physician as well. There may be techniques and routines which must be learned in entirety during this period. As the physician learns to trust the observations of the assistant, he

is usually willing to delegate more and more functions. It is anticipated that there will be occasional physicians who are unwilling or unable to delegate and who are, therefore, unable to use an assistant effectively.

We also see the necessity for refresher courses for the P.A., so that he can learn new techniques, or review areas previously learned but not used. In this respect the P.A. is the same as the physician. His education is never complete. He must always be a learner.

Most physicians are concerned about the legal status of the P.A. and about their own legal responsibility when utilizing such an individual. Hospital administrators are also concerned, since most physicians will want their P.A. to work with their patients in the hospital as well as in the office. The closely intertwined problems of legal status, licensure, and control of the activities of the P.A. have been the subject of considerable study.

It is our opinion that a separate practice act and a separate license for the P.A. is not the answer. This would require fifty separate laws, one for each state, and would require that we clearly define the tasks which can be done by the P.A. The ambiguities created by a profusion of overlapping categories is best seen in the practice acts for nursing, in which the Master's degree R.N., the B.S. degree R.N., the A.A. degree R.N., the advanced level L.P.N., the L.P.N., and the patient care aide are all performing bedside care, sometimes without a discernible difference in function. In addition, the official definition of limits of performance permitted by each category may further fragment the delivery of health care and impede the achievement of smoothly functioning systems of delivery. These laws would also become outmoded and could hamper the future expansion of the assistant's functional sphere. We feel that there are workable alternates and that these will be acceptable. One such alternate would be a minor revision of medical practice acts so as specifically to authorize delegation of tasks by physicians to trained assistants, plus a registry of assistants under supervision of a national body such as the A.M.A., the National Research Council, or the A.A.M.C.

The fears of the hospital administrator can be assuaged when the proposed new standards for accreditation of hospitals now being considered by the Joint Commission of Accreditation of Hospitals are adopted. In these proposed standards, the medical staff can delineate the rules and regulations governing P.A.'s with parallel delineation of the responsibilities of the medical staff utilizing them.

The impact of a P.A. on the throughput of a given office practice depends in large measure on the physician and his willingness to delegate. The number of graduate P.A.'s in practice settings has been, until very recently, so limited that no meaningful average could be determined. Estimates have ranged from 30 percent to 100 percent increase in throughput, the latter figure being a very special case in which a P.A. joined a group after the death of one of the physician-partners. After one year the number of patients seen by the group was the same as that seen the previous year with one additional physician.

In certain practice settings, achievement of an improved throughput is less important than the fact that each patient can receive more personal attention. In many busy offices, the pressure of inadequate time causes the physician to omit many of the questions and many of the examinations he once considered "routine." In such cases the P.A. can carry out these functions and improve the quality rather than the quantity of patient work-ups.

From the vantage point of the medical educator, there are several points which have caused us to reexamine our methods and goals in medical education. The P.A. trainee,

with little or no basic science preparation, can learn to manipulate the language of medicine, can master the concepts of disease, and can perform skilled tasks in a highly competent fashion. In fact, he can probably learn today's facts and master today's skills as well as the medical student. We feel that there are differences in judgment and that the medical students' depth of scientific knowledge will enable him to renew and extend his knowledge more readily than the P.A. in future years.

Most instructors are impressed by the maturity and eagerness of the P.A. trainees, and they are often described as being "hungry for knowledge." Most have become interested in a health career during their period of military service, and for many learning has become, for the first time, a relevant pursuit. While medicine seems too difficult and too remote to be a practical goal, a career as a physician's assistant seems an attainable and satisfying alternate. They pour enthusiasm and hard work into their studies and soon develop both pride and an esprit de corps which makes them a pleasure to teach.

The presence of P.A. trainees in the mix of learners in the medical centers has, in our opinion, made an impact on the attitude of the medical students and house officers toward delegation of tasks. This concept is readily accepted and supported by this group. Thus, instead of competing with one another in the teaching environment, these various groups learn the functions of the other groups and learn to work together.

From the vantage point of the administrator, it is well to know that the training of a P.A. costs about the same amount per year as the training of a medical student. If one notes that the teaching techniques are very similar, and the faculty the same, this result could be easily predicted. The total cost of training a P.A. is, of course, much less than the cost of training a physician because of the shorter total duration of training. Administrators should also know that funds for training such individuals are almost nonexistent. Almost all the funds supporting such ventures have come from the foundations rather than government. Josiah Macy Jr. Foundation supported the early development of our program, and the Carnegie Corporation and Commonwealth Fund are providing essential administrative support at this time. Federal financing under present laws for the training of allied health manpower is restricted to those programs leading to a college degree. Funding of experimental programs is theoretically possible, but this generally requires that prospective answers, definitions, and reassurances be supplied which can, in reality, only be derived retrospectively. The fact that we have been permitted to proceed with a controversial program in the absence of assured funding is a tribute, in my opinion, to an enlightened, progressive academic administration, as well as a dedicated clinical faculty.

A recent P.A. graduate suggested that our program motto should be, "Ask the man who owns one." Perhaps this could apply to the educational institution as well. A measure of both the overall acceptance of the concept at Duke and the willingness of the clinical staff to assume the responsibility of training is seen in the fact that the program began in one department and has now spread to all clinical departments.

The question is—should other medical schools and teaching hospitals become active in the training of new classes of health care personnel? Some have—such as Bowman Gray and the University of Colorado. But should the uncommitted majority consider such a move? In our opinion the use of such personnel is an obligatory part of any practical future modification of the health care system. It is only through their use that we can make maximal use of scarce and expen-

sive professional manpower. We also have the strong opinion that the physician must train his own assistants, just as he must be responsible for their correct use. Our answer logically follows these opinions. If newer types of personnel are a necessary part of tomorrow's medical care pattern, and if the physician must be responsible, then medical schools and teaching hospitals must be involved. We can promise hard work and low pay, but the rewards are worth the effort!

CASTRO CUBA—ANOTHER DISTINGUISHED AMERICAN CALLS FOR NEW COMMITMENTS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, barely 2 years ago a thoughtful and thought-provoking statement urging new leadership from the United States on the Communist threat from Castro Cuba was published by a prominent and respected American.

It was entitled "Cuba, Castro—Communism" and clearly advocated the constructive change that all informed people knew was both possible and necessary in countering, if not eliminating, communism in the Western Hemisphere.

This author recognized Castro Cuba as a base of operations to continue widespread insurrection and wage guerrilla warfare against the nations of Central and South America—a serious and continuing problem on our own doorstep—in fact, just 90 miles from the southernmost tip of the United States.

In this article, of just 2 years ago, the facts, the reasoning, and the conclusion were absolutely correct.

They still are.

The Communist regime, centered in Havana, remains a sanctuary for aggression and the base for the export of terror to other lands because we failed to follow the advice of Richard Milhous Nixon—then a private citizen, but now the President of the United States.

I include "Nixon on the Issues" and a newsclipping in my remarks at this point:

NIXON ON THE ISSUES
CUBA

Castro communism

They [people of Latin America, including young revolutionaries] do not want to impose on Latin America what Castro has imposed on Cuba. This is one of the exciting things about Latin America's development since the Cuban revolution. Communism as an "ism," as a method, no longer has appeal in Latin America, because it's made a depressed area out of Cuba. All over Latin America, the new revolutionaries talk against Castro, because they realize what he has done to the economy of Cuba and that without Soviet help, he would have failed completely.

A new administration will bring into office a new awareness of the continuing problem to our south. It will listen to our Latin friends and neighbors who recognize the danger and are confronted with the aggression and terror and who seek American partnership in forging common economic, political and diplomatic programs to deal with it.

We do not seek a new crisis or heightened

tensions in the Caribbean. But the communist regime there must be made to understand that Havana cannot remain forever a sanctuary for aggression and a base for the export of terror to other lands.

Cuba is not just a bankrupt communist regime. It has become the center for external aggression and the export of revolution to the Western Hemisphere under Castro's direct guidance. It operates with an ambitious strategy to create widespread insurrection and wage guerrilla warfare against the nations of Central and South America.

With American attention focused upon Vietnam—and Eastern Europe and the Middle East—we have tended to overlook the serious and continuing problem on our doorstep.

In the search for alternatives to Caudillos and Communists, we would do well to keep in mind that Castro-Communism constitutes a threat, not because it is strong, but because its target is weak. To meet this threat, what Latin America really needs is fewer marching feet and more helping hands.

Economic quarantine

The Cuban situation, unfortunately, is at a point now where, in effect, we cannot do what we could have done much earlier. . . . As a result of our failure to move in at the time of the Bay of Pigs, as a result of our failure during the Cuban confrontation to use our power effectively, we're now in a position that to mount any kind of a military operation would be extremely difficult, and extremely hazardous, and might risk a confrontation with the Soviet Union. Now, on the other hand, there are some things we can do. And I think what we must do is to maintain and tighten the economic blockade on Castro's Cuba. . . . we have to find other areas, economic and diplomatic, other than military, in order to effect a change in the Cuban regime.

I think the U.S. policies toward Cuba have to tighten the economic quarantine. And here is where the policies toward Cuba need a great assist from our friends in other parts of the world. Here is where I think some new diplomatic moves must be made with our European friends and our Canadian friends and the rest.

This is the only leverage we currently have on Castro. . . . Castro is exporting his revolution throughout the hemisphere. Therefore, U.S. foreign policy requires—and foreign policy of all other nations in the world interested in peace requires—this kind of government be quarantined; quarantined for the sake of peace.

Efforts to boycott his regime have met with minimal success. Some western nations have all but ignored our leadership in this. New leadership in the United States is committed to do better.

NIXON FORGETS PLEDGE CONCERNING CASTRO

KEY WEST.—While campaigning in 1968, Richard Nixon said of Cuba: "The Communist regime there must be made to understand that it cannot remain forever a sanctuary for the export of terror to other lands."

Nixon pledged to tighten the quarantine of Cuba—"A quarantine for the sake of peace."

Actually, the Castro regime has stepped up its role in America's race violence and is active in the murder of diplomats in Latin America. Nixon has sat idle while hundreds of American students have gone to Cuba to help Castro harvest his sugar crop. (In some instances these Red students receive federal subsidies from the Nixon administration.)

The quarantine: It is more non-existent than ever before.

The U.S. Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba has called upon Nixon to make good his campaign promises. The group suggests that he:

1. Impose comprehensive sanctions on all

shipping to and from Cuba to include all vessels of any line sending any ship to Cuba.

2. Impress upon our NATO "allies" the threat that Cuba poses to the free world, and use full persuasion to see that they embargo trade with this aggressor nation.

Nixon seems unconcerned about Cuba. But meanwhile he has enforced severe economic sanctions against Rhodesia, an anti-communist nation whose only crime is that it is an oasis of civilization in a continent of cannibalism, poverty, disease and savagery.

CONGRESSMAN CHARLES H. WILSON SUPPORTS HOUSE ACTION ON POSTAL REFORM

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the House of Representatives for passing H.R. 17070, the postal reform bill which would improve and modernize the postal service by reorganizing the Post Office Department. I feel H.R. 17070 is a solid bill on which to build a properly reformed postal service which will adequately serve the Nation's needs.

In my CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statement of June 15, I urged my colleagues to support meaningful postal reform and pointed out that for H.R. 17070 to be meaningful, it was necessary that it retain three essential reforms:

First, an 8-percent pay raise, retroactive to April 18, 1970;

Second, a reduction in the time it takes the postal worker to reach the top step of his labor grade to 8 years rather than 21 years—commonly referred to as compression; and,

Third, the establishment of an area wage system for postal employees.

I was very pleased that these vital constituents were accepted by the House of Representatives by an overwhelming vote. As I stated earlier, there are other aspects of H.R. 17070 which I strongly support, but it cannot be overemphasized that the retroactive pay raise, grade compression, and area wage provisions of the bill have to be the substance of any endeavor to livviate the postal crisis. There is no doubt in my mind that until the postal workers are treated as first-class citizens, no amount of postal modernization can effect veritable postal reform. While I think most of us, both on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and in the full House would agree that the bill is not perfect or ideal, it is nevertheless a comprehensive and worthwhile piece of legislation which many of us worked long and hard to produce; its adoption is clearly in the best interest of our Nation. I can only hope that when the Senate and House conferees finally reach a resolution on the postal reform, they will not emasculate the bill by striking these vital reforms.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore urge my colleagues on the other side of Capitol Hill to move unhesitatingly and decisively so that we might have postal reform legislation before the President in the very near future.

"LIB" NOT FOR NEGRO WOMEN

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, many observers have noted the absence of Negro women from the "Women's Liberation" movement. Various theories have been forwarded to explain this lack of participation, and undoubtedly a number of factors have combined to cause it.

Stella White, a good friend and fine columnist, recently wrote a most analytical and revealing piece on the subject in the Cleveland Plain Dealer. Stella's credentials as a social commentator are unimpeachable, and I am sure that a number of my colleagues will be interested in reviewing her thoughts. Consequently, I insert the column here as a part of the RECORD:

"LIB" NOT FOR NEGRO WOMEN

(By Stella G. White)

Currently there is much to-do about the Women's Liberation Movement. Mention often is made of the fact that the movement has attracted relatively few Negro women. It consists mainly of middle-class white women.

"The Negro woman has been forced to exist in a matriarchal society, ethnically speaking. As an aside, Negro men usually were referred to as "Mary's James" or some other appropriate designation identifying them as being not worthy of the respect of being men in their own right.

The liberation movement will not attract many Negro women because it has been the Negro women who had been able to get at least some of the better paying jobs, while the Negro male until very recently was restricted to menial work.

From "Blacks In America" by Dr. Edgar A. Toppin: "Since blacks (men) were consigned to lower-paying jobs, more black women and children had to go to work to help provide a decent income for the family. In 1890 . . . 57% black Americans were gainfully employed, about 36% . . . black women . . . Prejudice and discrimination contributed to the black man's low economic status. . . . Discrimination in licensing craftsmen forced blacks (men) to work as low-paid helpers even when they were as skilled as licensed white craftsmen. Banned by unionists, many blacks (men) worked as strike-breakers, increasing friction between the races.

From the beginning of the century Negro women were accepted in positions such as school teachers, librarians, social workers, and, of course, for the always available jobs as domestics.

Most Negro families in the middle and upper middle-class recall all too vividly a maiden aunt or sister who refused to or was not allowed to marry "out of her class." These women often held PhD's. Many others had earned master's degrees.

Because so many jobs at the professional level were not open to the Negro male, he did not go to college. Many who did go to college found employment, other than menial labor, only in the post office. It has been said that mail in the United States has been handled by more college trained personnel than anywhere in the world.

The Negro woman with a college degree often was denied marriage simply because there was no one of equal status to marry. Some brave women married men with limited education, then helped their husbands get a college education, but these women were not kindly regarded by others in their

economic class. The college-educated Negro woman often waited for marriage until one or both her parents had died. The parents would have bitterly opposed such a "step down."

A women's Liberation-type movement could appeal to Negro males because they seek equal opportunities with Negro women as to pay and type of position of employment.

The Negro woman would not be interested in the movement because for too many generations she has borne the burden of supporting the family, much to the humiliation of the Negro male.

The Negro woman has long been willing to relinquish the matriarchal role. She wishes it never had happened. She desires to be feminine in all this encompasses.

REPRESENTATIVE HENRY P. SMITH III ANNOUNCES RESULTS OF 1969 QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, with the critical domestic and international issues that face our Nation today, I find that the views of my constituents are invaluable at this time in helping me decide which course of action I will pursue in the months ahead.

I have just received the final results of a nine-part questionnaire which I submitted last month to each family and boxholder in the 40th Congressional District. I am pleased and proud to report that more than 25,000 completed questionnaires have been returned, many with additional comments and accompanying letters.

Mr. Speaker, I have always found the results of my questionnaires to be interesting and helpful, and I am sure that the other Members of the House will agree. The following is a percentage breakdown of the final tabulated results of my questionnaire:

[Answers in percent]

- As of today, which course of action would you favor in Vietnam?
 - Stepped up military activity in an effort to end the war: yes, 32; no, 19.
 - pursue present U.S. withdrawal schedule and Vietnamization of the war: yes, 39; no, 15.
 - immediate and complete U.S. withdrawal: yes, 30; no, 20.
- In Israeli-Arab crisis, U.S. should:
 - assist Israel only: yes, 20; no, 22.
 - treat both sides alike: yes, 16; no, 18.
 - withhold all military assistance and urge Israelis to negotiate peaceful settlement of dispute: yes, 66; no, 9.
- Do you favor the busing of school children to achieve racial balance? yes, 9; no, 89; no response, 2.
- Would you approve higher taxes if you knew that the money were earmarked for:
 - better education: yes, 30; no, 42.
 - pollution control: yes, 55; no, 31.
 - slum clearance: yes, 31; no, 41.
- If Nixon's Family Assistance proposals are substituted for welfare, should persons receiving assistance who are physically able be required to accept any work available? yes, 91; no, 7; no response, 2.
- should wage and price controls be used to help stop inflation? yes, 75; no, 20; no response, 5.

7. Would you favor lowering the voting age to 18? yes, 45; no 53; no response, 2.

8. With regard to widespread marijuana problem, would you favor:

a. reduction in penalty for use and possession: yes, 20; no, 43.

b. increased penalties for selling: yes, 89; no, 6.

9. How would you rate President Nixon's overall performance in office: good, 38; fair, 23; poor, 39.

MUST UNITED STATES PLAY HOST TO ITS ENEMIES

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I recently saw a report that East Germany, North Korea, and North Vietnam might wish to send delegations from their respective countries to the United States, to attend and participate in the United Nations' 25th anniversary celebration in October of this year.

Following is a letter I wrote yesterday to the Secretary of State, asking for the Department's opinion on this matter, if the report is indeed true, and strongly protesting granting of such permission if it has been, or will be, sought by these governments:

JUNE 23, 1970.

HON. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It came to my attention there may be some interest on the part of East Germany, North Korea, and North Vietnam in sending delegations from their respective countries to the United States, to attend and participate in the United Nations' twenty-fifth anniversary celebration in October of this year.

As I understand the matter, under agreements between the UN and our Government, permission for non-member states to visit this country for UN functions or ceremonies must be granted by the United States, specifically, and in effect their representatives are granted visas on more or less the same basis as any other foreign visitor. Therefore, final approval for the delegations I mentioned above would have to be granted by the Department of State.

I would very much like to know what your Department has under consideration in this matter if, as has been reported, these countries wish to send delegations here at that time. For myself, I cannot see how the interests of world peace could possibly be served by granting this permission if it is sought. The UN itself, I believe, has long ago passed from being an objective body; Moscow recently stated that the attitude of the present Secretary-General, U Thant, on Vietnam, was quite in accord with Soviet thinking. This in itself indicates that the twenty-fifth anniversary observances might possibly be turned into an anti-U.S. forum, as far as the Vietnam situation is concerned.

East Germany's present contribution to world peace and stability is the Berlin Wall, and the bodies along that wall, or on it, of those who have tried to escape. North Korea's seizure and inhumane treatment of the PUEBLO crew, plus, the shooting down of the EC-121, plus its constant belligerency and threats toward South Korea, scarcely commend it as a valuable member of a world organization devoted to peace. North Vietnam's record of wanton aggression against its neighbors is still being written and with

over forty thousand Americans dead as a result. I can see no reason whatsoever to let the homeland of these men play host to their killers. Nor, I submit, would their parents, widows and orphans look kindly and tolerantly upon it.

I do not believe the American people are of a mood to see the American Republic serve as host country on this occasion for representatives of these countries. I believe the American people are owed prompt and solid assurance that this will not take place.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM G. BRAY,
Member of Congress.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT L. F. SIKES NOW DOCTOR OF LAWS

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the dean of the Florida Congressional Delegation who holds the record for longevity of service in the U.S. Congress from the State of Florida, has just been awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree from the University of West Florida, Pensacola, Fla. All of Florida is proud of Congressman SIKES and I wanted to bring this new distinction for him to the attention of the House of Representatives because Congressman SIKES deserves the highest esteem and tribute of his colleagues.

There is no Congressman who is more beloved in Congress than Congressman SIKES. He is an astute master of the legislative processes, a real leader among leaders. It is no wonder that his district chooses him, year after year, to represent them in Washington. He does this representation with exceptional ability and success, both for his district and for the country as a whole.

I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a news story on the commencement exercises at the University of West Florida and the honorary degree awarded to Bob SIKES. I also include a biographical sketch of our distinguished leader:

[From the Pensacola (Fla.) News-Journal,
June 14, 1970]

UWF WILL HONOR SIKES, CULPEPPER
(By Mike Henderson)

Congressman Robert L. F. Sikes and Dr. J. Broward Culpepper, former chancellor of the State University System of Florida, are to receive honorary degrees at University of West Florida commencement exercises at 2 p.m. Sunday.

President Harold B. Crosby will confer honorary doctor of laws degrees on the two men during exercises in the new physical education building.

UWF will be graduating the largest class since opening its doors in 1967 with 545 of the 1,246 members expected to participate in the exercises.

SIKES, senior member of the Florida delegation and ranking member in the U.S. House of Representatives, is being honored for his long career as a legislator and for his role in national defense matters, education, forestry, conservation, health and recreational programs.

He is a member of the House Committee on Appropriations. The congressman is chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction and is vice chairman of the De-

fense Subcommittee and the Subcommittee on the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce and the Judiciary.

BIOGRAPHY OF HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

Honorable Robert L. F. Sikes, Democrat, of Crestview, Okaloosa County, Florida, U.S. Representative from the First District, was born in Isabella, Georgia, on June 3, 1906. He received his Bachelor of Science Degree from the University of Georgia in 1927, and his Masters Degree from the University of Florida in 1929. On March 15, 1969, he was awarded an Honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws from Stetson University, on April 26, 1969 an Honorary Degree of Doctor of Humane Letters from St. Leo College, and on June 14, 1970 an Honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws from the University of West Florida. He is a Major General AUS (Ret.) and was awarded the Legion of Merit.

Married, (Mrs. Sikes is the former Miss Inez Tyner, Laurel Hill, Florida); two children, (daughter, Mrs. Bobbye S. Wicke, Oldsmar, Florida, publisher of Tampa Tracings, a course on cardiology; son, Robert K. Sikes, Martin Marietta Corporation, Orlando, Florida).

He was twice elected to the Florida Legislature, representing Okaloosa County in the 1937 and 1939 sessions. He was elected to Congress in 1940 and has been reelected in 14 successive elections, and is currently serving his 15th term. He is the senior member of the Florida Delegation in Congress, and holds the record for longevity of service in the Congress from the State of Florida. He has also served as Chairman of the Okaloosa County Democratic Committee; Chairman, Okaloosa Planning Committee; Member of Congressional Democratic Committee; Chairman of the Florida Delegation to the Democratic National Convention, 1956 and 1960.

He is a member of Kiwanis; honorary member of Rotary, Lions, and Civitan Clubs, Retired Officers Association, National Association of Supervisors, American Federation of Government Employees, United Federation of Postal Clerks, National Association of Master Mechanics and Foremen, American Society of Arms Collectors; honorary life member of Fleet Reserve Association and the Navy League; life member, National Rifle Association, and Director from 1965 to 1967; member Moose, Elks, V.F.W., American Legion, 40 and 8, Military Order of the World Wars, and Reserve Officers Association. He was President of the Florida Press Association in 1937, and Lieutenant Governor of Kiwanis in 1940. Honorary member Order of Ahepa.

Congressman Sikes is a 33d Degree Scottish Rite Mason, and an Honorary Member and Inspector General of Scottish Rite for the Southern Jurisdiction of the U.S. He is a member of the Red Cross of Constantine of York Rite of Freemasonry, York Rite College; Royal Order of Scotland, KCCH; Knights Templar; Shrine; Grotto; National Sojourners; Knights of Pythias. He is a charter member and First Ambassador on Hadji Shrine Temple of Pensacola, Florida, and Grand Orator of the Masonic Grand Lodge of Florida for 1968-69.

He is a member of Phi Kappa Phi, Alpha Zeta, Sigma Delta Chi, Phi Sigma, Alpha Gamma Rho, and Blue Key.

Member, Board of Trustees of the Naval Aviation Museum Association; Member, Board of Directors, Florida Historical Society; Member, Board of Visitors, Civil Air Patrol; National Vice President and National Director, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1959-70.

He has served as Delegate to Pan American Roads Conference, Caracas, Venezuela, 1954; Delegate to Inter-Parliamentary Conference, Warsaw, Poland, 1959; Delegate to the Sixth World Forestry Congress, Madrid, Spain, 1966.

He is the recipient of the National Affairs

League's Leadership Award, 1951; Distinguished Service Award of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 1958; American Gun Dealers Leadership Award, 1959; Governor's Conservation Award, 1960; Guatemalan Order of Merit, 1961; Florida Young Democratic Clubs' Award, 1961; American Legion Distinguished Service Award, 1962; Navy Times Good Neighbor Award, 1962; Humanitarian Award from Children's Asthma Research Institute, 1963; Florida National Guard Outstanding Service Award, 1963; Reserve Officers Association "Minute Man Hall of Fame" Award, 1964; Distinguished Service Award of Reserve Officers Association, 1966; George Washington Memorial Award, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1966; Good Government Award by Pensacola Realty Board, 1966; Defender of Free Enterprise Award by Life Underwriters, 1966; Reserve Officers Association "Man of the Year" Award for Contributions to National Defense, 1967; Honorary State Farmer Award by Florida Association of the Future Farmers of America, 1967; Alpha Gamma Rho Alumni Award, 1968; UPI's Florida Public Service Award, 1968; Order of Ahepa Award, 1969; AMVETS Special Meritorious Commendation, 1969; Air Force Association Special Citation, 1970.

An Honorary Faculty Chair in Government has been designated in Congressman Sikes' name at Okaloosa-Walton Junior College, Niceville, Florida.

VIEWS FROM THE 14TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the events of this past May have brought about a profound change in the American people. The myth of the "silent majority" has been shattered, hopefully, for good.

I have found that the response to my annual questionnaire has been the highest since my coming to the Congress. Additionally, the number of questionnaires returned with comments was much higher than in previous years.

The people are concerned, and they are deeply concerned about the U.S. policy in Indochina.

They are unconvinced that the "Vietnamization" policy has been successful. In fact, 62 percent of those who returned questionnaires stated that this policy has not worked to the point where the 1,200,000-man South Vietnamese Army equipped with armor and air, can handle combat assignments against 250,000 Viet Cong and North Vietnamese enemy who possess no armor or air, without the assistance of American troops.

A majority, 58 percent, of those respondents, consistent with the above view, agree that American troops had to be sent into Cambodia to eliminate enemy sanctuaries. However, 61 percent indicated that they are opposed to re-entry of American troops even if the sanctuaries were reoccupied by the enemy.

A majority of those respondents, 58 percent, set a deadline of 1 year or less, for the South Vietnamese to find the will and ability to take over the military operations in that country. Thirteen percent were willing to wait 2 years, 3 per-

cent for 3 years, and 26 percent said they approved maintaining American fighting forces in Vietnam "as long as required."

Indicating an unwillingness to further expand the war in Indochina, 14th District residents overwhelmingly—65 percent to 35 percent—said that they were opposed to sending American troops into Laos to eliminate sanctuaries in that country.

There were a number of other issues listed on the questionnaires, Mr. Speaker, and I include the questions and the percentages of response for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The final tabulation follows:

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

(1) Do you believe "Vietnamization" has worked and that the South Vietnamese armed forces are now capable of defending South Vietnam without American combat troops? Yes, 38 percent; no, 62 percent.

(2) Do you believe American troops had to be used to eliminate the Cambodian sanctuaries? Yes, 58 percent; no, 42 percent.

(3) If the "sanctuaries" are re-occupied, would you approve American troops again being used to eliminate them? Yes, 39 percent; no, 61 percent.

(4) How long would you be willing to await a total take-over of combat operations by the South Vietnamese?

(a) 1 Year, 58 percent.

(b) 2 Years, 13 percent.

(c) 3 Years, 37 percent.

(d) As long as is required, 26 percent.

(5) Should we commence bombing North Vietnam again? Yes, 43 percent; no, 57 percent.

(6) Should we invade Laos to destroy enemy sanctuaries in that country as we have sought to do in Cambodia? Yes, 35 percent; no, 65 percent.

(7) Should the U.S. announce a total withdrawal from Southeast Asia by a date certain? Yes, 44 percent; no, 56 percent.

(8) Do you believe we should continue our Space Program at the present level of funding? Yes, 38 percent; no, 62 percent.

(9) Do you support President Nixon's Welfare Plan based on work incentives and guaranteed income? Yes, 63 percent; no, 37 percent.

(10) Do you support lowering the voting age to 18? Yes, 45 percent; no, 55 percent.

(11) Should Third-Class Mail Rates be increased substantially even at the risk of preventing its use by many mailers? Yes, 83 percent; no, 17 percent.

(12) Do you support increasing First-Class Mail to 8c in order to assist in financing the Postal deficit? Yes, 48 percent; no, 52 percent.

(13) Should we continue the Farm Subsidy Program? Yes, 23 percent; no, 77 percent.

(14) Should Wage and Price Controls be applied to fight inflation? Yes, 67 percent; no, 33 percent.

(15) Which three National Problems seem most critical to you:

(a) 23 percent: The Indo-China War

(b) 15 percent: Crime

(c) 10 percent: Racial Division

(d) 8 percent: Student Alienation

(e) 12 percent: Taxes

(f) 8 percent: Poverty

(g) 15 percent: Environmental Problems

(h) 9 percent: Drug Abuse

(16) Which solution to Crime seems most feasible to you?

(a) 18 percent: Harsher penalties

(b) 7 percent: Greater Numbers of Police-men

(c) 11 percent: Better Prisoner Rehabilitation

(d) 38 percent: More attention to Poverty and Education in High Crime Areas

(e) 25 percent: Tougher Judges

THE TOLERANCE OF VIOLENCE
ON THE CAMPUS

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly disturbed that the current turmoil brought on by the continuation of the Indochina war, and a lack of attention to our domestic problems by this administration may destroy the university. I am fully in favor of the searching inquiry and political activism now being demonstrated by our youth, but am afraid that the attendant disruption of our universities may lead to the destruction of higher education in the United States.

Our centers of learning are being attacked from both the left and the right. Rather than serving as centers for intellectual discovery and dispassioned reasoning, our colleges are being turned into platforms for anti-intellectual posturing. The search for relevance has all but foreclosed the search for reason. This will, of course, bring on an equal degree of repression as exhibited by the board of regents of the University of California in their recent decision to bar the rehiring of an associate professor because of her political beliefs.

I recommend to my colleagues the recent article by Prof. Alexander M. Bickel of the Yale Law School. This is a most cogent discussion of the possible fate of higher education in this country if present trends continue.

The article follows:

THE TOLERANCE OF VIOLENCE ON THE CAMPUS
(By Alexander M. Bickel)

Among academics and other intellectuals, let alone "poets, yeggs and thirsties," it is not merely fashionable, it is required to speak apocalyptically of the country in crisis. There is a crisis and it went from bad to worse this spring. But it is not only, it is not even chiefly, the crisis that fashion requires us to shake our heads about. The war has got to stop, the march into Cambodia is a gruesome error, the cities are a mess, our rivers and our air smell awful, and the blacks will not and ought not stand for being forgotten again. But there is another crisis that will incapacitate us from dealing with the ones I have just mentioned. It is not the crisis of allegiance on the part of downtrodden blacks and not the tinderbox of conflict between them and the lower-class whites who confront them, but the crisis of the abandonment of reason, of standards, of measure, the loss of balance and judgment by intellectuals and their audiences. The symptoms of this crisis are the incivility and even violence of rhetoric and action that academics and other intellectuals have domesticated into their universe of discourse, and the interdiction of objective discussion of certain problems that they have increasingly tolerated.

I write from the vantage point of a university—Yale—that has by and large kept its head. Violence and disruption are not a regular feature of our lives. No Nobel prize winner has been forcibly denied access to his laboratory, as was Dr. Isidor Rabi at Columbia recently. There has been only one significant seizure of a building, and that last fall and very brief. Students were more or less on strike for a few weeks this spring, but many parts of the university were continued normally in session just the same,

and all parts were open. No students will receive credit for work that has not been evaluated. Since the move into Cambodia, numerous students have put all they have of dedication, energy and talent—and they have breathtakingly much—into political action. They have organized a lobbying effort and executed it soberly and with high intelligence. They have committed themselves to the nitty-gritty work of campaigning this summer and fall. And at the law school they have labored day and night over legal memoranda dealing with the constitutional division of war-making power between President and Congress.

Yet here is what happened at Yale in the weeks immediately before. Some blacks, members of the Panther party, including Bobby Seale, the party's chairman, are under arrest in New Haven, charged with murder. The trial has not yet begun. Preliminary motions are being heard and decided. So much of the evidence as has emerged in the course of these preliminary hearings indicates that a brutal murder has indeed been committed. While the accused are of course to be presumed innocent, the state has made out enough of a case against them to obtain an indictment, and to convince a judge to hold all but one of them without bail, as in a capital case he may. Two of the accused have pleaded guilty to second-degree murder. Proceedings thus far have raised some legal issues—most cases do—but there has been no showing of gross or plain violation of anyone's rights. There was one minor disturbance in the courtroom, and the presiding judge summarily imposed six-month contempt sentences on two members of the Black Panther party who were in court as spectators and on whom the disturbance centered. This was, in the view of many impartial observers, a grave overreaction. Within a few days, the judge corrected himself and commuted the sentences. Everything else has gone along regularly, peaceably and with decorum.

Nonetheless The Movement, the amorphous collection of radicals, SDS, Yuppies, what-have-you, pressing an alliance with the Black Panthers which the latter accept apparently only on occasion, mounted an agitation to stop the trial and free the accused. The call went out to come to New Haven for a May Day demonstration. Many of the groups or grouplets from whom the call issued or to whom it went took it as a call to bring Yale to its knees by violence: Come to New Haven and see it burn. Very few if any of Yale's students and faculty accepted the call to violence. For a dominant portion of the student body, however, the issue was not the violence that was offered the city and the university by thousands of people about to descend on them. The issue was the trial as an instance of repression. The crisis was not the open threat of fire, death and destruction to a university and a city. The crisis was a trial for murder, even though there's no doubt a crime has been committed, no basis whatever at this stage for the surmise that the trial will be unfair, and no possibility other than the trial of dealing with an occurrence—the murder—which would be monstrous to ignore.

Over this trumped-up crisis of the trial hundreds upon hundreds of students whipped themselves to a pitch of hysteria, finally voting to strike. Interestingly enough, the passions raged in the college and in some measure in the graduate school. The law school—training still tells a little—was virtually untouched. On April 23, the faculty of Yale College met, and having heard the President of the University express his skepticism that black revolutionaries can get a fair trial anywhere in the United States, voted to countenance the strike. I was at the meeting and so voted, and did not really feel ashamed until I walked out through the crowd of students, who we had known were

out there, whom we had heard, and who now cheered us.

We did not call off school. Most faculty and many students continued to attend class, and there was little attempt to bring pressure on them. Nothing, we could have done would have likely dispelled the hysteria of a large mass of undergraduates, and many things we might have done would have heightened it. The difference between recognizing the situation, as we could not but do, and countenancing it, as we did, can be seen as minor. To countenance the condition that prevailed among our students might spare the university the kind of experience that Harvard had last spring and that has come to other places.

We were spared. But there is cause to be ashamed. We did not return a rational answer to our students, because we were too alone and it was too late. If we had said what is true, that the trial was no crisis, that it was inconceivable not to let it proceed, and that there is no reason to equate the police in Chicago with the courts in New Haven and with the state and federal courts that sit to correct the errors of courts in New Haven; and if we had added that the university would continue to function, its members being held to no more than their normal duties (which do not include constant attendance at class) and no less—if we had said all that we would have been denounced as rigid, unresponsive, authoritarian; we would have risked riots and destruction, and been saddled with responsibility for possible police overreaction. That is what it has come to. Truth and the function of the university are irrelevant and dangerous. They are pitfalls. I have to be grateful, and I am grateful, that we avoided these pitfalls, and that we had steady and shrewd leadership which saved us whole.

But we should realize where we have arrived, and try to know how and why. I suggest we have listened and talked ourselves into the situation we are in. We have listened—quietly, even solemnly, as if it were rational—to incredibly loose talk about the obsolescence and rottenness of our society and all our institutions, and have come to parrot it in order to propitiate a sizable number of young. It all started with the war, which does represent a malfunction of the system, because a democracy must not wage wars with the assent merely of a simple majority. Large and intense minorities have, and of right should have a veto against war, and there is no higher national interest than the speedy liquidation of a war that has been so vetoed. Lyndon Johnson never understood that, and Mr. Nixon's understanding of it has been revealed as imperfect. Hence the insufferable war continues, and leads quite naturally and reasonably to talk of systemic crisis.

But it is not reasonable to extend a systemic indictment to the entire structure of government, to the electoral process itself, to the administration of justice, to every debatable action that a new national administration thinks it has a mandate to take, and to every type of institution, including universities. Everything can be improved, even radically improved, and change is the law of life. But not everything can be improved instantly, and not all change is good. And destructive nihilism is evil no matter how motivated. These things it is now unfashionable for intellectuals and their audiences to say and hear. What is fashionable is the apocalypse and filthy and violent rhetoric.

We listen to the rhetoric as if it were the statement of a position, of one side of an issue, and we respond by disagreeing perhaps, but by accepting the premise of apocalyptic crisis. The reward we hope for is not too much violence. In New Haven there were three small fires, obviously set, in the law school, and a bombing in Ingalls Rink. But the peace was kept, by speakers who advised

the crowd that the time was not ripe for violence, yet. The University is full of slogans painted and stenciled all over it. These stenciled and spoken slogans and threats are called dissent. But they are in truth vandalism, a kind of aggression almost physical, in content most often a series of curses which do not pretend any attempt at persuasion. No principle of a free society requires public, let alone private, institutions to allow this sort of verbal violence to take place on their walls or orally within their precincts. Yet we observe it and listen to it respectfully, and thus legitimate it. Nothing is unspeakable, and hence nothing is really undoable. The university, we hear it said and assented to, is thoroughly unworthy, and so is the entire legal order. Therefore the university and the society may not use force to protect themselves against violence, let alone the threat of it, but force may justly be used against them.

There has been an appalling use of deadly force at Kent State, in Augusta, Ga., and in Jackson, Miss., which we must punish as criminal and which we must bend every effort to prevent in the future. The President was rightly criticized for reacting to the Kent State killings by saying in effect that violence will breed violence. To have said only that was not enough and is not the whole truth. But what the President did say was nevertheless true. It is probably statable in the form of an equation that so many rampages, so many bricks and bottles thrown, and even so many epithets hurled will eventually, in one or another corner of the country, produce so many innocent victims. It is probably also statable in the form of an equation that so much talk of the rottenness and sickness of men and institutions, solemnly countenanced by so many apparently rational people, will produce so many rampages and bottles and rocks, and so much incendiary counter-rhetoric like the Vice President's, as well as some counter-rampages. No sane person can condone riots by construction workers or by police, and certainly not killings. But a price is inevitably going to be paid for destroying the order of society. If the streets belong to the people, they are going to belong to all the people, not just young radicals. If all we say about Kent State is that it is an instance of brutal repression for which the Vice President and the Attorney General and an isolated and insensitive President are responsible, we are not telling the truth, and by not doing so we will help bring on more Kent States.

What, in the title of one of Lenin's pamphlets, is to be done? We must restore conditions in which slogans and mass emotions do not drown out and drive out reasoned analysis; in which passionate assertion is not automatically seen as high-minded and presumptively right, while dispassionate judgment is denounced as insensitive and presumptively immoral. The young are right about the war in Indochina, because the majoritarian political process alone does not legitimate a war. The President must stop it, and Congress must make him stop it. The young are right too about a great deal of racism, and about the debasement of values by commercialism. But many of the young are wrong about repression. The society is free and open, if flawed and gravely troubled. What repression there is imposed, as often as not, by the young in the universities, where their pressure for ideological orthodoxy and a kind of emotional solidarity threaten to achieve what Joe McCarthy never did.

Our domestic problems can be solved or alleviated only through the democratic political process, which is slow, and out of which no one gets all he wants. The political process is not only slow, it is prone to error, and it carries a high frustration factor. But resolution would produce only something less responsive to claims of social justice and in-

initely more coercive and oppressive. All this many of the young may not believe, but it is not disproved by epithets and demonstrations. Of course, the objective situation in the United States, as the Marxists would say, and as the true Marxists probably do say, is such that violent repression is much more likely than violent revolution. But if we are to have neither, we must have order—order under law, which means freedom to question the law and test it and freedom to seek a higher justice than the law may embody; but which means also freedom from coercion and violence, physical or verbal.

The place to begin restoring order in speech and action is the university. No single university can do it, and virtually all have slid so far into disorder that they must in fairness give notice of intention to return to earlier ways before acting to do so. The heads of leading universities should convene publicly and reassert standards of civility of speech and conduct. Instead of commiserating with each other under various pious auspices about a supposed crisis of irrelevance in higher education, they should announce their intention to institute a reform which is the precondition of all other reforms: the use of disciplinary power to keep discourse and action within the bounds of order. No more vandalism; no more assaultive, vicious speech; no more incitement to violent action; no more bullying, simulated or actual. If the reassertion of this minimum of authority should bring strife and violence in the short term, as it may, it will be less strife and less violence than is otherwise in store for us.

WHAT IS RIGHT WITH AMERICA

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the community of Martinsville, Va., was shocked and saddened last Friday by the untimely death of a valued and personal friend, Mr. Dan A. Greene. Dan Greene was a man who gave of himself untrudgingly, unstintingly, and unselfishly for the benefit of others and in the interest of the community and the State in which he lived. His passing has left a void which will be difficult to fill.

On June 22, there appeared in the Martinsville Bulletin an editorial concerning the late Dan Greene and I insert this in the RECORD:

DAN GREENE WILL LONG BE KNOWN FOR HIS CONTRIBUTIONS TO ALL

To say the least, our community was shocked by the news of the sudden illness and death of Dan A. Greene.

He had lived here since 1940, or for 30 years. Yet he was still a relatively young man when he died of a heart attack at the age of 54 last Friday evening.

Nonetheless, those 54 years were filled with incomparable contributions to his neighbors and friends. And they numbered in the many thousands because his work and concern embraced citizens of all ages and walks of life.

Recognized as a highly successful businessman, Dan A. Greene will be remembered longer, however, as a civic leader whose compassion and interest embraced about every facet of community life.

He was interested in our youth. This was evidenced by his activity in and support of the Boy Scout movement, his original efforts in helping to organize and continued support

of baseball programs for youngsters of all ages, and his assistance in the organization of the Martinsville Recreation Association.

He was interested in the needy, as evidenced by his efforts in organizing Christmas Cheer and his subsequent election by its members as a lifetime director.

He was interested in racial harmony and community progress. He was interested in everything that stood to benefit his fellowman; and he was not only generous with his time and leadership but was equally as generous with his financial assistance to every worthwhile civic and community project.

Ebullient and gregarious, he made friends easily and warmed their hearts with his vitality and interest in their personal lives and successes.

He was both the champion of the underdog and an admirer of the qualities possessed by the true champion, whatever his field.

He was a sentimentalist and a sensitive man, particularly when and if he detected what seemed to be an intrusion of injustice, bias and prejudice or oppression and exploitation. But he was a courageous man, too, and worked against all those things with the same sort of fervor and determination that marked all his contributions to his fellowman.

He was not a good loser in that he accepted attacks on or reversals of his principles without a hard fight. He believed any game worth playing was worth winning; any project started, worth completing.

This community will miss Dan Greene—and greatly. But it has profited more than we can relate here for having had him as a citizen and neighbor for the past 30 years; and for that, we are extremely grateful.

To his fine family, The Bulletin expresses its heartfelt sympathy, knowing that we express the sentiments of thousands and thousands of others who are appreciative of the vital part Dan Greene played in giving us a better community.

Mr. Speaker, Dan Greene was especially interested in the wholesome development of young people. Shortly before his death he delivered a speech to the youth of his area. In the address, Dan Greene discussed an aspect of the Vietnam war which is all too seldom publicized. He classified the war in Southeast Asia as merely one stage of a much longer and more extensive confrontation—the war between the free world and the Communists. This battle between ideologies has been raging in many places since the origin of the Communist doctrine. If its form has differed from time to time, the change was instituted only to serve the immediate situation. For the goal of the Communists remains that of world domination.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD Mr. Green's speech which he entitled "What's Right With America":

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH AMERICA

Hippies, Yuppies, new left, student unrest, radicals, SDS, beatniks, peaceniks, protesters, draft card burners, militants, anarchists, dissenters, activists—these are some of the emotion filled terms often used today in reference to the young people of the world.

As a result there is a large bridge of misunderstanding between a significant portion of our young people and many of their elders. The distrust, conflict and frustration that has seemingly grown up between the generations needs to be underscored to be resolved.

Why do we have this thing called "the generation gap" and why is there so much unrest among young people and the student class? These same questions are being asked not only in the U.S. but, in Mexico, Japan,

Germany, Italy, Spain and Iran and in practically all other democratic lands around the world.

No generation has been more examined, probed or less understood than today's younger generation. Our young people are called the "Now" generation, and with good reason. They find it hard to relate to the past. They find it easier to relate to the future. They are different from any other generation that has gone before, with a difference that goes beyond the fact that they are better fed, healthier, educated and certainly more sophisticated.

We also live in an age of youth not just because there are so many young people, but because our entire society is directed towards extending youth. We have made youth the "Ideal." Youth has become a major economic, social, and political factor. Our clothes, cars, entertainment and other facets of daily living all have the youth accent.

Young people demonstrate today not only because they believe in causes, but because demonstrations work. Young people generally feel that the older generation has not done a proper job in particularly two fields—the field of world peace and that of social progress.

Certainly we see today in more articulate young people, the intellectual and sensitive ones, a preference for a more humanistic and democratic society. They are showing it in the accent on people related jobs—social science, social service, the ministry and humanities.

Unfortunately too much of the attention of our news media and some of our leaders has been directed towards the minority of our young people. The ones who through their actions in sit ins, violence, utter disregard for the other persons rights, their abuse of their God given freedom to destroy freedom, and other demonstrations tend to bestow a mantle of shame upon all young people. Our adult generation needs very much to reform ourselves in order to eliminate this generation gap.

Speaking as one of this so called adult generation I am asking your help and understanding as future leaders of our great country to control this radical minority that is bent on destroying everything precious in this world of ours.

Wars cannot be abolished. It is true that one of the main reasons the younger generation is so disturbed is that they never really understood the true meaning of America's presence in Southeast Asia. Likewise, many millions of citizens who have read adverse comments on the war or in the press or heard the criticisms of the administration on television are not aware of the background of the vital issues.

We all agree that the universal question today is how to end the war in Vietnam. It must be and is the major concern of our national leadership. The whole world is watching, waiting and wondering. There has never been a popular war particularly with the men who fought it. But I doubt if there has ever been a more unpopular war nor a war more criticized. But it is a war and we are in it. It is a real war to the thousands of boys who have been killed so far and it is real to their families. It is real in the sense that it is costing over 2 billion a month. It is real to the over half a million men in Vietnam and Cambodia today.

It is real to the extent of turmoil it is creating among ourselves. It is real, it is tragic. Worse still it seems to be no closer to the end than when we started, although we have been told we will be out of Cambodia by July 1st and 150,000 of our boys will be out by next year.

I don't know how many of you feel as I do that the war in Vietnam is part of a much larger and much longer war—a war between the Communists and the Free World. It was declared by the Communists. It was declared

by Karl Marx before there was a Communist country in the world. It was declared by Lenin. It was waged by Stalin, it has been relentlessly waged by every communist leader since. It is being waged on many fronts in many forms. It is both a cold and a hot war. It is an economic war and a political war. It is a propaganda war and an ideological war. It is waged according to a Communist timetable on battlefields of their own choosing. It has a single objective, Communist control of the entire world. So far our generation has seen a divided Germany; a sectorized Berlin; a Russian occupation of Eastern Europe, Northern China, Poland, Hungary, Turkey, Czechoslovakia; invasion of South Korea; Missile crisis in Cuba; Algeria, and the forcing of the French to withdraw from Southeast Asia. Our determination to help free people to maintain their free institutions and their national integrity and to prevent Communism from carrying out their threat to encompass the world is without any doubt the main reason we are in this present conflict.

We are the world's one hope to contain communism until it destroys itself. We must not fall the freedom loving people throughout the world.

Everyone of us, whether we be young or old, is sickened by war. Evangelist Billy Graham in a talk recently before 3000 business leaders attending the Annual Convention of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce said "As long as we have one man in the world who hates, who has prejudice and intolerance, we have the danger of another world war that could tear civilization apart. Something is wrong with the human race that civilization has not solved, something that culture has not solved, something that social opportunities and economic advantage have not solved. It is man who must solve the problem of himself before he can solve the problems of the world in which we live. The only solution to this dilemma is to regenerate human nature so that hate is replaced by love, intolerance by charity, so that prejudice, lust and hate are taken away and men will not fight in wars nor resort to violence."

This is easy for Billy Graham to say. But, can we actually do anything about it. First, we must realize that man must create his own happiness. A man is not mature until he relates himself to the universe. He is not educated until he has disciplined his emotions. Whenever one goes counter to the basic strong currents of life, he shall one day find that he was merely deluding himself. This challenge demands more than understanding and sympathy, more than just token performance. It demands the developing of the sense of personal responsibility and initiative to bring order to a heartsick world. However, in trying to do our personal thing to help bring about this order we must act orderly.

In every game or situation throughout life there must be a set of rules. We cannot as we call it play the game unless these rules are clearly defined and then lived up to.

Someone in authority has set out the rules and regulations of all the sports represented;—be it baseball, tennis, track or golf which we must respect in order to play correctly. Ignorance especially in this special world of sports is no excuse.

Today the word rules is a real "red flag" term to some people. They don't like "rules" and they let the world know how they feel about them.

It is human nature to resist barriers. It seems to irritate our urge or drive for self survival. Even animals don't like cages or restrictions of any sort. They want to be free. Man usually desires freedom of expression. When this is stymied he resists it in various ways. Therefore, it is easy to see why some people react unfavorably to any type of rules and regulations. In a civilized society man can be free only when he obeys laws and abides by rules.

Order makes life possible. Order is hooks for hats, racks for shoes, procedures for traffic and a place for everything. Order is the frame without which all values lose shape. Order is the ground beneath our feet. Those who cry for immediate and drastic changes at the time of disorder and violence should recall that without order no one can have anything. Order is rules and regulations that are so vitally necessary to preserve our liberty. The youth minority that I spoke of earlier feel that this precious liberty that we have and are fighting so hard for means doing just what they please. Don't allow them to confuse you.

The Liberty of one person ends where the liberty of other persons begins. In order to have liberty there must be responsibility and observance of laws. Rules and regulations are vitally necessary for the preservation of law and order. Any other means will lead to chaos and disorder. Liberty does not confer the privilege of infringing on the rights of others. It must be exercised within reason, kept under control. It must be within the law. As good Americans, proud of our country we must be ever ready to defend our rights, and under God, exercise our heritage as law abiding citizens.

Today the greatest thing in the world is not money, not big buildings, nor armies of atomic power but character.

When Horace Greeley was dying he exclaimed "Fame is a vapor, popularity an accident, riches take wings, those who cheer today will curse tomorrow only one thing endures, character!"

These weighty words bid all remember that life's one task is the making of manhood—our world is a college, events are teachers, happiness is the graduating point, character is the diploma God gives man.

This world of ours needs men who can be depended upon, who puts others before themselves and who are not afraid to be counted. Those who are able to add something to the uplifting of political life, something to the brotherhood of social life, something to the practical efficiency of spiritual life, the ability to agree to disagree without being disagreeable and the good old common sense to weigh all the values before making a decision. Then and only then will we have done mankind a real service.

Life is good if we play according to the rules. But we cannot live and make ourselves better for ourselves alone. While self preservation is a fundamental instinct of human nature, consideration for others is a primary law of society. This primary law should be our doctrine in our quest and hope for the blessings of a real and lasting peace.

The noted critic John Mason Brown gave vivid testimony to the joy of service in these words and I quote: "No one I am convinced, can be happy who lives only for himself, better, more enduring and worthier than we are. People, ideas, causes—these offer the one possible escape not merely from selfishness but from the hungers of solitude and the sorrows of aimlessness."

The pitiful people are those who in their living elect to be spectators rather than participants; the tragic ones are those sight-seers who turn their backs deliberately on the procession. The only true happiness comes from squandering ourselves for a purpose. In the struggle in which the free world is now engaged there is no assurance that we shall survive, unless as individual men and women we possess those qualities of character which determine, finally whether a civilization lives or whether it dies. So my friends, lets get involved, but lets remember the rules. Our future is unlimited to the extent of what we can do as civilized human beings, as good members of our community, as good Americans imbued with the doctrine of the four freedoms to further and expound the precepts and ideals of peace, brotherly love, democracy and "Whats right with America" for all mankind.

THE AGE OF AQUARIUS

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the Members to a speech, "The Age of Aquarius," delivered by Miss Betsy Ballard, a freshman student at East Central State College, Ada, Okla., in my district. Miss Ballard is considered one of the most gifted contestants ever to participate in the 24-year-old Third District Oratorical Contest.

There are six colleges in my district, four of which are 2-year colleges, and two 4-year. Each college is eligible to send a freshman or sophomore representative to this event which is hosted each year on a different campus.

The 1970 first-place winner is a speech and drama major and an accomplished debater. Her speech was delivered from notes, and at my request was written in essay form from memory. Her theme, the problems of self-identification and communication, while not unusual, is dealt with in a highly original manner, which to my mind indicates that the writer has no problem in either area. Miss Ballard's oration follows:

THE AGE OF AQUARIUS

(By Betsy Ballard)

"When the moon is in the seventh house, and Jupiter aligns with Mars, then peace will guide the planet and love will steer the stars." Perhaps when you heard these words from the Broadway musical, *Hair*, you wondered, as I did, just when this magical "Age of Aquarius" is ever going to take place. Maybe you listened to those lyrics which proclaimed a beautiful future time when everyone is going to get along perfectly, there aren't going to be any problems—no strife; and then you picked up a newspaper and read the headlines and realized that things are not getting any better. They're getting worse. Maybe then you realized, as I did, that this situation stems, in part, from the individual; that the individual faces two staggering problems in today's society: self-identification and communication.

First of all, how do you find your own particular self? I'm sure that everyone here at one time or another has wondered to himself, "Who am I? Will I ever be able to make a place for myself? Will I ever belong?" These questions are by no means new, but in today's highly complex society where pressures to conform are always increasing and machines seem to be turning out more and more carbon copies of people, this search for identity has become increasingly important. The futility of finding one's self was once summed up in a short poem by e. e. cummings:

"To be yourself
in a world that is doing its best
night and day
to make you someone else
means to fight the hardest battle
that any human being can fight
and never stop fighting."

But now some people have stopped fighting, and that's where the trouble lies. An example of this is the extreme polarization of the age groups. In an effort to achieve some security, many young people have turned to drugs, dirt and long hair. They have joined the youth movement so that they may hold up a mask to the world and say, "This is me. This is where I belong." But they haven't

really come any closer to finding themselves. They haven't really solved any problem. They have given up their individuality for a false sense of belonging, for a comforting semblance to present to the world.

But the older people are just as guilty, in their own way. In their search for identity, many of them have joined what is now termed the "Silent Majority." They wear their conservative suits, drive their reasonably-priced cars and condemn anything new, better or different, as radical. They, too, have not found themselves. They, too, are hiding behind a mask.

But let's say that you are lucky enough to find your own particular self; what happens then? You run up against the second problem: communication. How do you stand up and say, "This is how I will be accepted."? It isn't easy. This is evidenced by the recent segregation disagreements. The children in the buses are saying, "We want to be educated. We want to go to school here. This is us: accept us." While the adults outside throwing the bricks are saying, "This is our school. This is our system. We don't want you here. Accept that." Both groups are desperately trying to be heard, but neither is trying to hear. This lack of communication has been satirized in a popular song, "The Rapper," which states that people today don't ever touch—they rap. They never really become part of anyone else.

Perhaps by now you're wondering, "Just what can I do to help? What would my own little effort accomplish?" Well, I wondered the same thing and I came up with a few solutions. You can do one of three things: first, you can do one stupid thing a day. Now, it has to be something stupid. It can't have any purpose or meaning, just something to help let off steam. Speaking from personal experience, I'll show you how this works: I stayed up very late one night, finishing a research paper over Adolph Hitler and the concentration camps. I was really depressed when I finished it, both because of the subject matter and the time I spent on it. In a way, I felt somehow responsible for what had happened to the Jews during world War II. Anyway, I finished it and turned it in the next day, and I was walking across campus with my arms full of books I'd used to research the subject, when all of a sudden it hit me: I'm done with the thing! And I just had to do something, so I threw all my books into the air and watched them fall and fell to my knees in the grass, screaming and praising the Lord. And you know, that was a stupid thing to do, but I felt better than I had in weeks—I felt released. Now someone is always going to point to the holes in this; they would have pointed out to me that the library book cover I ripped off cost me two and a half dollars, and that the people in the classes that I disturbed with my yelling were really annoyed. But I think that if I weighed the cost of that library book and the disturbance I caused against the feeling of relief I experienced, I'd find out that I came out ahead, and I'd do it again.

But I'm not saying that that will work for everyone. If you don't want to do that, you can adopt a slogan to live by. Just some simple phrase that will help you when the pressures build up. The Trappist Monks in Kentucky have one: theirs is "Work and pray" and that seems to work for them. But yours doesn't have to be anything serious, it could be "Prunes will conquer the world" or "Purple bunny rabbits are far superior to white ones" or anything that strikes your fancy.

But if you don't want to do either of those things, if you go in for something difficult, something meaningful, greet one person a day sincerely, from your heart. I believe the greeting in the times of the apostles went, "The blessings of God be upon you and your family." Try and put that amount of sincerity into your greeting. Just go up to

someone you know, or someone you don't know and say, "Hello, friend," and watch what they do. They might walk away, they might not even look at you. But they might answer you, "Hello, friend." And for that one brief moment, you won't have rapped—you'll have touched; you will have become a part of someone else. You will have communicated.

My advice was once summed up by a far more capable source when, in *Hamlet*, old Polonius says to his son Laertes, "To thine own self be true. Thus it must follow, as the night the day, thou canst not then be false to any man."

Well, I started out with *Hair*, then moved from E. E. Cummings to Shakespeare; perhaps it might be well to wind up with *Hair*. The rest of the song goes: "Harmony and understanding, sympathy and trust abounding. No more falsehoods or derisions—golden living dreams of visions. Mystic crystal revelations and the mind's true liberation."

It's a beautiful dream, isn't it? But, you know, it's never going to happen, not until the problems of self-identification and communication are answered. And I can't answer them because they are such purely personal problems. I can't offer an all-encompassing solution that will work for everyone—the ones I offered are purely superficial; they won't solve the problems of segregation or bridge the generation gap. They won't accomplish anything until there is a change in people. Until there is a change in me and a change in you to make us realize the supreme of recognizing and becoming the individual and of striving for and achieving true communication. But maybe some day this will take place; maybe some day this will actually happen. And then "to be yourself" won't be "the hardest battle any human being can fight." Maybe then we will find ourselves living in the Age of Aquarius.

RESOURCES AND THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, there is a little need for me to comment on the importance of maintaining a proper environment in this Nation, and indeed throughout the world, if man is to continue to live in comfort and security on the planet earth. A great deal has been written on this subject in recent months. Much of this material has been excellent but some, unfortunately, has not been accurate and, in my opinion, it has missed the mark by indicating that man alone is the only factor that has caused a degradation in our environment. Man certainly has caused changes in the environment, and many of these changes have been thoughtless and unnecessarily harmful. However, it seems to me that what we must strive to achieve is not a static environment, not one in which there is no change or progress, but rather one in which there is a balance between the needs of man and the needs of nature. I do not look forward to the time when industrial or technological progress and advancement must stop and I do not think it is necessary that they stop. Redirected, yes, but not stopped.

It was my privilege recently to appear at the commencement exercises at

the Colorado School of Mines at Golden, Colo. One of the participants on that occasion was Dr. William T. Pecora, Director of the U.S. Geological Survey. Dr. Pecora's remarks on the environment and the need for balance between the needs of man and those of nature struck me as being both objective and pertinent and I commend them to my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the address by Dr. Pecora in the RECORD:

RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT—QUEST
FOR BALANCE

(By W. T. Pecora, Director, U.S.
Geological Survey)

Ancient man lived in harmony with nature. His existence was precarious but he accepted the good and the bad as qualities beyond his control and he stood in awe at natural phenomena he could not understand. From this humble beginning evolved our present society which now indicts man for all environmental ills and assumes that nature can be shaped to meet his every need. The ability to maintain an acceptable environment can be hindered by failure to recognize basic earth processes and quality patterns beyond our control. With the intellectual development now achieved by man, it is inexcusable that we should fail to predict responses of nature consequent to our own development. Environmental degradation is a natural process on earth. Man, however, is beginning to contribute to that degradation in large measure in certain areas. Man has begun to develop an awareness that better housekeeping of the earth must be practiced as he continues to take from the earth the things he needs and uses.

PLANET EARTH IS MAN'S ABODE

For some 5 billion years the planet Earth has revolved about the sun; and there is good reason to believe its journey will extend beyond another 5 billion years. Throughout this period the earth has undergone constant change—mountains have risen where oceans formerly existed; animal and plant species have flourished and become extinct; earthquakes and volcanoes have always been with us; rivers and plains have appeared and reappeared; and glaciers have covered large segments of the planet many times. Although on Earth but a few million years at the most, man has in the past 200 years unraveled a great deal of earth history and learned how to use the planet to meet his growing needs for survival.

As earthbound residents, we look constantly, nevertheless, to other planets. One, the moon, satellite of the earth, has already been visited and found to be totally hostile to man. The surface of Venus is too hot for us, and Mars offers little, if any hope. The other planets are simply out of the question. Man, indeed, is earthbound and we must learn to accept this inescapable circumstance.

Of the billions of galaxies that exist in the universe, perhaps there is at least one other solar system like ours with a planet in the same solar position. Wherever that may be, it is beyond our reach, however great our expectation. We must learn to live on this planet throughout our full existence as one species.

CIVILIZATION ALWAYS MOVES FORWARD

Man has achieved phenomenal advance over 10,000 years in the face of a world population increase from a few million then to 3½ billion today. The complex development of society over this period was accomplished because man has an intellect that could innovate, plan, acquire information, store it, pass it along to succeeding generations, and increase the level of its systemic intellect through research and development. What has often been called intellectual curiosity, as

directed toward our total environment, is really a necessity by society if it is to avert disaster.

Man now truly inhabits the entire planet. He has crossed mountains and oceans, explored the poles, and burrowed deeply underground. The simple but astute primitive observer of nature and natural processes has developed into the creative scientists who serves man's mind in seeking to feed the technologic engines of modern society. Those unique quinquereimes of ancient times have developed into jet aircraft; simple mathematical devices that were developed separately in different civilizations have grown into complex modern computer systems; signal drums have blossomed into telecommunications systems that link hemispheres. Real time for man now has real meaning, and you are part of all of this. You cannot ignore nor escape your role. Your generation will do deeds only dreamed of by mine, just as my generation made a giant step from my father's. The status quo may have meaning for other species on earth; but for man there is no status quo because of his intellectual capability.

PROJECTED RESOURCE NEEDS OF THE
UNITED STATES

Let's take a look at the resource needs of the society that makes up the United States of America. We are at the apex of civilization, and yet within the life span of 200 million people now living in the United States, this nation will consume from the earth:

6½ quadrillion gallons of water
7½ billion tons of iron ore
1½ billion tons of aluminum ore
1 billion tons of phosphate rock
100 million tons of copper and so forth.

In 40 years, our population will double. Just think of the added requirements of the next generation!

Water usage will triple by the year 2,000
Energy requirements will triple by the year 2,000

By the year 2,000 we will have to construct as many houses and other facilities as now exist in the United States.

This staggering amount of natural mineral resources upon which the sustenance of the Nation depends imposes a tremendous task of new discovery, and new development. How can we do this without changing the character of our environment; for society must also provide against excessive noise, excessive pollution, excessive degradation of the landscape, water-scape, and sea-scape. We do want the best of all worlds!

If this be the situation for the United States, certainly resource needs for the rest of the world command even greater attention. Developing nations seek fulfillment in health and economic betterment. The crust of the earth is worldwide and knowledge gained in one country can be used to good advantage by scientists and engineers in others. The crust of the earth has full potential to provide for man's needs if we have the motivation to procure and develop. The problem for mankind is universal—planetary—not national. Certainly international competition cannot go on forever; wars must cease and man's society must be planetized if the species, *Homo sapiens*, shall persist on this earth.

If we must therefore take from the earth to provide for ourselves we must employ value judgment and trade-off concepts in deciding how much to take from our environment, where to take it, and how to leave it in the taking and using. Take and use we must or we cannot survive as a species on earth.

THE NEED FOR RESEARCH

If the earth shall provide the materials for the survival of man's society, then a prudent society must provide for an intimate understanding of the earth, inquiry into geologic processes that have operated over the span

of earth history, and operate today, continuing inventory of current and potential resources, and continuing effort to develop new techniques for information-gathering systems. Research and technologic development are costly investments; but they pay off handsomely in long term benefits. Too often a society thinks only of "now." The cumulative benefits of early endeavors, on hindsight, are superb demonstration that today's long term is tomorrow's short term. Time, for man, is a long continuum.

The best example of this is the basic mapping systems that have been developed in the past. These include base topographic maps, geologic maps, hydrologic maps, geophysical maps, geochemical maps, and thematic, environmental, special subject maps. All of these are the products of intensive research effort. I am concerned that the pace of doing this kind of work has slowed down in recent years and I predict that our society will suffer for it. Our priorities will have to be reordered because of increasing needs of a World society that has a divine right under God to utilize our planet's total resources and to better the lot of man on earth.

PRIMARY NATIONAL RESOURCES GOAL

The United States, from its very inception, has been accused of placing too much emphasis upon the accumulation of wealth and too much effort in raising, through industry, its so-called standard of living. This view was first stated unequivocally in 1831 by Alexis de Tocqueville, a French Nobleman who visited this country when it had 24 states and 13 million people. Similar views are being stated today, as we have grown to 50 states and 200 million people. The American democracy and its free enterprise system is a great and successful experiment, the first of its kind in the history of civilization. I, personally, see nothing wrong with dedication of individuals, or groups, toward amassment of wealth through honest industry. But in the process of achieving these goals our society unwittingly, or knowingly, has permitted deterioration of other values, not measurable in dollars or numbers, and which affect the quality of individual life in many ways. The growth of science and technology in discovery and utilization of our basic resources has failed in some ways and in many places to retain or fortify man's natural environment.

SOME MYTHS OF OUR ENVIRONMENT

It is believed by many people in this country that man alone is degrading and polluting his environment because of our modern industrial society. Some myths, however, need to be destroyed. Let me cite a few natural earth processes to demonstrate that natural processes are by far the principal agents in modifying our environment. This is not to excuse or put aside what man does, but rather to put man's actions in proper natural perspective. Those individuals who speak about restoring our inherited environment of pure air, pure rain, pure water, pure lakes, and pure coastlines ignore the inevitability of nature.

It has been calculated that more than 100 million tons of fixed nitrogen in the form of ammonia and nitrates is annually transferred from the atmosphere to the surface of the earth as part of a natural precipitation process. In the United States alone there falls upon the face of our land annually more than 4 million tons of table salt, 2½ million tons of sodium sulphate, and 36 million tons of calcium compounds—all in rain water.

Particulate matter and natural gasses dispersed from the volcanoes is a continuing phenomenon. From three eruptions alone, the Krakatau eruption in Java (1883), the Mount Katmai eruption in Alaska (1912), and the Hekla eruption in Iceland (1947) more particulate matter in the form of dust and ash and more combined gasses were

ejected into the atmosphere than from all of mankind's activity. Add to current volcanic processes the normal action of winds, forest fires, and evaporation from the sea, and we can readily conclude that man is an insignificant agent in the total picture, although he is becoming an important agent in extremely local context.

We have long been led to believe that water issuing from natural springs is pure and beneficial to health because of its purity. The springs issuing into the Arkansas and Red Rivers carry 17 tons of salt per minute. In the Lower Colorado River salt springs carry 1,500 tons of salt per day. The Lemonade Springs in New Mexico carry 900 pounds of sulphuric acid per million pounds of water, which is ten times the acid concentration of most acid mine streams in the country. Hot Springs in Yellowstone Park is likewise many times more acidic than the typical acid stream in a coal mining district. The Azure Yampah spring in Colorado contains eight times the radium that the Public Health Service sets as a safe limit. These are but a few examples of the kind of pollution that goes on continually from natural springs.

The lakes and ponds throughout geologic history have gone through a life cycle of birth, maturity, old age, and disappearance. No lake is truly permanent. Some of our inland lakes during their mature stage become more salty than the ocean itself. The Great Salt Lake is nearing its dying stages. Once 20,000 sq. mi. in area, (Lake Bonneville), it is now only 950 sq. mi. in area. Many thousands of years ago it was essentially a fresh water lake, fed during the pluvial period of the Great Ice Age, and now it is about ten times as salty as sea water.

We frequently hear that Lake Erie is dead. This is pure rubbish. Lake Erie is the shallowest of the Great Lakes, was created about 20,000 years ago and, barring another Ice Age, has several thousand of years yet to go before senility. The western part of the lake is extremely shallow and receives a large amount of natural organic material transported from the surrounding terrain. Here is where the algae growth has always been present. Lake Erie has continually produced about 50% of the fish catch of the entire Great Lakes system, consistently over the past 100 years. This is not a mark of a dead lake. Green Bay, of Lake Michigan, so named by the first settlers because of the green color of the algae so prevalent in the Bay is, like the western shallow part of Lake Erie, the source of a great amount of organic matter. The food supply for aquatic life is high in these environments. The oxygen supply, unfortunately, diminishes as algae growth increases, as this portion of the lake becomes more and more shallow and as organic material is swept into the water, whether from natural or human sources. Every lake or pond, whether natural or man-made, faces a similar life history. Man can certainly better or worsen a natural situation like this.

The rivers of our nation are being called dirty because of the works of man. We must understand that the river systems of the land are the natural transport systems for sediment washed downhill by the rains that fall upon the land. It is estimated that the Mississippi River carries into the Gulf a load of more than 2 million tons of sediment per day. This is equivalent to the load of 40,000 freight cars. The Colorado River carries into Lake Mead about 40,000 tons per day. The Paria River in Arizona is probably the dirtiest river in the world. It carries 500 times as much sediment as the Mississippi River per unit volume of water. This is a continuing condition year after year. Chemicals are also transported by streams in phenomenal amounts. The Brazos River of Texas, for example, transports 25,000 tons of dissolved salt per day. Peace Creek in Florida carries

twice the concentration of fluoride that is harmful to teeth. Many rivers and streams throughout the nation have natural qualities that do not meet the public health standards for drinking water.

The ocean has been the natural waste sink for the large-scale, natural pollution process of the earth. The character of the ocean itself has changed slowly throughout geologic time, while it has continually supported abundant life of all varieties.

MAN AS A GEOLOGIC AGENT

It must be quite evident that, although natural earth processes dwarf the actions of man in a total context, man can become a major geologic agent in a specific or local context. This inter reaction of man with nature is without question a most important issue of future years. In a society that has reached maturity in the industrial sense, the issue of environmental alteration becomes more and more acute. It is within this framework that certain actions 100 or 200 years ago are now considered sinful.

The philosophy of engineering project costs is being modified to allow for certain actions which in the past were not factored into our cost analyses. A mineral resource, for example, should not be developed unless it is rich enough to support proper restoration or re-utilization of the land. A major pipeline traversing Alaska some 800 miles should not be constructed without added safeguards to protect the natural environment. Offshore drilling for petroleum should not be endorsed without the added cost of providing maximum safeguards against pollution. Cities and industries should not use the water available from natural sources without factoring in the cost of returning the water to a usable state. The smokestacks of our refineries and energy plants must not treat materials that put unwanted matter into our air. Reservoirs are constructed and rivers are diverted. These problems and others like them are familiar to all of you. The science and technology which has made possible the great advance of mankind can surely pay attention to these matters and resolve them.

Who will bear the cost, however? Who will make the policy decisions? We know that government agencies have been urged by the people to regulate these matters, but who will pay the cost, I ask, for what I am convinced science and technology can do to ameliorate the situation. It must be the people. Whether through their tax participation or whether it be in the higher cost of a product, the people must pay the cost both in dollars and in landscape changes for taking from the environment what mankind needs. We who represent science and technology can show how resources can be utilized with minimal alteration or degradation of the environment. We can do this, however, only by making a complete inventory of cause and effect—in other words—spelling out our costs and trade offs in more than just dollars. President Nixon and Secretary Hicel have spoken of this on many occasions.

A GREATER ROLE FOR ENGINEERING

Throughout history engineering accomplishment has been a magnificent measure of human achievement, particularly where new challenges were posed. Daring projects, planned on basic natural laws, carefully monitored in the design and construction stages, became on hindsight well-conceived operations. For those times the ancient irrigation system of Mesopotamia, the Roman aqueduct, the pyramids were utterly fantastic operations. The hot water supply at Bath, England still functions perfectly almost 2,000 years after its construction. Today the Hoover Dam, the Open Pit at Bingham, Utah, the Golden Gate Bridge or the Hudson River Tunnel mark great ventures of our own era.

Although the engineering profession today

is recognized as one which gets things done, it is also recognized as one that is essentially pragmatic in acquiring maximum integrity of structure and function at minimum cost. A new ethic for engineering is evolving. More and more concern is being directed to areas of social impact arising from waste products disposal and environmental degradation.

In the 1969 Christmas Pageant of Peace in Washington, D.C. pine trees marked a path for the States of the Union—each tree for a state. These trees had been supplied by a private company in the Midwest and grown on restored lands where ugly coal strip mines had disrupted the landscape. The mining venture here was but an incident in a time plan. How proud I was to see this; but so few people know of it and other cases like it. So many are angry over chemical wastes dumped into lakes and rivers and gaseous products from smelters and coal-burning smoke stacks emitted to the air. And their numbers are increasing!

The value of the extractive mineral resources in the United States is currently in the order of \$30 billion annually. This includes both the energy and hard mineral resources. The impact of that part of the engineering profession responsible for this mineral production, and its subsequent use in the economy, is profound on the maintenance of our way of life. American industry is in trouble, however, because of past abuses to the environment which admittedly have been magnified or distorted by some critics. Profit has become an ugly word and the concept of service to mankind derived from engineering practice is being ridiculed in many places. We are in the midst of a conflict between the need to develop our resources and the need to preserve our environment—both for the benefit of mankind. In your chosen profession of engineering you will be very much involved—you will be subject to pressures from both sides and you must be responsive. Do not be silent under attack.

You young graduates will one day be leaders in your profession. The principal obligation of leadership is to be alert to the issues, to make tough value judgments, to be forthright in your expressions to management and to the community, to seek facts but, in the absence of total facts, to have the courage to make gut decisions with a constant edge toward people and people's problems. This is your quest—a quest for balance.

You may have read the words expressed by H. L. Keenleyside of Canada before a United Nations Scientific Conference. They came from a poem of James Russell Lowell in his tribute to Cromwell. More than anything else they represent the philosophic view I am presenting to you today. Let me give those words to you now:

"New times demand new measures and new men;

The World advances, and in time outgrows
The laws that in our father's day were best;
And doubtless, after us some better scheme
Will be shaped out by wiser men than we,
Made wiser by the steady growth of truth."

God be with you in your life's endeavor.
Never, Never, shade the Truth. Thank you!

WESTERN UNION SERVICE TO CONGRESS LAGS

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on many occasions in recent months, I have dis-

covered that important telegrams from constituents were arriving in my congressional office after the vote occurred in the House. As the pattern continued, I began to check carefully only to discover that the timelag between the time some telegrams arrive and the time they are delivered is inconceivably long, and so long as to render them useless.

The most glaring example occurred just today. I requested important information from my State on pending legislation. As the vote approached, the telegraphed information still had not arrived, so I telephoned the Governor's office and had the text of the telegram dictated.

The telegram finally arrived, dated as having been received at 12:58 a.m., yet it was not delivered to my office until 3:45 p.m. At the same time, a telegram was delivered that had been received by Western Union at 8:31 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, this is deplorable service from a company that is trusted by the sender for speed and accuracy. I suggest that the Committee on House Administration investigate this service, and if my experiences are being shared by other Members, that they join me in this complaint.

VIOLENCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. RAY BLANTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the right to assemble to petition the Government is a basic democratic privilege of a free people. In the United States, it is guaranteed by the Constitution.

As much as I respect and cherish this right of the people, I have become alarmed at the violence which permeates antiwar demonstrations here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I requested the District of Columbia government to compile statistics for me, which indicate the number of arrests made during recent demonstrations, and the cost to the taxpayers in terms of damage to public and private property, police overtime, and cleanup details. The point I want to make is

that the right to peaceful assembly is worth the cost to the taxpayers in the protection we should afford demonstrators as well as the necessary cleanup which follows any massive gathering of people. But the taxpayers should not have to pay for people who by design provoke violence and who abuse their rights.

Since January of last year, antiwar demonstrations which started with the inauguration ceremonies of the President have cost the taxpayers \$1,581,236 in police overtime and cleanup alone, not to mention the thousands of dollars in time consumed in courts and administrative procedures prior to and following demonstrations.

Damage to public property and to private property in Washington, D.C., has exceeded \$450,000. At least 39 police officers sustained injuries and at least 730 demonstrators and on-lookers.

These figures cover four demonstrations, including those at the inauguration, the October and November moratorium demonstrations and the most recent May 1970 antiwar demonstrations.

Mr. Speaker, I am greatly concerned about reports reaching me that veteran, professional demonstrators are telling prospective demonstrators that they can come to the Nation's Capital and participate in demonstrations, and if they are arrested during violence of any type, they can get off with very minor penalties. A look at the statistics on arrests and disposition of cases unfortunately confirms the fact that most participants arrested do indeed get off lightly.

It is a practice in the District of Columbia for the Board of Judges to set a "collateral" for arrests of various offenses. The standard collateral used during demonstrations ranges from \$5 to \$25. Only recently, during the demonstration at American University here was the collateral raised to \$50, and it was done so during the last day of the nearly week-old confrontations which took part in the American University area.

The rather ridiculously low collateral amounts to a small fine. The arrested individual puts up the \$5, \$10 or \$25 in lieu of being taken into custody. He can forfeit it, and that is the end of his case.

It is no small wonder that less than 20 percent of the arrested persons during demonstrations actually went to court, during the last four demonstrations.

Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues will agree that perhaps we need to study the feasibility of legislation which will limit the discretionary power of the Board of Judges to set such low collateral penalties. As a more effective deterrent, we may need a \$50 minimum across the board on offenses, or a selective procedure whereby at least some of the offenses, such as the throwing of missiles, destruction of property and defacing of property, have a higher collateral requirement. I note with particular interest that while there is a Federal statute setting a rather stiff penalty for mutilation of the U.S. flag, five persons during the inaugural demonstrations forfeited a mere \$25 collateral and that was the full extent of their punishment. If we are to have respect for the law, then laws must be obeyed and violators must be prosecuted, and I wonder why these five persons were allowed such light penalties.

A look at the charts will bring immediately to mind the thought that it is no wonder why people come to demonstrations in Washington, D.C., and have little fear of participating in unlawful or destructive activity.

It appears to me that the Corporation Counsel's Office should review their procedures, and I encourage them to recommend to the Board of Judges more adequate steps to deal with unlawful activities during demonstrations, and in particular, procedures regarding collateral. Likewise, I believe Congress needs to make a full study of the procedures used, and perhaps legislation in this field is not only warranted, but long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following charts in this text. I am including figures for the 1967 demonstration along with the January 1969, October 1969, November 1969, and May 1970 antiwar demonstration, along with injuries and cost figures. I am enclosing, as a sample of the breakdown of cost figures, a chart showing the cost to the District of Columbia government for the antiwar demonstration in May of this year, and November of last year.

Vietnam war moratorium and Three Sisters Bridge, Oct. 15, 1969

Charge—Disorderly:	Number
Arrests	135
Elect to forfeit \$10	126
Forfeit in court \$10	4
Juveniles turned over to the youth division	5

INAUGURAL ARRESTS JANUARY 18, THROUGH JANUARY 20, 1969

Charge	Total	Elect forfeit \$10	Elect forfeit \$25	Elect forfeit \$5	Nolle pros	No paper	Guilty	Juveniles turned over to youth aid
Disorderly	75	70			1			4
Destruction of property	4	1					(1)	1
Mutilation of U.S. flag	3		2				(2)	
Pedestrian violation	9			9				
Depositing trash	1	1						
Placing advertisement	1		1					
Burning of U.S. flag	3		3					
Throwing missiles	2		2					
C.D.W.	2					1		1
Assault on police	1					1		
Total	101	72	8	9	1	2	3	6

* 1-\$100 or 30 days—1 to 30 days.
 † 1 to 60 days.

NEW MOBILIZATION AND VIETNAM EMBASSY DEMONSTRATIONS NOV. 14 THROUGH NOV. 17, 1969

Charge	Total	Elect forfeit \$10	Forfeit in court	No papers	Nolle pros	Not guilty	Dismissed	Continued in court	Juveniles turned over to youth aid	Guilty
Disorderly	172	105	38	11	7	2		1	8	
Destruction of property	2								1	(1)
Mutilation of U.S. flag	2			1					1	
Unlawful entry	2					2				
Demonstrating within 500 feet of an embassy	19				15	1	3			
Pedestrian violation	21	20	1							
Dangerous Drug Act	1							1		
Defacing Washington Monument	1		1							
C.D.W. knife	1					1				
Assault on police	3				2	1				
Trespassing	3			2						1
Impeding traffic	1	1								
Unlawful assembly	2		1							1
Total	230	126	41	14	24	7	3	2	12	1

¹ 1 to 180 days.

PEACE MARCH, AMERICAN UNIVERSITY DEMONSTRATION, AND HEW DEMONSTRATION, MAY 8 THROUGH MAY 14, 1970

Charge	Total	Elect forfeit \$10	Elect forfeit \$25	Forfeit in court	Guilty	Not guilty	No papers	Nolle pros	Continued in court	Juveniles turned over to youth aid	Turned over to ASPD
Disorderly	365	174	19	133	1	1	25	3	3	4	2
Destruction of property	3			2					1		
A.D.W.	1						1				
Assault on police	1								1		
P.P.W.	1						1				
Dangerous Drug Act	1								1		
Throwing missiles	1			1							
Indecent exposure	5		4								
Violation police line	10	5		5							
Improper riding auto	3	2		1							
No driver's permit	1			1							
Pedestrian violation	1	1									
Total	393	182	23	144	1	1	27	3	6	4	2

INJURIES/COST—ANTIWAR DEMONSTRATIONS IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

	October 1967	January 1969	October 1969	November 1969	May 1970
Injuries:					
a. To police officers	13	(1)	None	26	13
b. To military personnel	10	(1)	None	0	0
c. To demonstrators/onlookers	24	(1)	None	580	150
Estimated damage to public and private property	(1)	(1)	None	\$244,130 to \$268,130	\$185,325
Estimated cost to Government for police overtime and cleanup	\$129,475	\$265,100	\$27,422	\$688,714	\$600,000

¹ Unknown.

² Major portion were those treated for exposure to tear gas.

SUMMARY OF COSTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, ANTIWAR DEMONSTRATION OF MAY 9-10, 1970

Agency	Direct costs	Indirect costs	Total costs	Funds absorbed by agency	Additional funds needed	Agency	Direct costs	Indirect costs	Total costs	Funds absorbed by agency	Additional funds needed
Office of the Commissioner	\$253		\$253	\$253		Fire Department	\$1,083		\$1,083	\$1,083	
Public Affairs Office	268		268	268		Juvenile Court	82		82	82	
Corporation Counsel	1,909		1,909	181	\$1,729	Department of Corrections	15,000		15,000		
Personnel Office	417		417	417		Recreation Department	4,198		4,198		\$4,198
Office of Community Services	71		71	71		National Park Service	27,572		27,572	27,572	
Department of General Services		\$1,283	1,283	1,283		Vocational Rehabilitation	187		187	187	
Office of Civil Defense	2,722		2,722	2,722		Public Health	5,418	\$958	6,376	6,376	
Department of Economic Development	2,217		2,217	2,217		Public Welfare	498	133	631	631	
Youth Opportunity Services	396		396	396		Department of Highways and Traffic	11,402		11,402		11,402
Coroner's Office	199		199		199	Sanitary Engineering	8,697		8,697		8,697
Zoning Commission		60	60	60		Total			613,844		
Metropolitan Police	528,821		528,821	528,821							

Source: Office of Budget and Executive Management, May 22, 1970.

ANTIWAR DEMONSTRATION OF NOV. 13-15, COSTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Agency	Direct costs	Indirect costs	Total costs	Funds absorbed by agency	Additional funds needed	Agency	Direct costs	Indirect costs	Total costs	Funds absorbed by agency	Additional funds needed
Corporation Counsel	\$3,399		\$3,399	\$3,399		Public Schools	\$107	\$830	\$937	\$937	
Department of General Services		\$3,979	3,979	232	\$3,979	Recreation Department	4,209		4,209		\$4,209
Department of Economic Development	232		232	232		National Park Service	41,725		41,725	41,725	
Office of the Coroner	445		445	445		Department of Public Health	33,989	1,806	35,795	15,795	20,000
Metropolitan Police	544,502		544,502	101,220	443,282	Department of Public Welfare	9,508		9,508	9,508	
Fire Department	5,642		5,642		5,642	Department of Highways and Traffic	17,956		17,956	17,956	
Office of Civil Defense	2,969	26	2,995		2,995	Department of Sanitary Engineering	6,006		6,006		6,006
Legal Aid Agency	22		22	22		Total	681,523	7,191	688,714	191,471	497,243
D.C. Bail Agency	232		232	232							
Department of Corrections	10,500	630	11,130		11,130						

Source: Office of Budget and Executive Department, Nov. 26, 1969.

THE SOYBEAN REVITALIZATION
TOOK COURAGE—A TRIBUTE TO
THE HARDIN AND PALMBY POLI-
CIES

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, to those who are interested in the prosperity of the soybean producer, I wish today to call attention to some basic facts about soybeans and especially the current market prices for soybeans. Today's Wall Street Journal indicates that the free market price is about 10 cents per bushel above the 1969 level. The current market price structure is a reflection of the basic fact that a market oriented price support policy and astute market expanding operations replaced the previous uneconomic market destroying policies. For the wisdom of this new policy, I am today paying tribute to Secretary Hardin and his excellent Assistant Secretary Palmby.

If we are to fully appreciate the dimensions of the accomplishment of this team, we must understand the problems left by the previous administration. Let us examine the following adverse inherited factors:

First. Soybean carryover stocks had leaped to 324.4 million bushels—nine times greater than the September 1, 1966 carryover—and over three times the level considered as a desirable carryover by several study groups.

Second. The September 1, 1969 investment by CCC, under loan and in inventory, covered about 337 million bushels with a value of \$857 million. Annual interest and storage alone was costing \$100 million.

Third. Until 1966, when the price support was raised from \$2.25 to \$2.50 per bushel, soybeans had been experiencing steady growth in markets and production. Demand had been increasing at a 9 percent annual rate through 1965, but in the 1966-68 period, the increase dropped to only 4 percent. The uneconomic loan level created stagnation in a commodity which had been the fastest growing one among all the crops.

Fourth. Primarily as a result of the uneconomic loan for soybeans in the United States, Russian sunflower and Canadian and European rapeseed production were stimulated. The expanded production and exports of oil from these foreign oilseed crops were made possible because of lower prices than U.S. produced soybean oil. The result was a considerable loss of hard-won dollar markets for oil. Some oil was actually imported.

Fifth. Under present legislation, when soybeans are supported, cottonseed must also be supported in a fair relationship to soybeans. Under this related program, CCC acquired from the 1968 crop about 300 million pounds of cottonseed oil and about 140,000 tons of cottonseed meal—at a cost of about \$50 million.

Sixth. Imports of competitive fishmeal increased sharply with deleterious effects on our balance of payments.

Facing this adverse combination of factors, Secretary Hardin declared:

Continuation of trends prevailing for the past two years could, in the long run, have a destructive effect upon the soybean industry and upon producer income from the crop. Further, if the current price-support level is continued another year, the resulting CCC investment in soybeans could prove to be disastrous.

Economists estimate that continuation of the program as it was for the past two years with support at \$2.50 per bushel would cause a buildup in carryover stocks of soybeans to \$600 million bushels or more by the end of the 1970-71 marketing year. Such a carryover would mean a CCC investment and cost exceeding \$1.5 billion and would force soybean prices to remain under loan levels. While the dollar volume of all commodities owned by CCC is not at a record-high level, the CCC price-support loan inventory of all commodities is at an all-time high volume since the start of the price-support programs.

It took a rare type of courage to adjust the price support level to realistic levels. The wisdom of this action is now apparent—both domestic disappearance and exports have increased sharply. The extent and the significance of this development is revealed in the following statistics:

First. In the current marketing year, following the adjustment in the loan, U.S. soybean processing will increase by about 115 to 125 million bushels to about 725 million bushels—the largest 1-year increase in history. The result will be a cash purchase by crushers from farmers and the CCC amounting to \$1.75 billion—an increase of \$275 million over a year earlier.

Second. In the 10 years prior to 1966, U.S. soybean exports increased an average of 18 million bushels each year. But in 1966 through 1968, the average increase was only 12 million bushels. In the current marketing year—under a reduced loan—exports will increase almost 115 million bushels—the largest 1-year increase in history. Soybean exporters will increase their cash purchases from farmers and CCC to almost \$1 billion—an increase of over \$250 million. Flexibility is the key.

Third. Dollar exports of soybeans and products will be a plus factor to our balance of payments of about \$1.5 billion. Soybeans are the largest earner of dollar exchange of any agricultural commodity.

Fourth. Stocks of soybeans hanging over the market will decrease by about 75 million bushels by September 1, 1970.

Fifth. Rather than being a drain on the budget, CCC is receiving some \$400 million from sales of soybeans to the trade at prices not less than 110 percent of the loan plus carrying charges plus some \$50 million from sales of cottonseed products.

I do not wish to leave the impression that all of this resulted from the price support adjustment. Rather it was a combination of events which when added to the flexibility introduced by Messrs. Hardin and Palmby enabled the soybean pricing structure to remain flexible enough to respond to changes in demand.

The demand for U.S. soybeans and soybean products rises and falls with overall changes in demand for fats and oils

and available competing products. This relates not only to changes in weather conditions, but also to long-term influences, such as expansion in palm and coconut plantations, butter and lard production, and overall trends in available supply, including monopolistic decisions made in the U.S.S.R. with respect to sales of sunflower oil. We must never overlook the competition. We must be able to meet the challenges and overcome them.

Reduced Russian sunflower seed and Peruvian fishmeal supplies improved U.S. trading opportunities.

Everything possible was done to work with producers, exporters and foreign importers in the field of market development. This included technical assistance, improved grade standards and promotional activities.

However, there were additional actions taken and proposed actions resisted which have meant much to attaining these effective and excellent results.

ADDITIONAL ACTIONS TAKEN

First. Public Law 480: For the first time Public Law 480 agreements for edible oils were announced prior to and during harvest so that farmers could share more fully in the price and income benefits of the program.

Second. Cottonseed product sales: The economic sophistication of the Hardin-Palmby team and knowledge of the interrelationships between the various fats and oils are further demonstrated by the manner in which cottonseed oil sales were handled. Over 300 million pounds of CCC-owned cotton oil from the 1958 crop have been sold for export to special markets at rising prices. No cottonseed oil is overhanging the market.

Third. The lard export subsidy: The EEC common agricultural policy for lard came into effect on July 1, 1967. The EEC Commission announced an export subsidy of 2.72 cents per pound for lard effective July 1, 1967. Effective January 1, 1968, the subsidy on lard was increased to 3.02 cents per pound. On February 27, 1968, the export subsidy on lard was increased to 3.18 cents per pound, and on May 27 the subsidy was further increased to 3.35 cents per pound.

This policy adversely affected the competitive position of the United States in foreign lard markets, particularly the U.K. which accounts for a major share of the world's lard imports. Total U.S. exports of lard declined from 459 million pounds—55 percent of world lard trade—during 1961-63 to less than 30 percent in the 1968 fiscal year.

The effect of the EEC lard export subsidy on world markets resulted in very serious injury to U.S. farmers in terms of income loss from international trade. The loss of markets to subsidized lard exports, forced large quantities of lard back into U.S. consumption channels, and not only displaced edible oils in many formulations, but also depressed lard and edible oil prices.

The United States discussed the implications of the EEC lard export subsidy with the Common Market during 1968. We requested them to eliminate this subsidy because of the adverse effects on the United States. We were unsuccessful

in this effort. The conclusion was reached in December 1968 that a U.S. export subsidy of 2 cents per pound was essential—if we were not to be even further disadvantaged.

The new administration reviewed this program on the basis of the supply-demand situation and decided that the program could be well implemented by a 50 percent reduction in the export subsidy—with great savings to the taxpayer. Exports and shipments of lard are expected to exceed 400 million pounds this marketing year.

The current export subsidy program has enabled us to recapture much of our normal share of the U.K. market. It has been of major significance in increasing farm income from hog production—possibly as much as \$70 to \$80 million. These exports are being paid for in hard currency, thus assisting in meeting our balance-of-payments problem.

RESISTANCE TO PRESSURE FOR ALLOTMENTS

This administration has resisted the proponents of high price supports and acreage limitations for soybeans. As recently as August 10, 1969, the American Soybean Association—the major soybean producer group, passed the following resolution:

We favor continuing to keep soybeans free of acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

The National Soybean Processors Association has come to similar conclusions.

The Hardin-Palmby team recognizes that the American Soybean industry must be flexible enough at all times to respond quickly to changes in demand. There is no indication anywhere that any other country would share in the burden of acreage limitation. The effect of acreage allotments on our part would be to concede a major part of the total market growth to our competition. Acreage controls would restrict markets rather than expand them. Also, fundamentally adding another crop to the list of those involved in acreage limitation would place a needless obstacle in the way of efficient farm operation.

If the soybean industry is to continue to expand, price support policies need to be such that soybeans, oil and meal can be offered in the market at competitive prices. Support at levels which price soybeans, oil or meal out of the market plus acreage restrictions would soon mean loss of markets to competitive products. In the longer run this could result in loss of income for soybean producers. In the shorter run the domestic feeders would have to pay substantially higher prices for soybean meal. Labor use at U.S. processing plants and in the transport industry would decrease.

Thirty-five years of Government price supports have already demonstrated that high price supports inevitably bring rigid controls to an agricultural commodity. The net result is usually a ceiling over an industry's growth and market opportunity. The net result is usually high Government costs. Worst of all, farmers end up with loss of market outlets to competing commodities, including synthetics. High support levels subsidize competitors at home and abroad.

Acreage controls for soybeans with attendant loan rates above competitive levels would provide an umbrella for foreign expansion of oilseed production, large imports of fishmeal, and use of a synthetic feed—urea.

EEC PROPOSALS FOR TAXES ON SOYBEAN PRODUCTS

On December 9, 1968, Mr. Sicco Mansholt—vice president of the Commission of the European Community and its principal agricultural spokesman—announced that the commission was about to propose a consumption tax of \$60 per metric ton on vegetable oils and \$30 per metric ton on cake and meal. This measure would be designed to help solve the mounting butter surplus problem in the Community by adversely affecting non-EEC members.

In response to this, the Hardin-Palmby response was to tell the officials of the Community that their proposed action would reduce sharply the Community's imports of oilseeds and oilseed products and would result in a massive impairment of the present access available to American imports under GATT. They made it clear that this would leave the United States no choice but to retaliate on a large scale against the products their countries sell us. Our retaliation might include such important exports as European automobiles, typewriters, office equipment, wines, and similar items that Americans buy from them in large amounts.

The response to the community said that what it does to its agriculture is more than an agricultural matter—it concerns the whole economy of Western Europe. If the cost to help European agriculture is high, then let their industry pay the expense—but not ask the United States to pay it. Swift reprisal will result from such a violation to the GATT.

There is strong support of American agricultural and trade groups in efforts to keep Community markets open. The Federal Government continues to make strong representation to the Community through all available channels. This is a very important matter on which we in the Congress stand together with the executive branch.

Our latest information is that the European Community will not institute these taxes this year. We, as the elected representatives of hundreds of thousands of oilseed producers, will continue to watch this situation most carefully. We continue an extremely strong position in opposition to the proposed taxes.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT ON FATS AND OILS

On another front, there continues to be expressions of support in some foreign quarters for the development of a type of international fats and oils agreement even in face of the failure of these types of agreements. I support the vigorous opposition of the U.S. Government to this concept as an inhibition upon the natural ability of U.S. soybeans and soybean products to compete effectively in world markets. Restrictions upon international trade in commodities, through such agreements, only imposes upon producers and processors of such commodities, the denial of the benefits of free trade.

Not only is there a side range in competition and sources of supply, but most of the major oils are byproducts. As a result, the technical complexity in the market for oils and fats is so great that the fixing of market prices, quotas, or market shares is unworkable.

I have devoted considerable thought to the major significance of this great crop to U.S. agriculture and agribusiness and especially the major positive contributions of the Hardin-Palmby team. I trust that my colleagues will study these matters, especially in view of the relative and growing importance of this commodity—the No. 2 source of cash receipts from sales of all crops.

RECYCLING PROGRAMS NEED PUBLIC SUPPORT

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, the House passed the Resource Recovery Act authorizing an intensified Federal effort to encourage new and better ways of meeting the problems of solid waste disposal. This much-needed legislation had my support. What is also needed, however, is for efforts in this area from the private sector as well, and in this regard I was encouraged by the editorial appearing in the Jackson Citizen Patriot, Jackson, Mich., Saturday, June 20, 1970, drawing attention to cleanup programs recently launched in Michigan, dealing directly with problems of junk cars and throw-away bottles. Because of the widespread interest in these areas, I am pleased to insert the editorial in the RECORD:

RECYCLING PROGRAMS NEED PUBLIC SUPPORT

Showcase environmental clean-up programs were launched this week in two Michigan cities and the final results could give some indication of what industry and the public can do to help solve pollution problems.

In the Traverse City area, General Motors is financing a program to collect and scrap abandoned or non-operable autos.

In the Ann Arbor area Owens-Illinois is paying one cent a pound for waste glass and cars are lined up waiting to dispose of those non-returnable bottles.

Both waste collection programs are innovative attempts at recycling the waste products of our industrial and commercial society.

Cars in the Traverse City area that are beyond repair will be hauled to a scrap yard at General Motor's expense and later melted down and the metal reused.

Owens-Illinois plans to melt down the throwaways and form them into new glass containers. Part of the glass will also be used in an experimental paving material called "glasphalt."

Recycling of society's wastes has always been an exciting concept, but one that has met little success except on small scale plants.

The use of industrial by-products to make additional new products has met with more success and resulted, in some cases, in cheap new raw materials.

The Ann Arbor and Traverse City projects

are relatively small in scale and admittedly, the results are not in.

The public in both locales seems to have embraced the projects, something that is vitally necessary when all the public hot air on environmental pollution has cooled.

For without public concern and cooperation, the projects are doomed to failure. In Ann Arbor the cars were lined up at a shopping center where the glass bottles were being collected.

The newness of the projects may prompt immediate response; the question remains what the public response would be if the project continued for a period of months or years.

It is estimated that there are 2,000-3,000 inoperable automobiles in the Traverse City area. In a small section of Philadelphia this year concerned citizens counted that many abandoned automobiles on their streets and hauled them away.

Junk dealers in Traverse City who are the immediate benefactors of the car reclamation project so far are skeptical. They don't think the public will respond in any way like General Motors would like it to respond.

They think the project will claim a few hundred cars and then peter out as the enthusiasm wanes.

Their skepticism is reflectant of many environmental observers and scientists who feel the debate over environmental ruin has generated a lot of rhetoric but little action on the part of the public. Everyone says they want to play the game but they haven't learned the rules.

The shoe that pollution militants have been trying to put on industry is about to be on the public.

It will be up to the public to see if the shoe fits.

MALAGASY REPUBLIC INDEPENDENCE DAY ANNIVERSARY

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to make note of the 10th anniversary of the independence of the Malagasy Republic which will be celebrated on June 26, 1970. In actuality, Madagascar's tradition of independence goes much further back than 10 years, for it existed as a kingdom in the pre-colonial period. Since 1867, when the United States concluded a commercial convention with the traditional ruler of the island, we have had an unbroken friendship with the people of Madagascar.

At this time in history the Malagasy Government is supporting our efforts for peace and freedom around the world, and has shown its support for our exploration of space by generously allowing us to use Malagasy soil for a space tracking facility. The island of Madagascar is an important supplier of vanilla and cloves to the United States. We also import graphite, mica, and coffee from the Malagasy Republic.

Madagascar's illustrious President—who has held his post since independence—is Philibert Tsiranana, a staunch friend of the West. I congratulate him and the people of Madagascar as they complete the first 10 years of their Republic's cherished independence.

OUR HEALTH CARE CRISIS

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the growing crisis in our health care delivery system profoundly affects not only the welfare of each of us today but the quality of life of generations of Americans to come.

Following are the interesting and candid remarks of Dr. Robert Q. Marston, Director of the National Institutes of Health, concerning the alarmingly low priority assigned to health care programs within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the increasing politicization of appointments to key health positions in HEW. Dr. Marston's comments appeared in an article written by Victor Cohn of the Washington Post:

AMERICA'S HEALTH CRISIS HELD TRACEABLE TO HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

(By Victor Cohn)

America is in a health crisis, but health is eternally third in attention at the troubled Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Welfare and education, costing more, inevitably come first in a secretary's attention.

The result is that a full-scale federal attack on health problems has never been developed, even while the country faces serious crises of health manpower, organization and costs.

These are opinions of Dr. Robert Q. Marston, director of the National Institutes of Health, and a conspicuous lone survivor among a "big three" of operating agency heads at the stormy department.

He stated them in a two-hour interview. Just doing so may have taken some courage. The past six weeks have seen the firing of both Dr. Joseph English, director of the Health Services and Mental Health Administration, and Dr. Stanley Yolles, director of the National Institute of Mental Health.

Both resigned at Nixon administration request after criticizing some of its health policies and bucking injection of politics into health jobs.

Marston said he too has quarreled with some such injections, while accepting others. There have been persistent rumors—called "untrue" by some sources—that he too has been "slated to go," and that his job, like the one English held, will be changed from a career to a political appointment.

Marston said, "I have been asked to stay," and "I have heard nothing, except in the newspapers," about any change in job status. "I would not accept a Schedule C Job"—that is, a political one—he said flatly.

MALEK CALLED "REASONABLE"

He said he has opposed department attempts to set new policy on some issues. But he also said he has found "a reasonable attitude" in the office of Deputy Under Secretary Frederic V. Malek—viewed by some as one of the administration's main political manipulators in HEW—despite several recent "concerns" and "problems."

These, he said, include having to get department approval of both NIH administrators and NIH advisers in fields like cancer and heart disease. They include trying to get more money for such health needs as rescuing medical schools in danger of going broke.

Marston is 47 years old, a handsome and personable man, a former medical professor and dean named NIH head by HEW Secretary Wilbur Cohen in 1968.

The academic medical community, NIH's main constituent, strongly supports him. "We think he's done a very good job," said Dr. John Cooper, president of the Association of American Medical Colleges.

Cooper said "we are terribly disturbed" at the administration's making English's old job "a political rather than professional appointment," and "we strongly oppose any such action regarding the heads of NIH or NIMH." He made it clear that the nation's medical school deans have serious reservations about some of the acts of top HEW officials.

Marston spoke no ill at all of anyone higher. Point by point, he said:

He believes a basic problem of U.S. health is simply that any HEW secretary must, by dollar and political importance, pay first attention to welfare (which includes Medicare and Medicaid), second to education and third to health. But health problems need more attention than they are getting, he believes, and the chief health official—now merely an assistant secretary—"should be" a full under secretary.

There is "general agreement now with the secretary's office" that Marston and colleagues will be allowed to pick scientific members of NIH advisory councils, but "we will expect more review and suggestions" on public, non-medical members. However, he conceded, there have been delays in approval of even scientific advisers.

There is also more screening now of NIH officials. Under previous administrations, Marston said, all career appointments from GS 16s up—the "supergrades"—had to be cleared by the secretary's office. Now this has been extended to GS 15s (officials who start at \$22,885 a year; they include deputy or assistant directors of NIH research institutes). But "I haven't been turned down on a recommendation," Marston said.

There have been no drastic effects at NIH of HEW decentralization efforts. At NIMH, these have plucked most of the control of community mental health centers from NIMH chiefs. This met furious Yolles opposition. So far at NIH, Marston said, only a "small," \$200,000-a-year Public Health Services traineeship program has been put under HEW regional offices.

He quoted a Malek letter "assuring" him there will be no loss of authority over NIH research grants or of NIH's celebrated "peer reviews" (by which other scientists judge which scientists should get grants). There has been serious concern in medical schools about any "erosion" of this system.

UNCERTAIN FUNDING

None of these subjects but "the uncertainty of funding" for research and training has been "our biggest problem since 1967," Marston reported.

NIH expenditures started a downhill slide in 1967, especially in real dollars after inflation. The fall of 1969 saw suddenly enforced research cuts that produced consternation in many universities. On short notice, scores of projects had to be curtailed and research assistants and technicians fired.

The President has recommended a fiscal 1971 NIH authorization of \$1.524 billion, up \$104 million from 1970. If this sum is voted, and there are no new administration holdbacks, "we will be in much better shape," Marston said. But any new reductions on short notice, he added, "would again be reflected in chaos in the universities."

The 1969 chaos, many of Marston's deputies maintain was caused not just by trouble in the U.S. economy but by "the whole system" in which health has the low priority it possesses in HEW.

Many of these deputies are far more critical than he of what they consider department "interference" and "kibitzing" and of what they call "weak leadership" in the face of this from the Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, Dr. Roger Egeberg.

All eyes in the health field are now on new HEW Secretary Elliot Richardson—to see what he does about politics in health appointments, about health priorities, about U.S. health.

A question Dr. Marston raised—should there be an under secretary of health?—may be broadened by many to ask: in a country with financially shaky medical schools and \$100-a-day hospital care, should there now be a full-scale secretary of health to help design a national plan?

OUR IMPROVING ENVIRONMENT

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we hear so much discouraging talk about our environment these days that an optimistic report from a knowledgeable source is encouraging. A. T.—Lex—Miller of Badger Meter Co., Milwaukee, is such a knowledgeable source, and he has prepared a delivered paper which I believe will be a source of useful information, and of interest to the Members of the House. It is entitled "Our Improving Environment."

The item follows:

OUR IMPROVING ENVIRONMENT

(By A. T. Miller)

INTRODUCTION

In the beginning and for thousands of years, man's environment was extremely hostile, barely yielding enough sustenance for survival. Man, clearly, was at the mercy of his environment.

However, at scattered times and places throughout history, man has demonstrated an ability to adapt and to substantially control and improve his environment.

Environment is usually thought of in physical terms such as air, water, climate, food and shelter, other people, natural resources, etc. But in considering total environment I would add those conditions that have affected the achievement of the historic goals of men which have been and still are: freedom and the opportunity to improve their well being—as they see it—not as someone prescribes it for them.

I mentioned occasions in history where men and life flourished. These included Sumer, Athens, Carthage, Rome, Venice, Florence, Kiev, The Saracens, England and America. The conditions that were present in each of the instances were freedom of action and commerce as well as security of the lives and property of the citizens.

Free men have always reacted creatively to a hostile situation.

PROBLEM AND THESIS

Today we seem to be in an age of crises: international, crime, youth, housing, population, food and pollution.

A generation ago it was the school shortage, automation, why can't Johnny read, the sputnik gap and others. Every generation has had its crises which is partly a result of the headline syndrome (Every day there must be a headline).

A current crisis that is causing concern among many people is our alleged deteriorating environment.

I disagree with their concern and would like to present and support the following thesis:

Man's total environment has been improv-

ing from the time he developed the first tools and that during the past generation the rate of improvement has increased.

I mentioned some examples where mankind flourished and where there was, at least in those locations, a rapid improvement in the total environment. Obviously the improvement in the environment worldwide has not been continuous as only two of those flourishing societies are left.

Nevertheless, the number of people sharing the improved environment is increasing. West Germany and Japan have certainly been a good example of this during the past 25 years. And more recently Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore and others have achieved rapid rises in their standards of living.

Furthermore we know what the preconditions are and can use this knowledge to evaluate instances of environmental deterioration to determine corrective action.

I would like to examine some specific examples of alleged environmental deterioration in the light of today's concern for the population explosion and the pollution of our ecological community.

WATER RESOURCES

First, let me say that there is no water shortage and very likely never will be except where distribution systems are inadequate. Water is used, not consumed. Therefore there is just as much water in the world today as there ever was. There are approximately 2½ billion gallons of fresh water available per person in the world today. This is more than one million times what we are using each day. And yet there are people who insist that inevitably we will run out of water.

I will agree that in spite of all the water being available, much of it is beginning to look used. It is obvious that there is a lot of polluted water. However, except for man caused silting of the waterways of the world and for some recent isolated changes in the availability of aquatic food, water pollution constitutes only a minor economic and health problem. The Milwaukee River for example, has been polluted for over 100 years but only recently has there been any significant expression of concern.

Secondly, let me dispel some pollution lore. It is quite evident that chemical and biological pollutants, in sufficient concentration can cause destruction of at least a part of the natural state of a river or lake. Thermal pollution may cause a local change but is not likely to cause destruction. It is also evident that regardless of the concentration of pollutants, every moving body of water has the capability of eliminating the effect at some point downstream. Furthermore there is no evidence whatsoever to indicate that any body of moving water, including Lake Erie, can be polluted to a point where it cannot eventually restore itself if the introduction of pollutants is sufficiently reduced. As with an area of polluted air, an area of polluted water eventually becomes diluted as it moves on.

A pertinent question that might be asked is—how did pollution get this bad? Since rivers and lakes have been considered public property, the concept of protecting private property from the actions of others (a precondition for a free society) has not been applicable. Therefore the waterways simply have become unchallenged dumping grounds.

All that is needed is for all of the pollutants—municipal, industrial and agricultural, to reduce their polluting to a level where the waters can clean themselves to whatever level is desired.

The ultimate cost of pollution abatement must be born by the polluters and passed on to their customers, whether industrial, municipal or agricultural.

Although some new developments would be helpful in reducing costs, such as continuous flow sewage treatment, the technol-

ogy exists today to abate nearly all of the water pollution. It is simply a matter of enforcement to achieve clean waters and this is what has been lacking. For example, a Federal law passed in 1899 is just now being effectively enforced in various parts of the country.

Pollution control is primarily a state and local problem. Where effective local enforcement has occurred dramatic results have been achieved in many parts of the world. For example, fish that have not been seen for generations have returned to the Thames in the London area. Game fish are again being caught in San Francisco Bay. Furthermore these improvements required no sacrifice in the standard of living.

Beyond the setting of standards for federal, interstate and other navigable waterways and some personnel for monitoring, there seems to be no more justification for a Federal bureaucracy concerned with water pollution abatement than for a Federal bureaucracy concerned with garbage collection.

Unfortunately the almost frantic effort to federalize a local matter has restrained the development of effective local pollution abatement programs.

However, it is obvious from steps already taken and others scheduled that our environment is improving. The next few years will witness a reversal of centuries of water pollution.

AIR RESOURCES

Air pollution is probably more serious than water pollution because we don't clean it before we use it and it is more difficult to evade. But the magnitude of the hazard is not known. That is, we really don't know very much about the long-term effect of different combinations and concentrations of impurities in the air. However, since we can see it and smell it, air pollution has become a social problem and therefore a political matter.

One of the incongruities of our laws pertaining to property is that the air rights do not include the air itself. However, this inconsistency is beginning to change and as a result, along with water the environmental problem of air pollution is rapidly yielding to local corrective action. I again emphasize "local action."

The technology for air pollution abatement does exist and is being applied. Furthermore it is improving rapidly as the innovators go to work. There was little incentive for innovation in the past as there was limited opportunity due to limited enforcement.

As in the case of water pollution abatement, wherever effective local enforcement of air pollution laws has occurred, dramatic results have been achieved.

Pittsburgh with a local program experienced significant improvement years ago. London has had pollution control laws for 400 years but erratic enforcement until recently. They have had no serious fog in seven years.

The head of the Los Angeles County Air Pollution Control District announced in March that he is retiring because, he says "there's nothing much left for me to do here." Air pollution in the Los Angeles basin is at its lowest point since 1954 and still declining without an erosion of the standard of living. Open air burning has been banned. Industry has complied with local air pollution abatement laws. California motor vehicle emission laws became effective in the early 1960's. Since then, because of the pollution control devices, hydrocarbon emissions per car have been reduced 80% and carbon monoxide emissions per car have been reduced 70%. In spite of the improvement some people continue to predict that Los Angeles smog will cause mass deaths by 1975.

With effective local enforcement of air

pollution laws, our environment will continue to improve.

POPULATION

The alleged population explosion, if true, would certainly be an important factor in our total environment. However I think that it is nonsense to project recent population growth rates without considering what caused the rise or what could change it.

The population problem is essentially a matter of people, space and food. Shelter and clothing are also important but, while their availability may be marginal, they are not critical in the areas where the population pressures are the greatest. As for people, the world population has been rising rapidly during the past century primarily due to a rapid reduction in death rates, not to a rise in birth rates.

The Western World with its series of economic scientific and technological advances witnessed a slow, gradual transition over many generations, from high death rates and high birth rates to low death rates and low birth rates concurrent with an improvement in the standard of living. During this time the rate of population growth did not change significantly.

But in parts of Asia, Africa and Latin America mortality rates have dropped substantially in the last few generations without a corresponding change in economic conditions or birth rates. This obviously led to a rapid rise in the rate of population growth. However we may view the result, one of the key factors contributing to the sharp drop in death rates in tropical countries has been the effective and continuing use of DDT in controlling insect carried diseases.

On the brighter side of the population problem, growth rates have been dropping in the technically and economically advanced nations of Europe and North America. In the United States for example, the population growth rate is down to less than 1% and still declining. The Census Bureau reported that the population increased 154,000 during March to an estimated 204,663,000. This is at the annual rate of $\frac{1}{10}$ of 1%. The population of the United States is stabilizing without government coercion.

Furthermore, birth rates and therefore population growth rates have been falling rapidly for several years in such developing nations as Taiwan, Hong Kong, Trinidad-Tabago and Singapore. These are not isolated cases but rather dramatic examples of the effect of market economies, the infusion of capital and a resulting rise in the standard of living. Also, birth rates are beginning to fall in Ceylon, Malaysia, Jamaica and Costa Rica for the same reason.

Japan has halted its program to reduce birth rates as there is concern about the long run labor requirements for their expanding industries. West Germany, Australia and others are promoting increases in population.

The environment in the free world is improving.

As to the availability of space for an expanding population there is not much to say beyond the fact that there is plenty of it. However, in order to take advantage of the open land we may have to break or at least bend the tradition of the central city. After all, the central city in this country was rendered obsolete over a generation ago by the automobile. All of its traditional functions have been diffused into outlying areas except the function of serving as a political base.

FOOD

More than seven thousand years of overgrazing and poor farming methods throughout the Middle East, North Africa and parts of Asia have caused eroded slopes, silted rivers and paralyzed food production. Changes in ancient civilizations and empires

in this area parallel disastrous grain farming methods.

There have been some interesting highlights during this time. The Sumerians, whom I mentioned earlier, over 4000 years ago developed irrigation technology within an environment of private property and a market economy. The early Egyptians harnessed the ox, thereby increasing productivity to a point where people were available for building programs. The Romans implemented and expanded the soil and water conservation technology of the Carthaginians. The Saracens improved it still further and developed what became known as scientific farming. In more recent times the English have been steadily increasing wheat productivity for many centuries. With a few other exceptions already mentioned the rest of the world went hungry most of this time.

Even today population growth threatens to exceed food production in some parts of the world where Malthus is again a vogue. In other parts however, food production is increasing far more rapidly than population.

It is interesting to note the variations in food production and productivity in different parts of the world. Since land is a fixed resource, the only valid measure of productivity is production per unit of land.

Wheat. The previous chart shows the productivity in bushels per acre for the United Kingdom from the 18th Century through 1968. Other nations are shown on the U.K. line with their yields as of 1963. In addition, the world population line is shown without the 14th Century plague dip.

You will note that for the United Kingdom there was slow growth until the yield takeoff in the 1940's.

Also note the position of other countries on the U.K. line. The United States and Canada are relatively low because of averaging in the nonirrigated lands in the plains area where yields are erratic. Actually many Midwestern areas exceed the U.K. in yields. Of interest—Yugoslavia is one of the most market oriented of the Eastern Bloc nations.

There have been a few changes in productivity since 1963. France moved up to 53 bushels in 1968. The United States with 13 bushels per acre in the 1930's and 20 bushels in the 1950's is now at about 30 bushels. Russia is still at about 17 bushels per acre.

Malthus wrote his first book in 1798 long before the takeoff.

Agricultural economists contend that certain conditions are necessary for a "yield takeoff" of a nation's primary food crop:

1. A high degree of market orientation in agriculture.
2. Relatively high level of literacy.
3. Per capita income levels far enough above subsistence levels to provide capital for investment in yield-raising capital inputs.
4. Higher level of development of the non-agricultural sector.

While these four conditions have existed wherever a yield takeoff has occurred I suspect that the last three items are less important since yield takeoffs are beginning to occur in developing nations where only the first condition is dominant.

The reasons for the yield takeoff in any food crop are typically the effective use of mechanization, chemicals and appropriate strains of the plant. The chemical revolution has produced new types of nutrients, herbicides, fungicides, insecticides and bioregulators. These are all part of the new technology of our improving environment as are the breakthroughs in the genetic design of new strains and varieties of crops.

New strains of wheat have yielded over 100 bushels per acre. Hybridization of wheat is just now getting started nearly forty years after corn. A synthetic species called triticale, combining wheat and rye, outproduces both in yield per acre and protein content.

Wheat production in this country has been rising faster than consumption for many years. As a result of persistent wheat surpluses, the national wheat acreage allotment has been significantly reduced in recent years. The government's 1970 wheat program calls for a 12% cut in acreage from the 1969 level. It is expected that in 1970 approximately 44 million acres will produce 1.3 billion bushels of wheat. This compares with 74 million acres producing less than 1 billion bushels fifty years ago.

While we are cutting acreage, Russia is still increasing acreage although total output in 1969 dropped 5% from the 1968 level.

Corn. The chart below shows the productivity line for the United States where about half of the world's supply is produced. The yield takeoff started in the late '30s and became fully effective in the early '40s. It was due to hybridization, fertilizers, weed control and higher plant densities.

Although the average yield has reached nearly 80 bushels per acre, many farms have exceeded 100 bushels. Over 300 bushels have been achieved experimentally with some new technologies yet to be tried.

In 1880 it took an average of 48 hours of work to produce one acre of corn. Today, with modern equipment, it takes only two hours. In that same period the yields per acre increased from 25 bushels to 80. The productivity of the farmer increased 24 times but the productivity of the land increased only 3 times. It is that land that is now becoming more productive.

As a matter of interest it has been estimated from contemporary records that the American Indians were achieving corn yields of between 15 and 20 bushels per acre at the time of the arrival of white men.

Rice. Rice is the chief food for half the world's population. This chart shows the productivity line for Japan where the yield takeoff occurred considerably earlier than in other rice producing countries. Note the position of the other nations with market economies that are not too far behind.

With a limitation on available land the Japanese, following the formation of their first national government, promoted an early takeoff after a thousand years of slow growth in productivity. The yield per acre increased from about 2200 pounds per acre to more than double that level today. As a result Japan is now exporting rice and has embarked on a program of reducing rice acreage 10% per year for three years.

The International Rice Research Institute in the Philippines, sponsored by the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, has developed some exciting new strains of rice. With IR-8, one of the new strains, the Philippines in 1969 not only became self sufficient but achieved a surplus. Unfortunately they could not sell all of the surplus because of the glut in the world rice markets. Note on the chart where the Philippines were in 1963. The individual Philippine farmers who are using IR-8 and appropriate chemicals have achieved in just a few years a yield increase that required over 1000 years to accomplish in Japan.

Rapid conversion to the new strains is taking place throughout Southeast Asia and the Western Pacific. The new strains of rice permit heavier fertilizing and not only have higher yields, but at least one and possibly two extra crops each year. They take four months or less to mature as against up to seven months for the old strains. Where weather conditions permit multiple cropping, the increase in production per year can be several times that of old types.

A yield takeoff now requires less time to implement where takeoff conditions are met. This is largely due to better communications which is another part of our improving environment.

While mechanization has helped increase wheat and corn yields it is not that important to increasing rice yields in Asia.

As with wheat and corn, the production of rice in the free world is increasing much faster than population.

The environment in the free world is improving.

India has high hopes, but also has rigid price controls on rice at levels below the free market price. This of course has discouraged the production of rice. Average yields per acre are still at the levels of 1900 with no indication of a national yield takeoff.

Other Food Crops. Recent yield takeoffs in the free world are not confined to the primary grain crops. For example, in the United States the yield per acre of grain sorghum, and soybeans has more than doubled since the 30's while the yield of potatoes has more than tripled in many areas.

In summarizing the food situation the unmistakable facts are these:

In the nations with market oriented agriculture, food production is increasing more rapidly than population while in the nations with socialized agriculture the opposite is true.

The capitalist nations are experiencing problems of increasing food surpluses. The developing nations with market economies that are effectively applying new technologies are rapidly achieving self-sufficiency. On the other hand the developing nations with planned economies and limited effectiveness of new technology are facing serious food shortages as are the major socialist nations: Russia, China, and India.

The United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) stated in its annual report released in January "The food problem facing the world in the near future is more likely to be surpluses rather than starvation."

As a word of caution, not all developing agricultural nations are ready for a yield take-off of their primary food crop. However, it will occur sooner if the preconditions are met.

Nevertheless, a higher percent of the free world's population is living above the subsistence level than ever before in history.

Another point, the world's total potentially arable land, using today's technology, is over three times the area actually harvested. Furthermore, throughout the world land is being reforested faster than timber is being cut, strip-mined land is being reclaimed faster than it is being mined, and many areas of land ruined centuries ago are once again blooming.

Our environment is improving.

In looking ahead, there are many exciting things being developed for the next wave of the agricultural revolution. The following are just a few:

1. Lower costs for desalting sea water as well as surface and subsurface brackish water.

2. Implementation of subirrigation techniques in which all nutrients and other chemicals are applied at the root level using only 1/3 as much water as with surface irrigation. This would eliminate chemical runoff and reduce soil runoff. This technique, together with Number 1 above, may very well be the answer to the salt buildup in the Imperial Valley of California.

3. Increased use of plastic shelters for cold weather farming. Many garden crops such as tomatoes are now grown in this manner.

4. Growing acceptance of the elimination of plowing to maximize yields and minimize topsoil runoff.

5. Lower unit costs and prices following the inevitable shift to corporate farming. The elimination of price supports and acreage restrictions will accelerate this shift.

6. I should also acknowledge and provide for the countless innovations, large and small, that have not yet emerged.

SUMMARY

I mentioned in the beginning that the goal of men throughout history, as clearly indicated by many voluntary emigrations and migrations has been freedom and the opportunity to improve their well being as they see it. Freedom for one implies freedom for all—which means security of life and property. These conditions, which promote the most effective utilization of human energy, represent a favorable total environment.

The evidence is overwhelming that the environment is improving. The free nations of the world, with rising standards of living for an increasing number of their citizens, illustrate the most favorable total environment the world has ever known.

Malthus who was more of a reporter than a prophet could no more visualize the real effect of new technology developed and creatively applied by free people than Karl Marx could. Both have been proven wrong.

Some people will say about food that "the problem is not a shortage but a matter of distribution." If they would only inquire into the matter they will find that there really are shortages. They will find free nations in all stages of development that have food surpluses, stabilizing populations, rising standards of living and the will to achieve control over their physical environment. They will also find nations with planned economies facing critical food shortages, and a wide range of population growth rates, level or declining standards of living and little concern for their physical environment. Those who inquire will become aware of the universal failure of planned agriculture.

Others say that the gap between the haves and have nots is increasing and that somehow the capitalist nations are responsible and should feel guilty. This is really the wrong comparison. It is not a question of have or have not but rather how well they are using what they have. Without question there is a gap that is widening. But it is between nations that have conditions conducive to rising standards of living and nations that have conditions that limit the rise in the standards of living. For example, compare the widening gap between East and West Germany remembering that both started from the same pile of rubble 25 years ago. Compare the widening gap between Japan and India. Compare the fortunes of Cuba and Mexico over the past generation with the gap now widening in favor of Mexico. These widening gaps are to the credit not the blame of the free nations.

If I were to consider an appropriate objective for this age of increasing awareness of our environment, I would say let us first identify and understand those conditions which will provide the best total environment for the greatest number.

For the nations with free societies the total environment is better and is continually improving. Individual economic freedom seems to be the key. Never before in history has there been such a great opportunity to extend these free world concepts to all the people of the world. Never before have the comparisons between the free and controlled societies been so obvious nor the communications to make them known so effective.

For those who want to take a personal part in environmental improvement I would suggest that after they acquire an understanding of the preconditions of an improving environment they actively promote the implementation of these conditions wherever they are lacking. On a local basis they should seek enactment and effective enforcement of appropriate environmental improvement laws based on the concepts covered earlier under water and air resources.

For purposes of pollution abatement, food

production and an improvement in other environmental factors, let us use the new technologies effectively—not abandon them. There is much to be done.

Personally I am very confident that by the year 2000, for the free world there will be clearer thinking on the matter of improving the total environment. There will be a realization that effective control and improvement in our environment requires no decline in our standard of living. On the contrary it should continue to improve if all conditions are met. As a result of effective local programs there will be cleaner air and water. Food production capability will continue to exceed population growth. The trend, that has already started, toward a stabilization of the world population will be continuing—voluntarily.

Obviously I cannot foresee future events, but I am certain that given the condition of freedom many more contributions to an improving total environment will be made by creative and productive individuals of this and future generations.

A CHANGE IN THE FISCAL YEAR?

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the end of this fiscal year is close at hand and it is obvious that few of our appropriation bills will be enacted before that time. This fact is borne out all the more because of the continuing appropriation bill which had to be considered by the House yesterday.

This inability on the part of the Congress to conduct its business in a timely fashion according to the old tradition of a 6-month legislative session has not passed unnoticed and I would like to insert the following editorial from the *Journal of Commerce* in New York, June 24, 1970, in the *RECORD* for the benefit of all my colleagues:

A CHANGE IN THE FISCAL YEAR?

If the Senate majority leader is correct in his predictions, the Senate will take only a two-week election break this year and then try to complete its labors by next Jan. 3. Not since that chamber returned from a recess to vote on the censure of Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy, in 1954, has it met following congressional elections. But since it appears very likely to do so this year, as Senator Mansfield predicts, it is pertinent to raise once again the question of whether it makes any sense to maintain a fiscal year that begins on July 1 and ends June 30.

Back in 1843, when the present fiscal year was established, it seemed a good idea to give Congress some extra time to pass appropriations bills. Congress then convened on the first day in December (something it continued doing up until 1934), and obviously didn't have enough time to sift through requests for appropriations and debate other urgent issues if tied to a calendar year expiring the minute the clock ushered in the new year.

A six-month extension seemed adequate, for Capitol Hill was largely deserted in summer. In fact, as late as 1946 it still seemed logical, for the Legislative Reorganization Act of that year provided that "except in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President, the two houses shall adjourn sine die not later than the last day (Sundays excepted) in the month

of July each year unless otherwise provided by Congress."

In retrospect this looks a little silly. Only on two occasions since 1946 (in 1952 and 1956) has Congress met its own adjournment deadline. The last time adjournment came as early as September was nine years ago. Since then it has ricocheted between October and December, the tardiest adjournment having been Dec. 30 in 1963.

The congressional workload has certainly increased along with the population, with the growing complexity of the problems facing American society and with the deepening penetration of the Federal Government into areas heretofore considered as being largely out of its province. Another factor is that, for all practical purposes, the nation is engaged in war. During all the years of World War II, Congress remained in session through most of December. The session beginning Jan. 3, 1950, actually lasted into Jan. 2, 1951, largely because of the Korean War.

This does not, of course, mean that Congress has been taxed beyond its limits in the more recent years. Last year its Monday and Friday sessions were distinguished largely by the scarcity of legislators in attendance. Moreover, it voted itself an extended summer vacation, even though a great many rather urgent measures, including appropriations measures, had not been decided. Some of them had barely been discussed.

Our purpose in bringing this up is not to chide the House and Senate on being lackadaisical as much as it is to point to the disrupting effect these lags have on national economic planning.

Last year, when the administration was beginning to take very much to heart the need for a drive to restrain inflation, the knowing just how much Congress was going to cut spending, if at all. Months after the new fiscal year began, key appropriations bills still awaited action under ad hoc measures called "continuing legislation" which allowed everyone to go on spending what he had planned to spend pending final congressional action.

One result of this was that the President and the Bureau of the Budget were virtually stymied in drawing up the budget for fiscal 1971. So were a great many economists and businessmen who were unable to make any definitive judgments on whether the commitments not yet voted on by Congress would produce another inflationary budget or something a little more hopeful.

This year, alas, things don't look very much better. The House has been doing its chores with fair regularity, but the Senate has seemed as preoccupied with the President's current ventures in Indochina as it did last year with ABM, MIRV and matters relating to a proposed new super battle tank.

All this, we agree, is quite within the Senate's province. But while the debate over national defense policy goes on, all manner of bread-and-butter legislation is left untouched, including over a dozen major appropriations bills and including such time-consuming programs as welfare reform, electoral college reform, the defense procurement authorizations, the debt limit increase, bank holding company bills and the like. Since the omnibus farm bill has not yet been acted upon by the House, the Senate will ultimately have to take that up, too.

So in view of the incontrovertible evidence that Congress is unable to act on most key money bills by the end of June, why maintain any longer the fiction that July 1 is an appropriate beginning for a new fiscal year? The Bureau of the Budget agreed as far back as last October that it isn't. Phillip S. Hughes, its deputy director, then said plainly that his agency favored a change. Sen. Warren Magnuson and Rep. Odin Langen have spon-

sored legislation that would push it six months ahead to coincide with the calendar year.

This, to us, would make sense. It would take into account the realities of the legislative timetable. It would end the six-month hiatus which occurs when approximately one-half a fiscal year expires before anyone knows for sure just how much Congress is going to spend in the course of the second half.

In such circumstances, of course, the President's annual budget message would have to be postponed for a few months. But that, in effect, is what is happening now.

FIGHTING DRUG ABUSE

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, all of us are aware of the growing problem of narcotics, principally among the young in this Nation. We have read with distress the many stories of young people using not only such drugs as LSD and marijuana, but also of their turning to hard narcotics in the heroin class.

The Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Council of Northeastern Pennsylvania, under the leadership of Mr. Tom Rice, Sr., is pursuing a remarkably intelligent program to fight the problem of drug addiction; and it is pursuing this fight through a program of educating the young.

At the request of the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Council of Northeastern Pennsylvania, and through the cooperation of Microdramas Co. of California, 15 stations in northeastern Pennsylvania scheduled for 1 week, June 8 through June 12, a series of five programs dealing with drug abuse. These stations programmed the identical material at the exact same time. This effort is, indeed, unique and has received the highest praise from health officials, law enforcement personnel, and in particular, from ADAC.

Three of the programs were written and produced by Jory Sherman of Rialto, Calif. Two other 15-minute features included an interview with Art Linkletter, whose daughter committed suicide as a result of a flashback suspected from the drug LSD. This program feature was furnished through the cooperation of the National Broadcasting Co. Another program made available through NBC was the actual testimony of Craig Gardner who recorded his reaction to drug usage just minutes before he took his own life as "an easy way out."

The stations involved in this unique educational approach included all program formats, including classical music.

This remarkable example of cooperation was under the leadership of Tom Rice who is not only president of the ADAC but is also president of WSCR radio in Scranton. Mr. Rice remarked that:

It is highly commendable for a broadcaster to interrupt his station's normal programming and, in some instances, go against station policy in participating in this total effort

in calling attention to the drug abuse problem.

I am sure that all of my colleagues here in the Congress will join me in commending these stations, just as Mr. Rice commended them. By programming the educational material at the same time, there was a saturation effort which must surely have a profound impact on all of the young people who spend so much of their lives listening to the radio.

The radio stations which participated in this program are: WICK, WSCR, WWDL-FM in Scranton; WBRE-AM/FM and WYZZ-FM in Wilkes-Barre; WCDL-AM/FM in Carbondale; WTTC-AM/FM in Towanda; WPEL in Montrose; WVPO-AM/FM in Stroudsburg; and WAZL in Hazleton. WARM and WEJL in Scranton are scheduling the program at a different time.

It is my sincere hope that the Commissioners at the Federal Communications Commission will take note of this remarkable and unique effort, and will commend each of these radio stations for the great public service they have rendered all of us.

OPINION POLL

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, in recent days many Americans have expressed in one form or another their views on national and international issues of our Government.

Many in the press have established and completed surveys of their readers in regard to our Government's commitments in Southeast Asia, the Middle East conflict, college turmoil and our overall troop placement in Europe.

Recently "The Daily Idahoian", in Moscow, Idaho, under the management of Mr. Jack Marineau, undertook a sampling of opinion concerning these issues.

I commend to my colleagues the results of this survey and insert them in the RECORD:

RESULTS OF OPINION POLL

[Percent]

	Yes	No
1. Should President Nixon have sent troops into Cambodia?	69.65	30.34
2. Are you in favor of the immediate withdrawal of all American troops from Southeast Asia?	31.94	68.05
3. Should National Guard troops with loaded guns be allowed to come on to college campuses to quell violence?	72.92	23.07
4. Should the United States sell more airplanes and war material to Israel?	55.47	44.52
5. Should the United States withdraw its troops from Europe at this time?	20.71	79.28

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the significance in this poll lies in the fact that it was conducted in a college community. Moscow is the home of the University of Idaho.

PENN CENTRAL CASE AND U.S. POLICY

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the financial debacle of the Penn Central has been a cause of great concern to me and the thousands of commuters who live in my district. The history of railroading has been full of stories of financial wheeling and dealing and the Penn Central fiasco is another depressing chapter in this story. A stinging analysis of the Penn Central case and the failure of last minute efforts by management to get the Government to bail out a railroad they had led to bankruptcy was written by Milton Viorst and appeared in the Washington Star of June 23. I believe that the Government should take sensible steps to assist the railroad industry—and I hope the House will act soon on the Rail Passenger Service Act—but I do not think that ill advised, hastily arranged loans are the right answer. While I would not yet favor the drastic solution of nationalization that Mr. Viorst advocates, I think it is clear that unless the railroad industry puts its own house in order, this is a result they may inevitably face. As the Penn Central case shows, the public which has been too often damned by the railroads, has finally gotten damned mad. The article follows:

PENN CENTRAL CASE AND U.S. POLICY
(By Milton Viorst)

When Deputy Defense Secretary David Packard told a closed session of the House Appropriations Committee some weeks ago that the financial solvency of the Penn Central Co. was vital to the national security, his audience laughed sardonically at him.

When he said that the Navy, as a defense requirement, would guarantee \$200 million in loans to Penn Central, hardly anyone doubted that the money was as good as lost.

Had Packard not taken the transaction to the committee as a fait accompli, he would probably have received congressional sanction. After all Congress has historically been as tolerant as administrations of the curious ways of railroads.

But President Nixon, after months of secret talks, had made a private deal with Penn Central, and Congress resented it. On Friday, he was forced to back out. On Sunday, Penn Central got even by declaring itself bankrupt.

No tears, however, are required. The trains will continue to run, despite Packard, at their customary level of inefficiency. And the company's stock will be traded, in recognition of Penn Central's possession of \$7 billion in assets that it chose not to liquidate.

Actually, what the administration proposed was to give Penn Central \$200 million to perpetuate its tradition of incompetent management and disdain for the public interest.

The proposal was in the grand tradition of collusion between the nation's railroads and federal agencies, particularly the agency held responsible by law for railroad regulation, the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The previous Democratic administrations, despite the anti-trust laws, sanctioned the merger of the Pennsylvania and the New York Central, though Penn Central gave notice at the time of a cutback in service

by projecting declining passenger and freight demand.

Needless to say, the prophecy was self-fulfilling. As service was reduced, demand indeed shifted to trucks and airplanes, leaving Penn Central free to diversify into a giant conglomerate.

From Penn Central's point of view, the logic was obvious: Why invest in new railroad cars, track and station facilities if there's a better return in pipelines and luxury hotels?

The railroads' contempt for passenger traffic is, of course, legendary. Anyone who has taken a train recently has had that confirmed. But Penn Central managed even to undo its profitable freight business.

Under law, the ICC has always had the power to compel Penn-Central to run a better railroad. But as one commissioner put it recently, "We do not intend to use that jurisdiction in requiring heavy investment . . ."

Rep. Richard Ottinger, whose New York district depends on Penn-Central, has said the ICC and the railroads maintain a "working economic and personal relationship, which frequently involves the most insidious possible influence by an industry upon an agency holding the public trust."

Rep. John Dingell of Michigan has charged that the ICC's dealings are riddled with conflict of interest.

In the end, however, even the ICC's indulgence didn't save Penn Central from its own blundering. It had invested so poorly that it lost its liquidity, and became the first major victim of the 1970 recession. It couldn't even make a deal with a President who would come through on his word.

What was particularly irritating to Congress was that the government demanded nothing in return for its generosity.

It is inconceivable that Packard did not promise, at the least, a complete government examination of Penn Central finances.

Nor did he suggest that, as a condition of the loan, Penn Central would start showing some concern for the public.

The administration did ask for legislation authorizing a total of \$750 million in rail loans, but there was no indication that any of the money had to be directed at improved service.

What Nixon did propose—with railroad approval, of course—was a public corporation to run unprofitable passenger lines. But as long as we contemplate nationalization, why not go all the way and take over the entire industry?

Deep down, the trouble is that federal transportation policy is insane. The 1971 budget contains \$4.6 billion for roads and \$1.35 billion for aviation. It has \$23 million to improve the railroads.

No wonder Penn Central concluded that no one cared about rail service, and that it could get away with anything it wanted, including bankruptcy.

A TRIBUTE TO GORDON CANFIELD
"MAN OF THE YEAR"

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, on June 9, 1970, the Kiwanis Club of Paterson, N.J., awarded its Man of the Year Award to Gordon Canfield in appreciation of his excellence in public service. As many of you in this Chamber will remember, Gordon Canfield served in this body with dis-

tingtion for 20 years from 1941 to 1961 when he retired.

His devotion to duty and his sacrifices as a dedicated public servant were well stated in the inscription accompanying the award:

Outstanding among men of all religions and political faiths;

Righteously indignant against all forms of discrimination;

Dedicated to God and his native land;

Openly, without evasion or mental reservation;

Now, yesterday and tomorrow.

The inscription went on to cite Gordon Canfield's awareness of his responsibilities in the community and the Congress as well as his devotion to his family and friends.

More than 300 attended the award luncheon given in his honor representing all religious faiths and political persuasions. It is my pleasure and honor to include at this point in my remarks the text of the "Tribute to Gordon Canfield" delivered by Dr. William P. Tolley, chairman of Mohawk Airlines and chancellor emeritus of Syracuse University:

As I look at this wonderful company of friends of Gordon and Dorothy Canfield, I am reminded of the comment of the little girl on her first day at school. Her mother was with her, and as she looked at the warm and cheerful classroom, the happy, chattering children and the smiling teacher, she turned to her mother and said, "The room says, 'yes.'"

This room says "yes," and we all say "yes" in gratitude, respect and love.

Walt Whitman once said, "This is the city and I am one of the citizens."

"Whatever interests the rest, interests me, politics, war, markets, newspapers, schools.

"The mayor and councils, banks, tariffs, steamships, factories, stocks, stores, real estate and personal estate."

In honoring Gordon Canfield as Man of the Year, Kiwanis honors the principle of good citizenship.

We take the words of Walt Whitman as an expression of our own interest, loyalty and commitment as citizens—"This is the city and I am one of the citizens. Whatever interests the rest, interests me."

It is a privilege for me to be here as it is for all the members of the Canfield family. I have known Gordon since 1915. We were students together in the Binghamton Central High School in Binghamton, New York. Gordon had been a newsboy and in high school he worked long hours as a newspaper reporter. But we knew him as a brilliant student, a natural leader, our finest debater, and by far our most gifted orator. He had won the state oratorical contest and a four-year scholarship at Columbia University—a scholarship he was unable to take because of the family finances. I remember the tremendous reception we gave him at the Lackawanna Station when he returned from New York City. Public speaking was a major activity in our high school and Gordon won all the public speaking contests and all the debates. To Mr. Greengard, our teacher and debate coach, there never was a debater with the forensic skill of Gordon Canfield.

I followed with interest Gordon's experience with Western Union, his service in World War I, his work as a reporter for the old Passaic Daily News, his service as secretary for 17 years to the late Congressman George Seger, his study at night to earn his law degree, and then his brilliant career as Congressman from the Eighth District for twenty years—retiring ten years ago as Dean of the New Jersey delegation.

We worried about Gordon's safety as he served as an ordinary seaman on an oil tanker on the Atlantic in World War II. We read with excitement and concern his first hand reports of visits to Buchenwald, Hiroshima and the Korean War Front. We listened to his prophetic words about drug addiction as a national problem and his vigorous leadership in Congress of the war on narcotics. He was Chairman of the Treasury-Post Office Appropriations Subcommittee. I should like to think that the recent postal strike would not have occurred if Gordon were still in Congress. It would not have occurred because the legitimate grievances of the postal workers would have been met long before.

Gordon was a key figure in providing for the needs of refugees from Hitler and the war zones. He had a deep interest in the race problem and all the problems of the little man. In his concern for the disadvantaged and the poor, he helped to make possible the present program of social security. He was the enemy of both facism and communism. And he knew what was needed to keep America strong. He had a special interest and concern for the Coast Guard. I remember a visit to the Coast Guard Academy as a speaker. I was treated courteously. When, however, I mentioned to the Commandant that I had married Gordon Canfield's sister, he jumped to attention. "Why," he said, "Congressman Canfield is the Father of the Coast Guard Reserve. No one in public life has done so much for so many years for the Coast Guard."

In the decade since his retirement from Congress, Gordon has spent his exceptional talents in community service for the First National Bank of Passaic County, The Church of the Covenant, Rotary, The Passaic Valley Chapter of the American Red Cross, The Paterson Council on the Aging, The First Federal Savings and Loan Association of which he is a Director, and as an active member of the distinguished board of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington.

As a Republican running for office in a heavily Democratic district, Gordon was unbeatable. There were many reasons for this: his warm personality, his love for people, his gift for friendship, his concern for justice, his unfailing kindness and courtesy, his sincerity and integrity, and, of course, his knowledge of government, his long and wide experience and his eloquence as a speaker.

Gordon is one who lets nothing stop him—not even the loss of health. He is a perfectionist. He is a tremendous worker. He leaves nothing to chance. He puts his heart into everything he does. He takes pride in that extra effort that spells the difference between what is good and what is outstanding.

What an example his life is in a day when so many suffer from an acute case of underachievement. This is a time of carelessness in dress and conduct. We have a youth culture where the peer-pressure is to conform to the lowest standards and aims. The accent is on obscenity in speech, rudeness in manners and mediocrity in performance. Dishonesty is condoned because there is so much of it. Violence is excused because of the greater violence of war. Immorality is defended as the new freedom and the new morality. Whatever is common and cheap becomes the norm. And youth captures youth and exploits it.

What we have forgotten is the distinction between right and wrong and between what is and what ought to be. We have forgotten that what is common may be unworthy of us, that what is average is not good enough. We have forgotten that a low aim in life has disastrous consequences for all who choose it.

Today we honor a man who is not common and who is not average. His life re-

fects the discipline and habit of a search for excellence. It was Browning who wrote, "The aim if reached or not, makes great the life." The high aim of Gordon Canfield makes great his life.

Gordon is one who believes that God is not dead, that the miracle of spring does not just happen each year, and that the conquest of space is possible because the laws of nature do not change.

Joined to this belief in a universe under law is Gordon's belief as a lawyer, legislator and citizen in an ordered society. In his thirty-seven years at Washington he came to see more clearly than most of us the role of the courts, of the President and of the Congress in a free society which makes its progress under law.

The mood of some of our social activists is that they will choose the laws to obey while still expecting the full protection of the American legal system. But the law, like an ordered society, is surprisingly fragile. It is like an umbrella. One can't punch holes in an umbrella and then expect protection from the rain.

Gordon has lived by his belief in an ordered universe, an ordered human society and an ordered morality. And the three are related.

There is no answer to the search for happiness in drug addiction and promiscuity. There is no happiness in the philosophy that anything goes. When anything goes, everything goes.

Nihilism in the field of morals means just what it does in society—the destruction of all law and order. Man cannot live in such a world. He must have a tradition, a standard, an ideal, a canon, an example, a moral belief, a moral law. There will be no great society without character, without the self-discipline and restraint of high ideals and moral values.

At this point Gordon would protest that we have said too much, but we have not. We need the example of men of character. And Gordon has been an example to all of us.

When we honor a man like Gordon, it is an exercise in responsible citizenship. It is a recognition that, "This is the city and I am one of the citizens. Whatever interests the rest, interests me."

At Syracuse University we make a great deal of the Athenian Oath. It is engraved on the wall of Maxwell Hall and it reads as follows: "We will ever strive for the ideals and sacred things of the city, both alone and with many. We will increasingly seek to quicken the sense of public duty: we will revere and obey the city's laws. We will transmit this city not only less, but greater, better, and more beautiful than it was transmitted to us."

Dorothy and Gordon have faithfully discharged the obligations of their oath of citizenship. As concerned and loyal Americans we should do the same. This is the meaning of what Kiwanis has done in Paterson today. In our commitment to good citizenship is our perfect tribute to Gordon and Dorothy Canfield.

THE LAND OF ENCHANTMENT

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, those of us from the Southwestern United States, and New Mexico in particular, were most appreciative of the very kind and thoughtful editorial in the June 19, 1970, issue of Life magazine written by Life's

managing editor, Mr. Ralph Graves. We extend a warm, hearty welcome to all Americans, easterners and others, to come visit the Land of Enchantment—enchanted scenery, history, and people. It is not only a great place to visit, but a wonderful, healthy place to live.

The editorial follows:

THE PLEASANT, FRIENDLY SOUND OF GOOD MANNERS

I have recently come back from west Texas, where I lived for a while many years ago, and from Arizona and New Mexico, where I had never been at all. It is customary for visitors to the Southwest to be impressed by the vastness and splendid emptiness of the country. To go there direct from the high-rise, car-choked world of New York City is indeed an experience in total contrast. Only someone who has been repeatedly trapped in traffic jams on six-lane "turnpikes" and "thruways," traffic jams caused by one car in one lane running out of gas, can appreciate the joy of driving a two-lane highway through open country for 100 miles—and seeing three cars. There is so much open space in this land, and it is such a pleasure to be a relaxed and inconsequential part of it.

It was only after several days of traveling and visiting and talking that I began to be aware of something more important than spaciousness. I was a stranger in every sense, not only because I didn't know anymore, but because the landscape and the towns and cities and even many of the place-names stopped, I was made to feel welcome. It did not matter whether I was meeting someone as an editor of Life or as a customer at a restaurant or drug store or just asking directions in the ignorant way of all strangers. I kept encountering friendliness and courtesy and goodwill. An oil executive who certainly did not agree with LIFE's view of oil pollution was nevertheless a gracious host. An Arizona businessman who thought Spiro Agnew had exactly the right view of "the Eastern press" made a special effort to arrange meetings and appointments for a visitor from the Eastern press. An artist I had never met simply dropped his work for two days to show me his country. A state governor who had just suffered a bitter political disappointment invited me out to his house at the end of a very bad day and never mentioned his troubles. On a more casual level, whenever I bought a tank of gas or a cup of coffee, I was never just handed my change. It was invariably accompanied by "Come back and see us" or "Have a nice day" or "Good luck now." All of these occurrences were more than good business or good politics; they were good manners.

When I realized what an extraordinarily pleasant thing was happening over and over again, I began to watch for examples of bad manners, of ordinary, everyday rudeness. I kept right on watching till the end of the trip, and I am embarrassed to report that my solitary exhibit after 10 days of alert attention was a cab driver—the New York City cab driver who took me home from Kennedy Airport to Manhattan.

I don't want to suggest that the people who live in Alpine and Albuquerque and Roswell and San Patricio and Pecos and Phoenix are nicer than Americans elsewhere. In fact, another LIFE editor who has made a similar trip through the South insists that for courtesy and kindness he will match the people he met against the people I met. But I am reminded by this experience—as perhaps many of us need to be reminded these days—that this country, for all its current disharmony, and protest and shouting, is inhabited by people who prefer to be decent to one another.

HOUSING NEEDS GROW MORE ACUTE

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, the housing needs of our country are continuing to grow more acute, and to meet the demands for shelter, the homebuilding industry and the finance industry need help now.

The Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970 is designed to deal with this situation and my only regret is that it has taken so long for the bill to reach us on the floor.

In consideration of these needs, I am favorably impressed with an editorial on the bill which appears in the July issue of Professional Builders, the Nation's largest housing publication. The editor, James J. Shapiro, believes that passage of the Emergency Home Finance Act now will help spur housing production and the ability of people to buy and rent decent shelter.

The editorial follows:

EMERGENCY HOUSING ACT—NO WAY TO LIGHT MY FIRE

To spur up more action during a skidding housing year, Congress has put final touches on a 1970 housing bill. It's called the Emergency Home Finance Act because the original purpose was to quickly pass a few key money measures and help a deteriorating emergency credit situation facing our industry.

The bill has important provisions, namely: (1) An appropriation of \$250,000,000 to be used by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. This would help inch downward S&L rates to builders. (2) An expansion (by about \$750,000,000) of special assistance funds that can be used by the Government National Mortgage Association at the discretion of the President. And HUD Secretary Romney has testified that the President would use the funds. (3) Establishment of a Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation within the Federal Home Loan Bank System to handle conventional mortgages. This would provide a secondary market for conventional mortgages held by commercial banks, mutual savings banks and most S&Ls. It would also serve as a stimulus for a uniform mortgage instrument between FHA and conventional mortgages. (4) A subsidy of \$60,000,000 for this new Mortgage Corp. making up the difference between seven percent mortgages which it would acquire and average borrowing cost. Loans could be either FHA, VA, or conventional and would be a big boost for housing in the \$20,000-to-\$30,000 range for middle-income families.

The bill is solid and packed with goodies, so what's the beef? The problem is really not the bill but its lack of emergency action. The Senate first acted on the bill in early April, but the House has fiddled and delayed, and the entire package will probably not be passed until late June or early July.

This is despite aggressive testimony by NAHB and individual lobbying efforts during the May Spring Board meeting in Washington. I might add that without NAHB's pushing, the bill would probably have been delayed even further.

Many provisions of the bill such as the establishment of the Mortgage Corporation

are excellent, but emergency legislation is not the place for a broad, far-reaching concept. Congress, particularly the House, should have quickly passed key money portions (like the FHLBB's \$250 million) and left the more complex programs for later debate.

The delay has put a further crimp in credit instead of alleviating it and has widened the credibility gap between builders and the Administration which has promised to "do something" about the housing situation. Now the ugly spectre of party politics enters the picture. Some Washington insiders say the situation has gone so long without decisive action that Democrats may delay real help at this time in order to point a pre-November-election accusing finger at Republicans who have "carried us into a housing depression."

During a recent trip to Washington, I had a chance to talk with long-time legislative pro in housing affairs, Joseph McGrath, staff vice president of NAHB, Joe's analysis: "This bill contains very helpful financial programs—but it just may be too late."

Is that any way to handle emergency housing matters?

OUR ENVIRONMENT A NEW NATIONAL COMMITMENT

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, pollution is a very serious problem in this Nation. A few days ago I received a special report published by my colleague the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McDONALD) which I thought reflected the severity of the problem, and the dedication to which we all are committed. The report, titled "Our Environment: A New National Commitment," is a brief, and to-the-point synopsis of pollutions' causes and hopefully its cures. I commend Mr. McDONALD for his efforts in this report, and offer my thanks to him for making this copy available to me. I wish to share this report with all of my colleagues, and offer at this time a copy to be printed in the RECORD. Portions of the report include a Flintstone cartoon by Hanna and Barbera, reprinted with permission from McNaught Syndicate, Inc., a Joe Palooka cartoon by Ham Fisher, reprinted by permission from McNaught Syndicate, Inc., and a photograph of Mr. McDONALD with Federal Water Quality Administration Commissioner, David Dominick.

The report follows:

THE JACK McDONALD CONGRESSIONAL REPORT OUR ENVIRONMENT: A NEW NATIONAL COMMITMENT

America the beautiful?

The genius that in less than a century has made us the most affluent nation in history has given us an unwanted byproduct—polluted air and waterways and an incredible mass of litter.

Thousands of factories and millions of cars, symbols of our fantastic productivity, daily poison the air we breathe. Our waterways are polluted by industry and government alike. Our countryside is used as a trash can for millions of articles hurled from speeding cars. Our entire population of more than 200 million is in some manner affected.

And so the Seventies have been declared the "decade of the environment," a time for the American people to devote greater attention and more of our wealth to the problems of pollution so that our very affluence will not be our destroyer.

This new national dedication comes none too soon, for as we have grown so have we sown the seeds of potential disaster.

The vastness and wealth of our nation have been largely responsible for our current plight.

We have had as much—and continue to find so much more—that we have been unconcerned about the wise use of our resources. And we grew so quickly as an industrial nation we did not stop to consider the consequences of our ever-expanding wealth.

Thus today we have industries and communities polluting our rivers, lakes and harbors because we have lagged in providing controls.

We find these same sources polluting the air we breathe, along with the millions of motor vehicles that are the foremost symbol of our national wealth.

In sum, we find today that the very things that have given us the highest standard of living in the annals of man have also come perilously close to making this a hollow achievement.

So it is not difficult to understand that we are in trouble.

To grasp the magnitude of the challenge, let us look closely at the sources and effects of pollution and the efforts to conquer it.

IS THIS THE AMERICAN GENIUS?

"The family which takes its mauve and cerise, air-conditioned, power-steered and power-braked automobile out for a tour passes through cities that are badly paved, made hideous by litter, blighted buildings, billboards and posts for wires that should long since have been put underground. They pass on into a countryside that has been rendered largely invisible by commercial art . . . They picnic on exquisitely packaged food from a portable icebox by a polluted stream and go on to spend the night at a park which is a menace to public health and morals. Just before dozing off on an air mattress, beneath a nylon tent, amid the stench of decaying refuse, they may reflect vaguely on the curious unevenness of their blessings. Is this, indeed, the American genius?"—JOHN KENNETH GALBRAITH in "The Affluent Society"

THE 1970 QUESTIONNAIRE

Results of my fourth annual questionnaire will be announced shortly in the press. For the first time, the results will also reflect the views of the 18-to-21 age group.

THE DEADLY NATURE OF OUR AIR AND WATER

Air pollution can be as lethal as the cyanide pellet used in the gas chamber. Water pollution not only kills millions of fish but denies us the use of scores of recreation areas. Solid wastes can be both eyesores and health hazards.

In Donora, Pa., in October 1948, a blanket of fog lifted after four days, leaving 6,000 of the town's 14,000 residents ill and 20 dead.

A similar incident in December 1952 killed 4,000 Londoners in one week.

These tragedies are grim enough, but let us consider the long-term effects of air pollution. These include ill and diseases from the cold to cancer.

Studies have linked air pollution to colds and have shown a striking difference between urban and rural mortality rates for lung cancer.

Here are some other effects of air pollution:

It obscures visibility, creating hazards to air, land and water transportation.

It causes metals to tarnish, corrode, crack, weaken and discolor.

It sometimes forces electrical equipment manufacturers to use gold for electrical contacts because other metals, such as silver, corrode in sulfur atmospheres and corroded metal resists electrical current.

It injures and kills plants.

Every major river system in our country is polluted. Millions of fish die annually in the Mississippi; eels in the Hudson cling to wastes and sometimes attack sanitary engineers taking water samples; blood from slaughterhouses discolors and pollutes the Missouri.

About 8 million people are drinking from municipal water systems that contain more bacteria than is considered "safe" under federal standards.

Besides the bacteriological danger, we should consider the matter of pesticides. It is known, for instance, that the concentration of pesticides builds up as they move through the food chain, from water to seaweed to fish to birds to mammals—to man. DDT residues have been found in penguins, polar bears and in fish in the far Pacific.

Recreational areas are destroyed when pollution produces a great excess of such nutrients as phosphates and nitrates which produce algae and clog waterways.

The rapid buildup of nutrients is blamed for aging Lake Erie, biologically, 15,000 years since 1920.

The solid waste disposal problem may soon approach the air and water pollution crises. Some 80 percent of the population is in some way affected by refuse storage, collection, transportation and processing. More than 330,000 people handle urban wastes alone.

Disposal space is diminishing. A year's refuse from 10,000 persons covers an acre of ground seven feet deep. The space problem is worst in urban areas, which also must bear rising collection costs. Present annual collection costs nationally are \$4.5 billion. The average cost per person is \$7 a year. And facilities are becoming inadequate.

Today, the town dump is a haphazard and inefficient operation, due principally to local apathy. The U.S. Public Health Service estimates that 94 percent of the dumps and 75 percent of the incinerators in use are inadequate with respect to sanitation and pollution. Only 5 percent of refuse is disposed of by the sanitary landfill method in which six inches of dirt is dumped over each day's collection.

As an indication of the scope of this problem, one former federal official has charged that half the communities with more than 2,500 inhabitants are not doing even a "minimally acceptable" collection and disposal job.

SOME GENERAL STATISTICS

Water—Every river system in our nation is polluted to some extent. Both treated and untreated industrial discharges into our waterways equal the raw sewage from almost 170 million people.

More than 15 million fish were killed last year by more than 18 billion gallons of industrial and municipal wastes, according to the Interior Department.

Many recreation and swimming areas along the Great Lakes have been closed because the water is unsafe. Lake Erie is practically dead, its oxygen content nearing zero, as 3 million tons of filth and debris pour into it daily.

Air—37 million tons of sulfur dioxide pour out of industrial chimneys each year. Over 90 million cars add 66 million tons of carbon monoxide. Another 5 million tons comes from electrical incinerators.

Solid wastes—Each day, we discard millions of tons of garbage, rubbish, automobile hulks, abandoned refrigerators and slaughterhouse refuse. Enough is discarded annual-

ly to fill the Panama Canal four times. One example is the aluminum can, produced at the rate of 48 billion a year. Another 28 billion bottles and jars are produced annually.

Today, 70 percent of our people live on 2 percent of our land. The average American is responsible for 1,800 pounds of solid waste each year—almost one ton—and that output is rising 4 percent each year.

A MULTITUDE OF VILLAINS AT THE SOURCE

The sources of pollution seem endless.

Our rivers, harbors and lakes are contaminated by municipal sewage and industrial waste; by overflow from septic tanks, discharges from ships, pesticides, silt, detergents and fertilizers.

More than half our air contamination consists of carbon monoxide. More than one tenth is hydrocarbons. These are the emissions of motor vehicles. Home and factory combustion of sulfur-containing coal and oil produces the second most plentiful gas pollutant.

Our land is about to be engulfed by solid waste. Monuments of our civilization may become heaps of auto hulks, glass bottles, tin and aluminum cans, used packaging, discarded tires and other rubbish.

The causes are easy to find.

When we think of water pollution, it is shocking to realize that one third of the 19,200 communities with municipal water systems fail to meet existing U.S. Public Health Service standards and that more than 1,300 communities discharge wastes without treatment.

Industrial pollution is twice as great a problem, and it is an indication of the task ahead that a major steel complex—supposedly a showcase for control efforts—is still responsible for 10 percent of the total wastes emptying into Lake Erie.

The pesticide menace has become so widespread it has led to a ban on all but essential use of DDT within the next few years. Detergents and fertilizers often escape even secondary waste treatment and are a major source of phosphate pollution which results in fertilization of vegetation in our waterways. This can eventually end animal and plant life.

Thermal pollution caused by atomic reactors is a more recent concern. Extensive damage and destruction of marine plant and wildlife are feared as a result of the discharge of atomic wastes and "hot" water used to cool reactors.

When we consider the solid waste problem we must bear in mind that in only 20 years our population has increased 30 percent—but solid waste loads have increased 60 percent. Our annual accumulation is currently 200 million tons.

This alarming rise is due not only to the increase in population but to greater consumption and affluence. Thus, today we are more inclined to throw away what we once saved.

An illustration of our sloppy habits may be seen in a spot check of a one-mile stretch of Kansas highway. Found, among other things, were 770 paper cups, 730 empty cigarette packs, 590 beer cans and 130 soft drink bottles.

Recycling benefits

The U.S. Bureau of Mines, which is involved in research in resource recovery, estimates that if all solid waste were properly incinerated, it would yield salvageable metals worth more than \$1 billion each year.

One ton of recycled waste paper can provide wood pulp equivalent to 17 pulped trees.

MY SEVEN PROPOSALS FOR A CLEANER ENVIRONMENT

The pollution problems we've discussed can be solved—but the task is a massive one that will demand the utmost of every American.

In the congressional area, we can formulate the over-all policy, encourage research and cooperation and provide a portion of the necessary funding.

In an effort to accelerate our total effort, I have introduced as a prime sponsor the bills recommended by the President as part of his comprehensive environmental improvement program.

Clean Water Financing Act—H.R. 16049 provides an initial \$10 billion for municipal waste treatment plants and interceptor sewers, with state and local governments paying \$6 billion. The bill also revises the present rigid allocation formula to give special emphasis to need and prospects for water quality improvement.

Environmental Financing Authority—H.R. 16048 provides for purchase of bonds if a municipality cannot sell at a reasonable rate. The EPA would then sell its own bonds on the taxable market. The municipal bond market's condition in 1969 was such that 509 issues totaling \$2.9 billion were unsalable.

Industrial Pollution—H.R. 16050 and H.R. 16051 are amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and deal primarily with industrial pollution. While standards presently are established in general terms and federal jurisdiction is limited to interstate waters, H.R. 16051 extends the Secretary of Interior's authority to preparation of water quality programs for all navigable waters. The bill also broadens the secretary's enforcement authority.

H.R. 16050 provides for research, investigations, experiments, demonstrations and studies relating to the causes, control and prevention of water pollution. Federal grants are provided to state and interstate agencies to assist them in enforcement.

Clean Air—H.R. 16047, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970, authorizes tests on motor vehicles and engines; regulates the contents of fuel and fuel additives, and proposes establishment of nationwide standards governing industries, power plants, furnaces, incinerators and other stationary sources of air pollution. The bill also provides severe penalties for violators.

Solid Waste—H.R. 16046, the Wastes Reclamation and Recycling Act of 1970, calls upon the Council on Environmental Quality to study various means and regulatory measures to accelerate reclamation and recycling of such discards as junk automobiles which might be re-usable.

Parks and Recreation—H.R. 16045 amends the land and Water Conservation Act of 1965 to carry out administration recommendations dealing with parks and public recreation.

It authorizes the Secretary of Interior to sell surplus federal property to state and local governments for park and recreation purposes at public benefit discounts up to 100 percent.

One third of all land in the United States—more than 750 million acres—is owned by the federal government. Vast amounts of such land with great potential as recreation areas are owned by agencies that could be located elsewhere.

SINCE 1955: A NOTE ON PROGRESS

In 1955, Congress passed legislation calling on state and local governments to take the basic responsibility for prevention of air pollution and giving the Department of Health, Education and Welfare authority to devote itself to research and technical support.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956 established the basic federal responsibilities in this area. Subsequent legislation has broadened the federal involvement and established standards to be met by states.

The Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965 created the forerunner of HEW's Bureau of Solid Waste Management.

In 1967, the Air Quality Act paved the way for a regional approach to the problem. HEW has designated 57 such regions under the National Air Pollution Control Administration. States are expected to develop air quality standards and implementation plans for coordination on a regional basis.

WHIRL IS KING

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, in my native State of Virginia, the George C. Marshall Research Foundation, dedicated to the memory of our great Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army during World War II and subsequent Secretary of State, has as its executive director the eminent Dr. Forrest C. Pogue. Dr. Pogue was honored twice during the recent college commencement season, on June 5 by Washington & Lee University, Lexington, Va., with a Litt.D. and the following day by his alma mater, Murray State University, Murray, Ky., with a LL.D. Dr. Pogue was the commencement speaker on the latter occasion, and I am pleased to include his address in the RECORD:

WHIRL IS KING

(Commencement address at Murray State University, June 6, 1970, by Forrest C. Pogue)

"Whirl is king, having driven out Zeus." With this quotation from Aristophanes, Walter Lippmann began a volume on the whirling confusion of his day which followed the sweeping away of moral authority and traditions. Huxley was right, he says, when he declared: "A man's worst difficulties begin when he is able to do as he likes."

What most distinguishes the generation who have approached maturity since the debacle of idealism at the end of the war is not their rebellion against the religious and moral code of their parents, but their disillusionment with their own rebellion. It is common for young men and women to rebel, but that they should rebel sadly and without faith in their own rebellion, that they should detest the new freedom no less than the old certainties—that is something of a novelty. As Mr. Canby once said, "At the age of seven they saw through their parents and characterized them in a phrase. At fourteen they saw through education and dodged it. At eighteen they lost respect for their home towns and at twenty they saw that our social system is ridiculous. At twenty-three the autobiography ends because the author has seen through society to date and does not know what to do next."

"They have seen through the religion of nature to which the early romantics turned for consolation. . . . They have seen through the religion of beauty because, for one thing, they are too much oppressed by the ugliness of Main Street. They cannot take refuge in an ivory tower because the modern apartment house, with a radio loudspeaker on the floor above and on the floor below and just across the courtyard will not permit it. They cannot make a religion of science . . . because they do not understand modern science. They never learned enough mathematics and physics. . . . As for religion of progress, that is preempted by George Babbitt and the Rotary Club, and the religion of humanity is utterly unacceptable to those who have

to ride in the subways during the rush hour." . . . The eager search for new religions, the hasty adherence to cults . . . are confessions that to modern man his activity has no place in any rational order. His life seems mere restlessness and compulsion, rather than conduct lighted by luminous beliefs. He is possessed by a great deal of excitement amidst which, as Mr. Santayana once remarked, he redoubles his effort when he has forgotten his aim."

Having recently put down this volume of criticism on a troubled period of history, I picked up another, a novel on the generation gap—of the difficulties between fathers and sons. The story opens with the visit of a young student and his best friend, on the way home from university, to the estate of the former's father, who, while completely out of date, tries to keep up to some extent with the new generation. The father's brother, living more in the past, finds it difficult to cope with the new ideas.

The older visitor, a medical student, is brash, sure of himself, almost contemptuous of the older generation. "Your father is a nice old man," he tells his college friend, "but his day is done." We are thoroughly prepared for the argument which follows between representatives of the two generations. The student starts one argument by declaring that "negation is the most useful thing of all." Angered, the brother of the host retorts, "You deny everything, or, speaking more precisely, you destroy everything . . . But one must construct too, you know." "That's not our business now," said the student impatiently, "The ground must be cleared first." "But do you destroy without knowing why," came the question. "We shall destroy because we are a force."

The two books might have been written this week. But the former Lippmann's "Preface to Morals," I first read forty years ago in Dr. Lowry's Sociology class, and the second, Turgenev's "Fathers and Sons," appeared in Russia more than 100 years ago. But the problems they describe are completely contemporary. I have been amused on rereading them to find that I have reacted differently since the first reading. I read Lippmann as a junior and felt somewhat irritated at his viewpoint toward youth. The Turgenev I read in 1932, a few months out of graduate school, with a Master's degree and no job—returned to my home in a tiny West Kentucky town—reduced to killing boredom by turning through the pages of Everyman classics. I was inclined then to feel that the great society of my day had blundered into a staggering depression that was upsetting the entire whole economy—and particularly preventing me from getting a job—and that it needed to be swept away so that we could begin again properly. Quite aged, a few months past twenty, I was certain that some changes needed to be made; that they needed to be made now.

Three things stand out from the books by Lippmann and Turgenev concerning the young: (1) their desire to change everything at once and to start fresh, (2) the tendency to grow bored and world weary with the changes they have begun, and (3) impatience with authority.

Extravagance and youth go together. It makes each new generation interesting and difficult for the generation passing off the stage. The extravagance is made bearable for the old because of the knowledge—as one critic writes of *Fathers and Sons*—that in twenty years the son will himself understand what it is to be called out-of-date.

Although Turgenev's young student occasionally attacked the romantic ideas of the age just past, he showed many of their attitudes in the extravagance of language. From the time of Byron to that of Hugo, the young intellectuals and artists had at-

tacked tradition in ideas as they did in dress. Long locks, oddities in clothing, became the fashion as conformity in non-conformism became the rage. At one stage they won the nickname "Les Incroyables" (the incredibles or unbelievables) for their eccentricities. Their writings, music, and art were marked by a breaking away from classic forms, by a deep melancholy, admiration of the noble savage, a desire to escape to nature, a love for the morbid, and a certain preoccupation with death. The medical student who preached Nihilism spoke of an age of science but his exuberant talk of sweeping everything away and starting over had a Romantic wildness about it which appealed to a generation of Anarchists who sought to purge old sins and discarded ideas by bombing or shooting a number of high officials, including in twenty years the murders of the Tsar of Russia, shortly after he emancipated the serfs, the President of France, the King of Italy, the Empress of Austria, and the President of the United States. Convinced that the removal of those in authority and the destruction of police stations, banks, and government offices would overnight bring the millenium, they cheerfully blew up themselves along with their victims or surrendered happily to the police. One can understand the killing of a tyrant or the bombing of a monster when their removals might bring a better life. But the anarchistic terrorists made no distinction between bad and good men. All authority was bad and it must be removed in every form.

The student of the past may well be concerned by the violence of the last few years and will agree that universities are in a state of crisis. But he will not concede that this is unparalleled in modern history. His concern is that through neglect of the study of history, the young will ignore some lessons and some warnings.

Few young militants in the universities realize or care how painfully the modern university system has been developed and freedom of instruction and discussion in classrooms won. Early universities grew up around small communities of students which had been established near a cathedral where churchmen taught interpretations of the scriptures or canon law. The power to give licenses to teach was conferred on the churchmen in charge by popes, kings, and emperors. Some rulers and churchmen, in order to aid poor students, set up endowments which helped to provide subsistence. Students found their own lodgings, usually near the lecture rooms, and made their own arrangements for lectures with professors, sometimes swearing, according to tradition, that they would not use their knives or swords on professors if they failed their examinations. One took what the professor was inclined to teach and accepted the conditions laid down by the church.

Many university students were older than the average student of the present day and were not always gentle in their manners. Over pots of ale and glasses of wine in taverns, they engaged in quarrels, and some were seized for theft of purses and for swordplay. To avoid inevitable clashes between Town and Gown and to prevent local authorities from entering the lecture rooms to haul out students for punishment, the universities in time lodged their students within walls and established curfews and rules for their comings and goings. Except in such matter as murder and sacrilege, the city authorities tended to leave to university officials the keeping of order within their precincts. One can see in Heidelberg the university jail where youthful offenders were kept. He can also see a copy of a proclamation addressed by the Tsar of Russia to his troops, when they came through Heidelberg during the Napoleonic wars, forbidding them to stable their

horses or billet their men in the buildings and yards of the university.

In the period between the early Middle Ages and the wars of Napoleon, nearly every major country of Europe had developed universities, adding to the original faculty of theology other faculties of philosophy, medicine, and law. Even though they became powerful, administrators became aware that their rights did not extend to making attacks against the emperor or king nor to teaching heresy. Professors and students attacking the authority of the state could be hanged and those guilty of heretical teachings could be jailed or even burned. Cautious schoolmen learned to avoid touchy topics of state and advanced interpretations of the scriptures. Or often they learned to hide attacks on a modern tyrant in a classics course involving the history of Rome and Greece.

When liberal ideas in the universities came in touch with a liberal movement within a country, an opening was made which permitted students unaccustomed latitude. Thus, the Napoleonic wars, with their spreading of nationalism and demands for unity in historically divided states such as Italy and Germany encouraged students and professors in lands opposed to the French Emperor to preach unification of their countries in the classroom. Students in several of the smaller German states organized clubs where, after taking fierce oaths of brotherhood, they read fiery attacks on Napoleon and sang stirring songs of German unity. After Waterloo they continued their demand for German unity although it, in effect, involved opposition to the rulers of Austria, Russia, and Prussia who desired that the German states remain numerous and weak.

It was in this climate of reaction that German students in 1817, still tasting the heady wine of German nationalism, organized a festival at Wartburg Castle, associated with Luther's 16th century defiance of the Pope. It was no Woodstock but it frightened the authorities. In the spirit more of a pep rally rather than of conspiracy, or should we call it "living theater", they tossed into a blazing bonfire a wig, a corporal's cane, a copy of Prussian police regulations, and the plays of Kotzebue, a German conservative dramatist, who was suspected of being in the pay of Russia. The burned symbols represented the courts, hidebound restrictions, the Army, the State, Prince Metternich, as representative of the Emperor of the Austro-Hungarian empire, who had assumed the task of keeping Conservative forces in control of Europe, watched warily this student movement. When some months later, a half crazed student killed Kotzebue, Metternich acted quickly. Summoning representatives of neighboring nations to Carlsbad he persuaded them to put into effect strong decrees against freedom of instruction and of the press. Special curators were appointed to oversee universities, guards were placed inside classrooms, and in many schools special subjects, such as history and philosophy, were suppressed or kept under special surveillance. (It is interesting to note that history, a topic which periodically some of our university friends propose to toss out as irrelevant to the present day, was always a topic which despotic monarchs suppressed first as dangerous to the monarchy.)

There were stirrings in 1830 among students and workers but little of a profound revolutionary nature came until 1848—the year of revolution throughout Europe. The prime participants were members of the bourgeoisie, workers, and students. In Paris after the government of Louis Philippe had forbidden a banquet on Washington's birthday, students of the university joined the workers and middle class representatives in demonstrations against the king. Fired on by troops protecting the royal palaces, the dissidents threw up barricades in the streets. Frightened, and disheartened the king fled

and the surprised rioters proclaimed a Republic. The news from Paris spread through Europe where capital after capital, long weary of repressive rule, rose in revolt.

A student march in Vienna asking freedom from censorship helped to spark the rising in that city. In panic, the emperor permitted arms to be given to students who organized an "Academic Legion" and passed the summer pleasantly attempting to run the government of the city. Exuberant students joined with revolutionists across Europe in movements in which they hoped to bring autonomy to some, unity to others, extend the right to vote to the middle class, and obtain better wages and hours for workers. Following a pattern which was to become commonplace in later risings, the coalition of moderate and left wing elements soon fell apart. Demands by the workers frightened the middle class, extravagant statements and recriminations drove many moderates into the arms of the reaction. When the workers refused to moderate their demands, officers of the new republic called in troops. Within a short time some 3000 radicals—part of them students—were shot or hanged. Having ventured outside their gates, the students received no quarter. In Vienna, a large military force, encouraged by Russia, drove out the liberal government with much bloodshed. By the end of 1848 the revolution was at an end with few gains for liberalism. The republic was retained in France, but in the hands of the nephew of the Napoleon I. Within three years, Louis Napoleon had made himself Emperor of the French.

In the years that followed students split along class lines. Students of the aristocracy and the upper middle class abstained from revolt; some of the poorer joined Marxist groups or slipped swiftly from school life into Bohemian quarters of great cities to engage in talk and dreams of the Revolution. Although students furnished fighters to political riots in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, leaving their wounded or dead in bloody skirmishes in the streets, they left the leadership and the main work to the working class. At times, there was an attempt to aid in peaceful picketing or in demonstration in favor of imprisoned laborers, but a lack of community understanding and cooperation existed between those who had gone from the secondary schools and academies into universities and their worker counterparts who had left school in the lower grades to enter the factories and the mills. A cleavage developed which has never been completely closed.

For the most part, the American universities developed without the European tradition of violent confrontations with police and troops. Often deliberately placed in small communities away from cities or set apart from the community in which they lived by dormitory and club life, American students tended, until recently, to be onlookers rather than participants in the upheavals in political and economic life. Only after graduation, when they had found their way into professions did they become linked with activist groups.

To some degree, the universities in the United States owed their economic support to a certain neutralism in political and economic strife. The private institutions depended on gifts by the wealthy to pay for buildings and instruction while the state institutions, dependent often on the goodwill of governors and legislatures, found it expedient to court the favor of state authorities. In a sense, there was a reversion to the compromise of the Middle Ages—the Town respected the rights of the Gown as long as the latter kept its criticisms within its walls.

For some reason student activists of the present day have never understood this compromise and have assumed that presidents and deans are free agents who can be forced to grant not only changes within the univer-

sities proper but also made into agents who can coerce the state. Although within the past fifty years, administrators and older professors have won great freedom of action in their own affairs and have built up considerable immunity against alumni and legislative censorship of their programs, they are dependent on a continued flow of income from increased endowments and legislative appropriations.

In a period of inflated costs and increased demands on private universities by student groups, the private institutions are particularly vulnerable. Student demonstrations which frighten conservative or moderate donors place the universities in intolerable situations. Their traditions of free speech favor the students; their practical will to survive favors refusal of excessive demands. Small wonder that administrators appear vacillating to both sides.

The state universities are in almost even worse plight, despite rather generous appropriations in recent years. Without large endowments, required to admit ever increasing numbers of state residents, the state schools have struggled to provide new classrooms, dormitories, greatly enlarged faculties amid spiraling costs. Legislatures already overwhelmed by demands for funds for public school education, for highways, for social welfare programs look increasingly for a place to cut appropriations.

In this situation, militants must face the fact that while they may be able to burn down a school, drive presidents and deans from their offices and even their homes, and seize buildings, they cannot coerce the legislatures of the states. These men have been threatened by experts. But they react poorly to demonstrations. Much more effective are the returns from the precincts.

At the last rally in Washington, which serious-minded college organizers kept peaceful despite the efforts of a small group to make it violent (those student marshal pigs were worse than the cops some militants declared), the main theme was that the next student move would be in the fall elections. A few ruled out this move and called for revolution. This last group made two fundamental errors in judgment—one a failure to see that the revolution has been made and the other a failure to see that the base for the more violent revolution they desire does not exist.

It is difficult for a student born 18-20 years ago to realize the tremendous revolution that has swept this country in one college generation. And it has come in the case of concessions to Black people and to students, not because of rallies or marches but because a great many people—black and white, young and old, conservative and radical—have known in their hearts for years that changes were required. The rallies and the dramatizations of injustices have played their part, but they would have come to nothing but for the fact that there was silent support from the moderates.

Gandhi, shriveled, toothless, half-naked, dressed in rough cloth that he had spun himself, mobilized a people against a mighty empire in the 1920s and 1930s. He did it not by violence nor by invective but by catching the conscience of the British people. He was safe from clubbings because his calm non-violent protests made uneasy a people which had treasured independence. Their support gave him victory.

Isn't this the way continued change must come? Does not deep revolutionary change in our ways and institutions, as opposed to revolution "for the hell of it", require a broader base than student protest? How can students drawn from every state in the land, dependent on scholarships, family allowances, or government-backed loans continue to close down universities? Millions of older people are as uneasy or as outraged as students are about many of the national and

international problems that we face. But the small band of activists by their clowning, their flouting of every rule of free discussion, their Marquisian scorn for tolerance and moderation, are depriving their movement of the sentimental advantage that American students have possessed for generations. Although students have upset their parents and neighbors for centuries, there has been a wry tolerance and a forgiving approach to college pranks and extravagant actions through the years. That advantage is drying up.

Where is the working class support that a successful revolution requires? Where is the backing of a solid ethnic group which might reinforce student demands? The worker made his own fight for more than fifty years—with little assistance from students I would note—in strikes and organization and bloody encounters at first for decent working hours, and then for better wages, and finally for security for his old age. Now that he has them he does not react well to accusations that he is a crass materialist. Having skimmed and saved to send his children to a college which he never had a chance to attend, he is outraged when students invite his help in closing it down.

At times in the past there has been a tacit community of interest between most students and some Blacks. But can the white students from well-to-do homes mobilize the majority of the Blacks against materialism? Many Blacks resent the efforts of the student militants to tell them what is good for them. The student leaders who announce their intent to stage future revolutions might well ponder the reaction of a Black worker at the time of the recent demonstration in Washington: "Revolution is the latest fad with those white college kids. They know their daddies can afford it."

The danger is that the excesses of the student militants—the mind-blowing type where "Whirl is king"—can bring repression and indefinite postponement of the true and deep revolution—justice for the Blacks, constructive changes in the educational system, in depth attack on poverty, environmental pollution war, overpopulation—the whole list of contemporary ills. In a manner reminiscent of the young student in Turgenev's book, some of the militant leaders have recently reeled off a number of summer pastimes for settling the world's problems—infiltration of factories where they can stage showdowns, causing widespread power shortages, contaminating water supply, blocking main traffic arteries (that was done for several days recently at the University of Maryland, aiding the campaigns of all the candidates who promised law and order). This type of approach to solving crucial problems is equivalent to advocating the burning down of medical schools as the cure for cancer.

There is, of course, no easy answer to the problems which seriously divide this country. War, disarmament, race, pollution have been with us for generations and they will not be solved by a nihilistic approach. I believe that the progress we have made has come in part because professors such as Doctor Lowry here have examined problems with their students, have spoken out in the classroom and to clubs where they were invited, have taken time to talk with genuinely troubled students in their offices, and have educated a group of citizens whose voices have been decisive in their communities.

I realize that this process seems unduly slow. But I would preserve the right of free discussion. I would condemn the swollen-faced extremist, full of rage and hate, who screams himself hoarse with cries of "Communist rat" or "Fascist pig." I am old-fashioned enough to believe that problems must still be approached with reason. I believe

that there is still a place in the quiet of the university community where a wise professor and a thoughtful group of students can come closer to solutions than in angry confrontations.

In this climate, there must be a disposition on the part of those in authority to make adjustments required by changing times. But there can be no free discussion on the basis of non-negotiable demands. Neither can there be useful dialogue on the basis of topics which are ruled out of order. I have been encouraged in recent weeks by the way in which the students, faculty, and administration of Murray State have handled the crisis which followed the tragedy at Kent State. There was an attempt to examine the issues and to let representatives in Washington and elsewhere know their views.

Particularly encouraging has been the decision by many students to turn their energies in the coming months to the ballot box. More effective than any shouting match is a carefully run campaign. But victories at the polls demand more than sudden improvisation. And candidacies can be wrecked by violence on the eve of elections. The frightening thing is that some students have said "We will give the system one more chance" as if there must be instant success, or else. It is a bit like kicking a slot machine because it doesn't pay off the first time you put in your quarter.

I believe our extremely serious problems deserve a more thoughtful answer than that. Because we are dealing with civilization and the decisions we make may be fatal ones. We shall need a broad coalition to make our ideas work. I often hear repeated nowadays, the powerful lines of William B. Yeats, written a half century ago:

"Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold;
Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world,
The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere
The ceremony of innocence is drowned;

The best lack all conviction, while the worst
Are full of passionate intensity."

Kenneth Clark repeats that verse in his book, *Civilization*, which was published recently. He makes the point that civilization, seemingly strong, is actually quite fragile and that it can be destroyed by a number of factors. It is endangered by a number of fears such as war, invasion, plague or famine. It is stifled by those who oppose growth or change. It is doomed by exhaustion or by feelings of hopelessness. Civilization, he continues, requires confidence—(1) a confidence in the society in which we live, (2) a belief in its philosophy, (3) a belief in its laws, and (4) a confidence in one's mental powers. Above all, there must be a sense of permanence. Civilized man, he argues, must feel he belongs somewhere in time and space, consciously looking forward and back. All of these, one might add, are aided by the free university.

Such a society must be based on a knowledge of our mistakes and our successes. It requires a courage that does not drop out, a tolerance that does not shout down those with whom we disagree, a willingness to testify to one's beliefs, an ability to work patiently for a desired end. Let us hope that the tremendous energy that has been shown in the protests of the past year can be brought to the building of a constructive program that can affirm rather than deny.

In a thoughtful column the other day, James Reston made an appeal which we might all think about in an era when it is easier to scream at an opponent than to discuss his position. Declaring that we suffered from inflated language and despair, he suggested that we turn to the following statement by the philosopher, Alfred North Whitehead:

"It is the first step of wisdom to recognize advances in civilization as processes which all but wreck the society in which they occur . . . the art of free society consists, first, in the maintenance of the symbolic code; and secondly, in a fearlessness of revision . . . those societies which cannot combine reverence to their symbols with freedom of revision, must ultimately decay."

Twenty-six years ago today, I was aboard a landing craft in the English Channel, part of a follow-up force which was to go in after the beaches of Normandy (in our case, Omaha Beach) had been secured. In the previous five days, as we waited anxiously on our LST, there had been time to think of the coming attack and what it meant for us and our generation. We had had years of confusion, of moral doubts, of internal division. For years "Whirl" had indeed been king. Now we were united and our minds and hearts were set on one thing. All our energies were set on victory.

There were some who felt that the outcome of the battle would determine whether Western Europe regained its freedom and whether the right to speak, write, and teach freely would be restored. There was the question whether young Europeans, then in Labor battalions, in the Resistance, or in prisons, would again have the chance to go to school or to pursue their professions. We were not happy at the prospect of what the coming battle might bring to us personally. But we felt that it was right that we should be there. And from that we gained an abiding strength.

We still have fearful struggles at home and abroad. We still need the unity of purpose that sustained us in 1944. Let us hope—let pray—that we shall soon find a cause that will enlist our best efforts for our country and for man.

AGRICULTURE—WHO SUBSIDIZES WHO?

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons we are without a new farm bill at this late date is the misunderstanding surrounding this complex problem. Many people think our producers are living a life of ease on Government subsidies.

This misunderstanding usually does not exist in the countryside where the people are closer to the situation.

As a case in point, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial by Tom Licklider of the Renville Star Farmer, in my Minnesota Sixth Congressional District.

As Editor Licklider points out, "one of the biggest subsidies taking place in the country today is the subsidy by agriculture of the consumer."

Mr. Speaker, I commend the reading of this editorial to my colleagues:

AGRICULTURE—WHO SUBSIDIZES WHO?

Generally speaking, agriculture has been considered a subsidized industry. Government has poured billions of tax dollars into ill-advised farm programs—programs that millions of farmers would like to see scrapped in favor of more reliance on a free market in place of the restrictions that inevitably accompany government subsidies.

Farmers simply do not like the idea of being looked upon as beneficiaries of tax-

payer handouts. In fact, a farm industry representative has rejected the notion that taxpayers are subsidizing farmers. He says, "One of the biggest subsidies taking place in the country today is the subsidy by agriculture of the consumer." He argues that farmers subsidize the cities of America with brainpower. "Rural youth finish high school and college at great expense then go to the cities to make their contributions," he commented. A second subsidy, the farm spokesman declared, is the tremendous amount of food and fiber farmers provide to the consumer at less cost in proportion to wages than any other area in the world. The points made by this farm leader throw a new light on a little understood industry.

MANY MEMBERS PARTICIPATE IN EFFORT TO SAVE TAXPAYERS' MONEY IN PENN CENTRAL CASE

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the decision to abandon the loan guarantee to bail out the Penn Central Transportation Co. was a relief to the American taxpayer.

Under the circumstances there was no way to justify the arrangements which the administration had set up for this huge corporation. The decision against the loan guarantee probably saved the American taxpayer at least one-half billion dollars. The effort to reverse the administration's decision involved many Members of the House and Senate. Many Members participated in educating the administration officials over the past 10 days. I have been happy to have the opportunity to work with these other Members in what I consider to be a vital effort to protect the public interest.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a copy of a telegram which six members of the Banking and Currency Committee sent to Secretary of the Navy Chafee regarding this loan on June 17. I also insert in the RECORD a letter which eight members of the House Commerce Committee sent to Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird objecting to the loan guarantee.

Without these and other efforts, I am convinced that the administration would have gone through with its ill-advised loan guarantee and the taxpayers would have lost hundreds of millions of dollars.

The telegram and letter follow:

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING
AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE,

June 17, 1970.

HON. JOHN HUBBARD CHAFEE,
Secretary of the Navy,
Department of the Navy,
Washington, D.C.:

Because of serious questions being raised about the propriety and legality of the approval of up to \$200 million in loan guarantees by your agency under Section 301 of the Defense Production Act, we urge you to delay approval of such loan guarantees until after the House Banking and Currency Committee has had an opportunity to hold hearings on this subject in connection with renewal of the defense production act next week.

Among the many questions that must be

answered prior to approval of such an unprecedented loan is the legality of such a loan under the standards set forth in the defense production act. Legislative history reveals that DPA was intended primarily to assist small businesses in fulfilling defense contracts for the procurement of specific military hardware. At least for the last several years loans have been made only for this purpose. DPA also requires that your agency must find that a DPA loan guarantee is "necessary to expedite production and deliveries . . . for the national defense." Can you demonstrate either that Penn-Central would be impaired in expediting deliveries of defense items if operating in receivership under Section 77 of the Federal Bankruptcy Act or that the many existing alternative transportation facilities could not expedite deliveries of defense items now carried by Penn-Central.

Other serious questions, such as the use to which the \$200 million loan to Penn Central will be put and whether the true purpose of the guarantee is only to bail out numerous commercial banks and other corporations holding large amounts of Penn-Central debt, as well as officers and directors of Penn-Central with large blocks of Penn-Central stock, rather than the stated purpose of expediting delivery of defense items, should be answered before any such loan guarantee is approved.

We therefore urge that you delay any final action on this matter until after the House Banking and Currency Committee has had a chance to thoroughly investigate this proposal.

WRIGHT PATMAN,

Chairman.

WILLIAM A. BARRETT,
MRS. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
HENRY S. REUSS,
THOMAS L. ASHLEY,
WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD,

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 18, 1970.

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Secretary, Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Together with the Departments of Treasury and Transportation, the Department of Defense has announced plans for Government guarantees of an immediate \$200 million in bank loans on behalf of the Penn Central Company before June 30, 1970. Additional financial assistance from as yet unspecified sources could be made available at a later date. The short-term credit guarantees would be provided under the "V" loan provisions of the Defense Production Act.

As you no doubt are aware, we are gravely concerned about the action proposed. It appears to us that the use of the Defense Production Act for the purposes outlined is of extremely questionable legality. Accordingly, we urge that no action be taken until the legal issues are clearly resolved and we request that you furnish us with a full report thereon.

Apart from the issue of legality, we would like to emphasize the rapidly declining quality and quantity of passenger train facilities which would be available for national defense purposes in the event of a nation-wide mobilization. In 1944, the American railroads had 46,588 passenger train cars including 8,751 Pullman cars in the service of Class I railroads. By 1960, this number had been reduced to 28,305 cars including 2,650 Pullman cars. In 1969, only 12,800 passenger cars, none of which were Pullman cars, were available for passenger use. Many of these cars are quite old and lack many of the conveniences essential for defense purposes. In the event the action is taken to award the guarantees, we strongly urge you to take all possible steps to assure that sufficient pas-

senger facilities are maintained in adequate working condition so that the railroads, and particularly the Penn Central and its affiliates, can service the public needs, including transportation of military personnel, in the event of national emergency. Furthermore, if the guarantees are made the Department of Defense should demand as a *quid pro quo* some measurable improvement in facilities and the implementation of plans for the immediate expanded utilization of the railroads by the Department.

In closing, we want to emphasize our concern both as to legal propriety of the loan guarantees and to the inadequacy of railroad facilities for national defense purposes, and we invite your comments.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. MOSS,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
TORBERT H. MACDONALD,
RICHARD L. OTTINGER,
ROBERT O. TIERNAN,
LIONEL VAN DERLIN,
BROCK ADAMS,
BOB ECKHARDT,

Members of Congress.

BEWARE THE ANGER OF THE LEGIONS

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, Marine Cpl. Ronald Vinson, of Shelbyville, Ind., is now serving in Vietnam and has recently voluntarily extended his tour for another 6 months. He recently wrote to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Maurice Vinson, of Shelbyville, giving his views on unrest in the streets and on the campuses of this country, and, as the following letter shows, he has some very definite ideas about it all.

His parents sent the letter to the editor of the Shelbyville News, where it appeared on Monday, June 22, 1970. Mr. Vinson graciously gave me permission to include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I find this letter to be quite out of the ordinary, for a good many reasons. It needs all the publicity it can possibly get, primarily because it seems major news media print nothing and give publicity to nothing except letters from men opposing what is going on in Vietnam, and who go to great lengths to sharply criticize our country's policy there.

Let me make one thing quite clear: It is their right, to put what they please into letters. It is also the right of major newspapers to give publicity to what they wish. However, I think it must be admitted that by far the greater amount of attention is given to the opposite side; rarely, if ever—and I cannot offhand recall anything—has a major newspaper given, or have the TV commentators lavished much of their high-paid time upon a letter such as Corporal Vinson's. So in fairness, the other side should be heard, especially when they write with such obvious deep belief in, and commitment to, what they see as their duty. And also, when they make it so very clear indeed how they view what is going on in this country, in many places, today.

The letter is also unusual in another rather strange respect. History repeats itself; this is said so often it is almost a cliché. But when I read this letter in the Shelbyville paper, I had the definite feeling I had read something very much like it, somewhere else. Checking, I found I had part of a letter written by Marcus Flavinus, in the second century A.D., to his cousin Tertullus, in Rome. Flavinus was a centurion in the Second Cohort, Augusta Legion, on guard at one of Rome's farflung outposts.

Flavinus' letter follows that of Corporal Vinson's. Indeed, as almost 2,000 years ago, we have the same thing today: Beware the anger of the legions. I wish both letters could go side by side in every university in the country.

The letters follow:

CORPORAL VINSON'S LETTER

To the Editor:

The following was received in a letter from our son, U.S. Marine Cpl. Ronald Vinson of Shelbyville, who is stationed in South Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. MAURICE VINSON.

Many of us here in Vietnam have been following the stories about unrest on the Nation's campuses and streets, with subdued anger. It is demoralizing to read about our ignorant counterparts vandalizing campus buildings, manhandling institution leaders, depriving others of the education they have paid for, and so much need and deserve.

It is painful to the less pampered thousands of students here who have taken their lessons from instructors dressed in black pajamas and sandals and the classrooms are sandbagged, hot and sweaty jungle clearings. Where the Saturday night date is a cold beer and a letter from home. Where the grades are not a's or b's or c's but sudden death, crippling wounds, or maybe victory. But we don't expect you people back in the United States to be concerned. You did your share in '41 or was it '52 and now you are too tired to do more than mutter. Well, what is this world coming to?

Well, don't worry, because someday soon this war will be over and over half a million angry men are going to descend on the 50 states with dreams of homes, families, educations, and jobs. When these men hit the campuses and streets, I sincerely hope that someone tries to stop an ex-Marine from going to class, or that some smelly, flaky, social reject tries to plant a Viet Cong flag next to an artificial leg of a SeaBee, or splits in the burned face of an Army Medic or a Navy Corpsman.

I guarantee it will only happen once.

Cpl. RONALD VINSON.

CENTURION MARCUS FLAVINUS' LETTER

We have been told, on leaving our native soil, that we were going to defend the sacred rights conferred on us by so many of our citizens settled overseas, so many years of our presence, so many benefits brought by us to populations in need of our assistance and civilization. We could verify that all this was true, and because true, we did not hesitate to shed our share of blood, to sacrifice our youth and hopes. We regretted nothing, but whereas we over here are inspired by this frame of mind, I am told that in Rome factions and conspiracies are rife, that treachery flourishes, and that many in their uncertainty and confusion lend ready ear to the dire temptations of relinquishment and vilify our actions. . . . Make haste to reassure me, I beg you, and tell me that our

fellow citizens understand us, support us, and protect us, as we ourselves are protecting the glory of the Empire. If it should be otherwise, if we should have to leave our bleached bones on these desert sands in vain, then beware the anger of the Legions.

JACK DEMPSEY'S BIRTHDAY

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, one of the really greatest Americans it has ever been my privilege to know is world heavyweight champion Jack Dempsey. In my book he is still the champion of champions and the king of kings in the boxing world. Jack Dempsey was the idol of every schoolboy in the roaring twenties when Dempsey, Babe Ruth, and the Four Horsemen were everyday conversation. His life meant much to me personally and to thousands and even millions of American boys. Jack Dempsey is a patriot who believes in the destiny of our Nation. He is a great and good American.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday was Jack Dempsey's birthday. I just want to join his friends and many admirers in wishing him a happy birthday, many more happy years, and the best always. The Evening Star here in Washington carried an excellent article on Jack Dempsey on his birthday which I commend to the attention of my colleagues and the people of this country:

EX-CHAMP 75 TODAY: DEMPSEY GETS HIS KICKS JUST BEING NICE TO PEOPLE

NEW YORK.—Jack Dempsey is 75 today and, if there is anybody in the world he is keeping it a dark secret.

"I think a heavyweight champion has an obligation to be an example," he said, "of clean living, being nice to people and helping people.

"When you are fighting, you are out to win with no holds barred. It's either you or the other guy. But being nice to people doesn't cost anything. Every time you sign an autograph you make a friend."

Dempsey spends his time these days, signing autographs on postcards, menus and albums in the same Broadway restaurant in which he has operated since 1938. For the last 10 days he has been busy helping others celebrate his birthday at boxing arenas, race tracks and hotels. Tonight they will honor him at his own restaurant.

LONELY LANDMARK

As Dempsey sat in a window booth Tuesday afternoon, scores of tourists and old friends came up to shake hands. A group of young girls sang him a "Happy Birthday" from the street.

Dempsey's is fast becoming a lonely landmark in its area on Broadway. Lindy's is gone. The Latin Quarter is a movie house. A shiny 48-story skyscraper is rising on the corner of 50th and Broadway.

"Times have changed," said Dempsey. "On Saturday and Sunday it used to be so crowded that people walked in the street. They couldn't even get on the sidewalk. Now people are afraid to go out nights."

In the old days an occasional visitor with too much sauce under his belt would chal-

lenge Dempsey. They don't do that any more.

"A couple of guys tried to mug me on Third Avenue a few months ago," said Dempsey. "They tried to rob me but I flattened them."

Jack Amiel, his partner in the restaurant, chimed in to say:

"Just the other day at the Luxor Baths, a guy wanted to give Jack \$5,000 just to take a knockdown so he could tell people he did it."

FIGHT GAME IN LIMBO

Dempsey spends most of his time at his New York apartment, visiting the restaurant at the lunch and dinner hours. He likes to take the sun on the terrace and watch baseball and news on television. He makes an occasional trip to California to visit his two daughters and seven grand daughters.

What does Dempsey think about the fight game?

"There is no place to start and no place to go," he said. "Only one club in California runs every week. Kids go to football, baseball, hockey, basketball, where the money is. Maybe, if I came along now, I might go where the money is, too.

"In the old days a fighter got great exposure with so many newspapers and so many writers. Tex Rickard used to insist, before you fought for a title, you had to lick every contender.

"But I am very grateful for the fight game. Whatever I have I owe to the fight game and my friends. I will never be able to pay back all I owe to it."

FEELS SORRY FOR CLAY

And how about Cassius Clay?

"I feel sorry for him, honestly," said Dempsey. "I feel he was forced to do things he didn't want to do. He was a good boxer, an excellent boxer."

Dempsey considers his victory over Jess Willard in 1919 that gave him the world title his greatest boxing accomplishment. The moment he remembers best is the first round of the 1923 fight with Luis Firpo when he was knocked out of the ring. "The newspaper fellows saved me by pushing me back into the ring," he said.

And would Dempsey do anything different if he had it to do all over again?

"Well," he said, pausing for an instant, "We all make some mistakes. But the Good Lord has been good to Jack Dempsey."

MEMORIAL TO ROBERT E. MCCORD

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, today marks the sad occasion of the funeral of one of the Education and Labor Committee's most valuable staff members, Robert E. McCord.

I first met Bob McCord when I came to Congress in 1958. At that time he was staff director of the Education Subcommittee chaired by my late distinguished colleague, the Honorable Cleveland Bailey of West Virginia.

Bob came to Congress in 1956 and served with great ability and dedication both the House of Representatives and the Education and Labor Committee, of which he was chief clerk and senior specialist at the time of his death this past Sunday, June 21.

The news was a great shock to all of

us. We shall miss him. Bob was always willing to help members of the committee through our legislative trials and tribulations.

Like my other colleagues on the Committee on Education and Labor, I knew Bob McCord as a man always ready to do his job. He was a good and generous man. I take this opportunity to extend my deepest sympathy and sincerest wishes to his family and friends.

CHARTERING GROUPS ALARMED OVER PROPOSED CAB REGULA- TIONS

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with our colleagues a letter I have directed to the Honorable Secor Browne, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, concerning proposed regulations, EDR-183, issued on May 13, 1970. The regulations have the effect of eliminating many leading civil, fraternal, and social organizations from charter eligibility because of membership size.

I feel the regulations will have a severe impact on the consumer and the charter carriers.

The letter follows:

JUNE 22, 1970.

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

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Civil Aeronautics Board's proposed regulations EDR-183 issued May 13, 1970 has caused considerable consternation among chartering groups throughout the country.

It is my understanding that EDR-183 constricts charter eligibility imposing arbitrary criteria which determines whether or not a group is charterworthy. This action has the effect of eliminating many leading civil, fraternal and social organizations because of membership size from charter eligibility. This will have a severe impact not only upon the consumer, the organization, but equally upon charter carriers who have developed a low-cost system of air travel which has benefited the American public.

It appears to me that the Board action is neither in keeping with the duty of the Board as expressed in the Federal Aviation Act "to promote air transportation" nor in keeping with the Administration's policy as expressed in the International Policy Statement issued today by the President.

This matter is currently being reviewed by myself and other members of the Congress with a view toward holding hearings with regard to this proposal as well as other matters affecting air transportation. In view of this, it is requested that the Board either withdraw this proposed rule pending completion of legislative hearings or in the alternative, suspend the procedural dates until such time as legislative hearings have been held and a report issued.

I am advised there is ample precedent for this request and that the Board suspended or postponed its proposed rulemaking concerning charters for dependent military personnel at the request of a member of the Armed Services Committee.

I am convinced that much of permanent value is added by the Charter operations, that they aid materially in broadening the number of persons who accept air transpor-

tation as a safe and convenient mode of travel and therefore strengthens all air carrier operations.

I would appreciate being advised of the action of the Board at the earliest possible date.

With warm personal regards, I am

Most Sincerely,

JOHN E. MOSS,
Member of Congress.

THE RAILROADS: A STUDY IN POWER

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, when I sat in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee listening to testimony from all sides supporting the call to convert the Post Office Department to a public corporation answerable to a Post Office Commission, I could not help be reminded of the experience we in Montana have had at the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The railroads ask for a freight rate increase and the Interstate Commerce Commission approves. So, in an environment where there is no serious freight competition, the rates have continued to skyrocket and it now costs more for a Montana wheat grower to ship his product to the west coast than it does for a North Dakota grower.

I contend there is more patronage, more mutual back-scratching, more nest-feathering in the insulated and isolated Commissions like the ICC, the FCC, and the CAB than anywhere in government. Speaking from personal experience, I know it is practically impossible for even a Member of Congress to get to see a Commissioner. Once in a while we are privileged to present our views to one of the layers of insulation in the person of a hearing examiner.

Mr. Speaker, the National Farmers Union Washington Newsletter this week contains an excellent capsule analysis of the problems raised by such a Commission. I recommend it to my colleagues for reading with the prediction that the message contained here will likely be applicable to the new post office. It certainly suggests the responsibility of the Congress to get to the bottom of the mess created by the strange creature represented by the ICC and the railroads:

THE RAILROADS: A STUDY IN POWER

The railroads provide a revealing case study of huge concentrations of economic power control and corrupt political institutions. The American people created the railroads by investing enormous tracts of land. Yet we have lost control of our investment. Transportation is the artery through which the economy flows. Freight rates are a tax on the economic bloodstream. The rates are set by a government agency. It has been corrupted from service to the people to service of the railroads. The power of the railroads swells into corruption of other agencies of government.

The railroads, in a massive assault on the American economy, have managed to increase their taxing rate more than 20 percent in the past 35 months. This has in-

creased railroad income \$2 billion a year in that period, of which about \$400 million is on agricultural products.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, the oldest government "regulatory" agency, has become a classic example of the fox guarding the chickens. It has granted these rate increases solely on the railroads' requests—sometimes with hearings and sometimes without. The hold of the railroads over the ICC has been the subject of much comment. It led Ralph Nader to recommend abolition of the agency. But railroad influence does not stop with the ICC. The other day leaders of Congress and the Administration agreed that the American people should underwrite a \$200 million loan for one railroad, the Penn Central. The railroad's acquisitiveness and mismanagement have created a cash flow emergency. Penn Central is the nation's largest real estate company and owns one of the most expensive luxury resorts in the world at Boca Raton, Fla. The rush to bail out Penn Central, with its \$7 billion in assets, is an impressive indication of its political power. (Consider for a moment the "cash flow" problems of American agriculture...)

Railroad power is enhanced by the fragmentation of efforts to deal with it. The USDA, for example, is directed under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to "assist in improving transportation services and facilities in obtaining equitable and reasonable transportation rates and services and adequate transportation facilities for agricultural products and farm supplies by making complaint or petition to the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Maritime Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, or other federal or state transportation regulatory bodies with respect to rates, charges, tariffs, practices and services, or by working directly with individual carriers or groups of carriers."

This is a decisive mandate. And indeed, transportation efforts by the USDA have been one of the brighter spots in the Department. But these efforts are hampered by fragmentation into at least seven agencies. The Consumer and Marketing Service is virtually the only agency that does a creditable job. Significantly, the Office of the General Counsel has only one lawyer who works on transportation. Transportation research services are weak, or nonexistent. There is no coordination of effort whatever. Considering that 23 percent of all rail freight is agricultural, it would seem that transportation might deserve an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture to coordinate efforts. (One might also argue that the ICC should have agricultural representation.) No wonder the USDA—despite convincing legal arguments before the ICC—has failed to win, or appreciably influence, the major rate cases that have enriched the railroads since 1967. It is inconceivable that the fragmentation of transportation efforts of the USDA are the result of oversight.

One can argue that the ICC should be more responsive to the public interest, that perhaps it should have a farmer on the Commission, and that the USDA should coordinate implementation of its mandate under the law. But until the enormous political power of the railroads is broken to the halter, such arguments will be fruitless.

DAY OF PRAYER FOR OUR PRESIDENT

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, Pastor Fred Hollomon of the First Southern Baptist

Church, Manhattan, Kans., believes prayer is better than protest and he has written me to suggest a day of prayer for our President on Sunday, July 5.

Pastor Hollomon makes a most convincing case for this type of action at this particular time and I wish to share his reasoning with my colleagues because this is an idea which could appeal to other ministers and other congregations in cities and towns across the Nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD a copy of the letter I received from Pastor Hollomon and I commend its contents to one and all for serious study:

DAY OF PRAYER FOR OUR PRESIDENT

In our country, frustration is not limited to those who feel they have no influence on White House decisions.

Frustration for many of us is having to stand by as wave after wave of protest bombards the White House with no sign of a let-up.

Frustration is having to listen to relentless verbal attacks on the President and Vice-President, much of which cannot possibly be termed constructive.

Frustration is having to endure seemingly endless accusations against the Administration tempered with little, if any, humility.

Frustration is having to watch our elected officials become targets of ridicule for every cynical citizen on and off the tax rolls—regardless of how ridiculous an alternative he has to offer—if any.

Personally, I do not agree with all of President Nixon's policies. He made a decision recently which, in my opinion, was ill-advised and potentially dangerous. However, my ultimate frustration is to observe all the dissent and protest, and criticism and accusations and attacks and ridicule—and to know all along that there is a better way of dealing with those in authority . . . prayer.

Many of us believe that prayer is better than protest because:

Prayer recognizes that neither the President nor the protestor has a monopoly on what is right;

Prayer acknowledges that there is a Wisdom which exceeds that of both Administration and population;

Prayer engages the power of One who surpasses the strength of all soldiers and strikers;

Prayer offers help to the President rather than criticism.

As a Christian and a minister of the gospel, I am committed to the teachings of the New Testament. In I Timothy 2: 1,2 these words are found: "I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; For kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty."

Perhaps the reason our nation is not leading "a quiet and peaceable life . . ." is because we are doing more protesting than praying.

On Saturday, July 4, this nation celebrates the birthday of its independence. I believe that Sunday, July 5, would be an appropriate "Day of Prayer for Our President." I really believe that a lot of Americans would welcome the opportunity to relieve some of their frustration.

However, those of us who have witnessed the power of prayer would have a much higher motive than the relief of frustration. We would expect President Nixon to feel the impact of such a united prayer effort. In fact, it seems to me that those who believe that prayer changes things would subscribe to a united prayer effort regardless of their feelings toward the President and his policies.

I have asked the church pastor to make

our place of worship available on Sunday afternoon, July 5, for all those who wish to drop in for a few minutes of prayer. Perhaps other churches would like to do the same.

I realize that there are some people who would consider this idea an effort to counteract the protestors and/or solicit the plaudits of the so-called silent majority. Although such a Day of Prayer might have this effect, this is not my primary aim; and since my motives will be judged by a far more capable Authority, that kind of reaction will be of no concern to me.

I just believe that President Nixon needs more prayer and less protest.

OPERATION MATCH, INC.

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, in these days of love-ins, hippies, and seeming decay of the moral fiber, it is a pleasure to discover an organization believing in the old values of affectionate friendship and the concept of bringing people together in a dignified, decent manner to meet members of the opposite sex.

Years ago the church, the community center, and friends provided the means for "singles" to meet. In today's fast-paced society these sources have proved inadequate and our "unattached" people, including those who have the misfortune to be widowed or divorced, find themselves without the opportunities to meet new acquaintances, make new friendships, and develop the lasting type of relationship that are so important to us all, especially to those who find themselves single, like myself.

There does exist a company which was the first to use the advanced technology of our computer age to bring members of our society together. It is Operation Match, Inc., known to millions of Americans as the very first "computerized dating" service ever organized.

The story is familiar. It is the story of America itself. Two young men came up with an idea and have developed it into a very attractive business. But more than business, it provides an opportunity in today's world for people to meet, get to know each other and to spend time with people with whom they share mutual interests. Most importantly, it works.

Thousands of people have already met and married through Operation Match. Millions more have had their lives made a little fuller through the people they have met. Opportunities are presented for unmarrieds to travel together with members of the opposite sex on cruises and at key vacation resorts in our country. Reaction to this project has been widespread, with almost every major newspaper and magazine in our country noting this unusual phenomena favorably.

Their philosophy is "The nice way to meet nice people in your area." They have the capability, through this computer operation to match people anywhere in our great country; this organization and others like it should be com-

mended for the remarkable service they are providing to our citizens.

I submit the same questions of this "computer people" business for the edification and interest of those who may desire a closer look at one manifestation of this "Computer Age" in which we live.

QUANTITATIVE PERSONALITY PROJECTION

TEST XXVII

SECTION I: ABSOLUTE FACTORS

- 1. My race is:
 - (1) Caucasian (white)
 - (2) Oriental
 - (3) Black
 - (4) Spanish-American
 - 2. My date may be a Caucasian:
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No
 - 3. My date may be an Oriental:
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No
 - 4. My date may be Black:
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No
 - 5. My date may be Spanish-American:
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No
 - 6. My religious background is:
 - (1) Protestant
 - (2) Catholic
 - (3) Jewish
 - (4) Other denominations
 - (5) Unaffiliated
 - 7. My date's religious background may be:
 - Protestant:
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No
 - Catholic:
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No
 - Jewish:
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No
 - Other denominations:
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No
 - 8. My date's religious background may be unaffiliated:
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No
 - 9. I am presently:
 - (1) working full-time
 - (2) working part-time
 - (3) in the armed forces
 - (4) attending school full-time
 - (5) attending school part-time
 - (6) both working part-time and attending school part-time
 - (7) retired
 - (8) not working
 - 10. My highest level of educational attainment is:
 - (1) some elementary school
 - (2) completed elementary school
 - (3) completed junior high school
 - (4) some high school
 - (5) completed high school
 - (6) some college
 - (7) completed college
 - (8) graduate study
 - 11. My date's highest level of educational attainment should be:
 - (1) some elementary school
 - (2) completed elementary school
 - (3) completed junior high school
 - (4) some high school
 - (5) completed high school
 - (6) some college
 - (7) completed college
 - (8) graduate study
- The way in which you answer the questions in this section will help determine the requirements your potential matches must meet before the computer will further examine them.

15. My height is (refer to the table below):

16. The best height for my date is (refer to the table below):

- (1) 5' or under
- (2) 5' to 5'2"
- (3) 5'2" to 5'4"
- (4) 5'4" to 5'6"
- (5) 5'6" to 5'8"
- (6) 5'8" to 5'10"
- (7) 5'10" to 6'
- (8) 6' to 6'2"
- (9) 6'2" or above

17. The ideal age for my date is:

- (1) ten or more years older than I
- (2) five to ten years older than I
- (3) three to five years older than I
- (4) one to two years older than I
- (5) my age
- (6) one to two years younger than I
- (7) three to five years younger than I
- (8) five to ten years younger than I
- (9) ten or more years younger than I

18. I am:

- (1) Single
- (2) Widow or widower—with no children at home
- (3) Widow or widower—with children at home
- (4) Divorced—with no children at home
- (5) Divorced—with children at home

19. My date may be single:

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

20. My date may be widowed—with no children at home:

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

21. My date may be widowed—with children at home:

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

22. My date may be divorced—with no children at home:

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

23. My date may be divorced—with children at home:

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

- 24. Folk music
 - 25. Popular music
 - 26. Classical music
 - 27. Jazz
 - 28. Dancing
 - 29. Art and painting
 - 30. Literature
 - 31. Opera
 - 32. Theatre
 - 33. Travel
 - 34. Medicine
 - 35. Law
 - 36. Agriculture and gardening
 - 37. Community service
 - 38. Bridge
 - 39. Swimming and water sports
 - 40. Skiing (snow)
 - 41. Bowling
 - 42. Golf
 - 43. Tennis
 - 44. Movies
 - 45. Television
 - 46. Photography
 - 47. Playing a musical instrument
 - 48. Spectator sports (for example, baseball)
49. How important is it to you that your date share your interests?
- (1) unimportant
 - (2) slightly important
 - (3) moderately important
 - (4) very important

SECTION III: ATTITUDES

50. My religious convictions are:

- (1) strong
- (2) average
- (3) weak

51. I believe in a God who answers prayers:

- (1) always
- (2) sometimes
- (3) never

52. I prefer to associate with people who go to church and believe in God:

(1) always
(2) sometimes
(3) never

53. How important is it to you that your date share your attitudes towards religion?

- (1) very important
- (2) moderately important
- (3) slightly important
- (4) unimportant

54. Romantic love in marriage is:

- (1) very important
- (2) moderately important
- (3) slightly important
- (4) unimportant

55. For my age I consider myself:

- (1) Very sexually experienced
- (2) Moderately sexually experienced
- (3) Somewhat sexually experienced
- (4) Sexually inexperienced

56. My ideal date should be:

- (1) Very sexually experienced
- (2) Moderately sexually experienced
- (3) Somewhat sexually experienced
- (4) Sexually inexperienced
- (5) Doesn't matter

57. Which of the following questions do you find most interesting to think about?

- (1) Who am I?
- (2) What will I be like in ten years?
- (3) Should I get married in the next few years?
- (4) What is the meaning of life?

SECTION IV: SITUATIONS

58. A married couple with whom you are friendly has invited you over to dinner in order to introduce you to another single friend of theirs. They believe you might get along well together and would be interested in dating one another. Would you feel that your friends are:

- (1) Meddling in your affairs?
- (2) Just trying to be helpful, but it would be better if they don't interfere?
- (3) Doing you a favor for which they deserve your thanks?

59. Imagine yourself facing three doors. Behind the first door is \$20. Behind the second door is either \$5 or \$30. Behind the third door is either \$40 or someone ready to throw a pail of cold water. You may open any door but you must face the consequences. Which do you open?

- (1) The first door
- (2) The second door
- (3) The third door

60. Two friends of yours who are in love are considering living together for a while to "try out" the relationship before getting married. They come to you for your opinion about their plan. Your advice is:

- (1) This might ruin their relationship—it's morally wrong.
- (2) If they were really in love, they would get married.
- (3) You would encourage them to do it with some reservations.
- (4) You would tell them enthusiastically to go ahead.

61. You have just gone to a dance with a date. You soon see that there are many opportunities for making new friends of the opposite sex. You:

- (1) Deliberately try to enlarge your circle of romantic possibilities.
- (2) Don't run after anybody but don't turn off possibilities either.
- (3) Feel a conflict between your desires and your commitment for the evening.
- (4) Remain with your date for the evening.

SECTION V: PSYCHOLOGICAL VALENCE

62. I believe people involved in serious dating should be informed about birth control.

- (1) True
- (2) False

63. Once I make up my mind, I seldom change it.

- (1) True
- (2) False

64. I don't like things to be uncertain or unpredictable.

- (1) True
- (2) False

65. I often wish people would be more definite about things.

- (1) True
- (2) False

66. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.

- (1) True
- (2) False

67. I am always polite, even to people who are disagreeable.

- (1) True
- (2) False

68. I have never deliberately said something to hurt someone's feelings.

- (1) True
- (2) False

69. I am interested in having (more) children.

- (1) True
- (2) False

70. I have sometimes considered seeing a psychiatrist about a personal problem.

- (1) True
- (2) False

74. My political affiliation is:

- (1) Republican
- (2) Democratic
- (3) Left of Center
- (4) Right of Center

75. My date's political affiliation should be:

- (1) Republican
- (2) Democratic
- (3) Left of Center
- (4) Right of Center
- (5) Doesn't Matter

76. I smoke:

- (1) heavily
- (2) moderately
- (3) never

77. My date may smoke:

- (1) heavily
- (2) moderately
- (3) never
- (4) doesn't matter

78. I drink:

- (1) often
- (2) occasionally
- (3) never

79. My date may drink:

- (1) often
- (2) occasionally
- (3) never
- (4) doesn't matter

80. I presently attend religious services:

- (1) once a week or more
- (2) once or twice a month
- (3) once or twice a year
- (4) never

81. My date should attend religious services:

- (1) once a week or more
- (2) once or twice a month
- (3) once or twice a year
- (4) never
- (5) doesn't matter

82. My income is:

- (1) under \$3,000
- (2) \$3,000 to \$5,000
- (3) \$5,000 to \$7,500
- (4) \$7,500 to \$10,000
- (5) \$10,000 to \$15,000
- (6) \$15,000 to \$25,000
- (7) over \$25,000

83. My date's income should be:

- (1) under \$3,000
- (2) \$3,000 to \$5,000
- (3) \$5,000 to \$7,500
- (4) \$7,500 to \$10,000
- (5) \$10,000 to \$15,000
- (6) \$15,000 to \$25,000
- (7) over \$25,000
- (8) doesn't matter

84. My social class is:

- (1) upper
- (2) upper middle
- (3) middle

- (4) lower middle
 (5) lower
 85. My date's social class should be:
 (1) upper
 (2) upper middle
 (3) middle
 (4) lower middle
 (5) lower
 (6) doesn't matter
 86. Relative to other person of my age, my general intelligence is considered:
 (1) very superior
 (2) superior
 (3) above average
 (4) average
 (5) below average
 87. My date's general intelligence should be:
 (1) very superior
 (2) superior
 (3) above average
 (4) average
 (5) below average
 (6) doesn't matter
 88. My father's education:
 (1) completed grade school
 (2) completed high school
 (3) completed college
 (4) completed graduate training
 For each of the following pairs of opposite words or phrases choose the one which better describes you most of the time. Although individual items may present difficult decisions, choose the answer which is more appropriate and enter the number in the appropriate box on the answer sheet.
 89. (1) Usually talkative, (2) Usually a better listener
 90. (1) Read a lot, (2) Don't read very much
 91. (1) Very close to my family, (2) Not very close to my family
 92. (1) Athletic, (2) Not athletic
 93. (1) Politically concerned, (2) Politically indifferent
 94. (1) Politically liberal, (2) Politically conservative
 95. (1) Do not like children very much, (2) Like children very much
 96. (1) Emotional, (2) Rational
 97. (1) Well-groomed, (2) Not concerned with appearance
 98. (1) Interested in marriage partner, (2) Not interested in marriage partner
 99. Of the following types of movies, I most enjoy:
 (1) Dramas
 (2) Adventures
 (3) Westerns
 (4) Musicals
 (5) Comedies
 100. Of the following men, I most admire:
 (1) Winston Churchill
 (2) Prof. Albert Einstein
 (3) Dr. Albert Schweitzer
 (4) Joe Namath
 101. I would most like to visit:
 (1) Italy
 (2) Japan
 (3) Greece
 (4) Russia
 102. Of the following television programs, I like most:
 (1) Bonanza
 (2) Mission Impossible
 (3) Dean Martin Show
 (4) Johnny Carson "Tonight" Show

SECTION VII: PHYSICAL INVENTORY

103. My hair is:
 (1) blond
 (2) brown
 (3) black
 (4) red
 (5) gray
 (6) I am bald
 104. I prefer my date's hair to be:
 (1) blond
 (2) brown
 (3) black
 (4) red

- (5) gray
 (6) doesn't matter
 105. My eyes are:
 (1) blue
 (2) brown
 (3) green
 (4) hazel
 106. I prefer my date's eyes to be:
 (1) blue
 (2) brown
 (3) green
 (4) hazel
 (5) doesn't matter
 107. Members of the opposite sex consider me:
 (1) very attractive
 (2) attractive
 (3) average
 (4) unattractive
 108. My date should be:
 (1) very attractive
 (2) attractive
 (3) average
 (4) unattractive
 (5) doesn't matter
 109. Physical attractiveness is:
 (1) unimportant
 (2) slightly important
 (3) moderately important
 (4) very important
 110. I expect my Operation Match dates to be:
 (1) very successful
 (2) fairly successful
 (3) as good as any blind date
 (4) unsuccessful

All data provided Operation Match Inc. is the property of Operation Match Inc., and will be kept strictly confidential. Thank you for participating.

INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORT POLICY

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I call to your attention and that of my colleagues the recent action of President Nixon on June 22 in approving a new international air transport policy. This is an unprecedented action long overdue and in my judgment will set the stage for further development of our air transport industry during the decade of the 1970's. For the first time the advantages of low-cost charter transportation, which millions of Americans have enjoyed, has been recognized and placed on a parity with scheduled individually ticketed services. This, I am sure is welcome news to the consumer as well as to the charter specialists who have long pioneered the development of this concept.

Mr. Speaker, the policy clearly establishes that group-charter transportation is in the public interest that supplemental as well as scheduled carriers must have a fair and equal opportunity to compete in this market. It also recognizes, again for the first time, that the rights of charter carriers must be set forth in intergovernmental agreements with the rights of the U.S. carriers and foreign carriers—both scheduled and independent—covering charter services included in these agreements and that any attempt to restrict U.S. carrier operations abroad should be vigorously opposed.

Mr. Speaker, the policy speaks for itself and I insert in the RECORD the policy statement of the President together with the statement by the President in accepting that policy.

In summary, I would like to quote for emphasis the final statement of the President in his acceptance of this policy:

I am directing that this new statement of policy guidance be used henceforth by responsible officials of the government in dealing with international aviation problems.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Civil Aeronautics Board will be guided by this statement and immediately withdraw its proposed rule EDR 183 which it has promulgated and on which comments are due by July 30, as that proposal is directly in opposition to the new policy and I further hope that without additional direction of Congress, the board will on its own immediately set out to implement the policy by according equal rights in bulk transportation to the supplemental carriers and that the board will adopt a simplified set of rules governing charters in group transportation which the President has called for, and eliminate the archaic rules presently in existence. Simplified rules are needed to protect the consumer and to insure his right to low-cost air travel.

The items follow:

PRESIDENT NIXON'S ANNOUNCEMENT

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 22, 1970.—President Nixon's announcement today of the new International Air Transportation Policy should mark the beginning of concerted action to "oppose foreign restrictions on U.S. carriers."

Speaking for America's charter airlines, Edward J. Driscoll, President of the National Air Carrier Association, commended one of the key policies in the Presidential statement: "Attempts to restrict U.S. carrier operations abroad should be vigorously opposed, and where required, the U.S. should take appropriate measures against the carriers of foreign countries restricting U.S. carrier operations in violation of bilateral agreements or of the principle of reciprocity."

"We urge immediate consultations with foreign governments to obtain acceptance of your policies on a workable basis at the earliest possible time," Driscoll told the President in presenting the views of U.S. charter airlines.

Driscoll noted that for the first time in aviation history the role of the supplemental air carriers—the charter specialists—has been recognized as being on a parity with scheduled airlines.

"The White House statement that 'additional uniformity and simplification of charter rules is desirable' reinforces the position NACA has taken for several years in condemning Civil Aeronautics Board charter-worthiness rules as archaic, confusing, and against the interests of the traveling public," said Driscoll, who told the President that the CAB appears to be "out-of-step with your announced policy."

Though the new statement leaves other actions to be taken, Driscoll acknowledged that many of the positions were milestones in national aviation policy. Among these, he said, were the following statements:

"Charter services have been useful in holding down fare and rate levels and expanding passenger and cargo markets . . . they can provide low-cost transportation of a sort fitted to the needs of a significant portion of the traveling public."

"Attempts to restrict U.S. carrier operations abroad should be vigorously opposed,

the foreign landing rights for charter services should be regularized as free as possible from substantial restriction.

"The economic and technological benefits we seek can best be achieved by encouraging competition and by a relative freedom from government restriction.

"The U.S. should work for the broadest range of profitable services, designed to appeal to the broadest consumer market and based on the lowest cost of operating an efficient air transportation system.

"We expect both scheduled services and charter services to have important roles throughout the coming decade."

The President by his action today "has reestablished the principle that every American has the right to travel at the lowest possible cost," said Driscoll. He expressed the hope that this statement would reverse the trend by some U.S. agencies "to strangle the low-cost charter concept. The U.S. should not stand by idly as the international aviation cartel gets more and more foreign countries to discriminate against U.S. supplemental airlines."

Driscoll spoke on behalf of the following 10 airlines:

American Flyers Airline Corporation.
Capitol International Airways, Inc.
Modern Air Transport.
Overseas National Airways, Inc.
Purdue Airlines.
Saturn Airways, Inc.
Southern Air Transport, Inc.
Trans International Airlines, Inc.
Universal Airlines, Inc.
World Airways, Inc.

The text of his wire to President Nixon follows:

"Your announcement today of the new International Air Transport Policy can begin the long overdue action needed to create an expanded and prosperous air transport industry that will better serve both consumer needs and our country's national goals.

"In behalf of the supplemental airline industry, which developed the low-cost charter concept for both passenger group and cargo markets, and thereby caused a shift in the U.S. favor in our balance of payments on North Atlantic transportation, we appreciate the government's recognition of the fact that both scheduled and charter airlines have equally important future roles as part of a vital U.S. air transportation system.

"We hope that you will provide strong leadership in enforcing a policy that favors less regulation and more competition, and opposes foreign restrictions on U.S. carriers. In the public interest, present trends contrary to these policies must be reversed.

"As you know, recent actions and proposals by the Civil Aeronautics Board appear to be out-of-step with your announced policy. We urge your initiative in encouraging legislation that will give your recommendations the force of law. We also urge immediate consultations with foreign governments to obtain acceptance of your policies on a worldwide basis at the earliest possible time.

"On our part, we pledge renewed effort to work as a part of the total airline industry in providing the American and foreign traveler with the quality and variety of services and fare structures that will meet public needs and assure stability of both segments of the airline industry."

EDWARD J. DRISCOLL,

President,
National Air Carriers Association.

STATEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORTATION POLICY

Public policies operate in a steadily changing technical, economic, and social environment. For sustained progress toward broad national goals we must reexamine our policies regularly to assure that relevant changes are taken into account. This is especially im-

portant in fields like international air transportation, where changes are rapid.

United States policies with regard to international air transportation were last given comprehensive review in 1962-1963, as high capacity jet aircraft were coming into service. In the meantime, international aviation has expanded greatly. This dramatic growth has generated new policy questions and changed the dimensions of others. Renewed attention must now be paid to such problems as airway and terminal congestion, the liability of carriers for passengers and cargo, and the cost burden of the facilities needed for safe international flight. Our policies with regard to competition need reappraisal in the light of the substantially expanded market for international services, and its projected further growth. This market has now warranted certification of two United States round-the-world carriers. It has sustained the recent strong traffic growth of the United States supplemental airlines. It is the type of market which attracted an unprecedented eighteen United States carrier applications for route awards in the Transpacific case. At the same time, it is a market in which prospects of excess capacity or other dislocations are seen from various quarters, and these concerns are made the more acute by the appearance of the wide-bodied jets and anticipation of supersonic aircraft.

The present review of United States international air transportation policy is an effort to take account of current conditions, and the prospective circumstances of the 1970s, in a way which best serves our fundamental interests in international air transport. These interests, as expressed in the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, are (1) promote international air transportation that is "fast, safe, efficient and convenient . . . at the lowest cost consistent therewith and with other national objectives, including the efficient utilization and conservation of the nation's resources" and (2) to encourage and develop "an air transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense."

Clearly, such a policy must seek to achieve a number of objectives and take into account a number of constraints. It must aim to develop and maintain a sound system of international air transportation that carries people and goods safely, efficiently, and economically. It should promote an expanding, innovative, economically and technologically efficient international air transport system which (1) provides that passengers and shippers share in the benefits through improved service and reduced fares and (2) assures U.S. air carriers a fair and equal opportunity to compete in world aviation markets so as to maintain and further develop an economically viable service network wherever a substantial need for air transportation appears.

These purposes cannot be realized until aircraft hijackings are stopped. By any standard, air piracy is reprehensible. We support measures designed to end this terrible practice.

Our international air transportation policy must recognize a number of other U.S. objectives or principles; these may at times be served by the policy or at times be constraints upon it. Thus, the policy must be appropriately mindful of U.S. strategic and political interests, the international military air transportation interests of the U.S., and the prospective effect of the policy on the U.S. balance of payments. It must take into account legitimate air transport interests of other countries and recognize that in the final analysis the policy cannot be viable without international acceptance. It should recognize that the United States historically has believed that the economic and tech-

nological benefits we seek can best be achieved by encouraging competition (the extent of competition to be determined on a case-by-case basis) and by a relative freedom from governmental restrictions. The policy must also reflect our concern about the quality of the environment, and our determination that adequate efforts are made to preserve and enhance that quality as we continue to develop the technology of air transportation.

Proceeding from the premises set out above, our review has led us to the following conclusions with regard to the central aspects of this nation's international air transportation policy.

1. The exchange of air transport rights: The basic system of exchanging air transport rights through a structure of bilateral agreements embodying the Bermuda provisions¹ should be continued although further studies should be made as to the feasibility of exchanging rights on a multilateral basis. The rights exchanged in these agreements should be designed both to meet the needs of the public for air transportation and to assure U.S. air carriers the opportunity to achieve benefits no less than those available to the foreign air carriers. However, in the negotiation of agreements, care should be taken not to pay an excessive price for rights for which there is little near-term requirement. In order to avoid the wasteful introduction of excess capacity, caution should be exercised in granting routes on which the traffic potential is limited. The Bermuda capacity provisions have served both the United States and international air transportation well in providing a liberal economic environment for the conduct of international air services. Attempts to restrict U.S. carrier operations abroad should be vigorously opposed, and where required, the United States should take appropriate measures against the carriers of foreign countries restricting U.S. carrier operations in violation of the terms of bilateral agreements or of the principle of reciprocity.

2. Charter operations and the role of supplemental carriers in relation to scheduled services: Since 1963 international charter services by scheduled and supplemental carriers have grown in importance, have been increasingly accepted by the public, and now form an integral part of some markets. While the roles of scheduled and supplemental carriers are different as described in this Statement, there has nonetheless developed in certain areas competition between them. This may, indeed, increase.

We expect both scheduled services (individually ticketed and individually waybilled) and charter services (whether offered by supplemental carriers or scheduled carriers) to have important roles throughout the coming decade. The growth rates of both services make it appear likely that both will have substantial markets.

Scheduled services are of vital importance to air transportation and offer services to the public which are not provided by charter services. Only scheduled services are expected to offer regular and dependably frequent schedules, provide extensive flexi-

¹In general, under Bermuda principles each airline is free to decide the number of flights it will operate on agreed routes, subject to *ex post facto* review of its operations to assure that they conform to certain general principles: (1) the airlines have a fair and equal opportunity to compete; (2) the airlines of one country do not operate so as to affect unduly the operations of the airlines of the other country; (3) the air services bear a close relationship to public requirements; and (4) the primary objective of air services is to carry traffic to and from an airline's homeland.

bility in length of stay, and maintain worldwide routes, including routes to areas of low traffic volume. Substantial impairment of scheduled services could result in travelers and shippers losing the ability to obtain these benefits. Accordingly, in any instances where a substantial impairment of scheduled services appears likely, it would be appropriate, where necessary to avoid prejudice to the public interest, to take steps to prevent such impairment.

Charter services by scheduled and supplemental carriers have been useful in holding down fare and rate levels and expanding passenger and cargo markets. They offer opportunities to exploit the inherent efficiency of payload movement and the elasticity of demand for international air transport. They can provide low-cost transportation of a sort fitted to the needs of a significant portion of the traveling public. Charter services are a most valuable component of the international air transportation system, and they should be encouraged. If it appears that there is likely to be a substantial impairment of charter services, it would be appropriate, where necessary to avoid prejudice to the public interest, to take steps to prevent such impairment.

Additional uniformity and simplification of charter rules is desirable, and an effective charter enforcement program should be maintained.

Both scheduled carriers and supplemental carriers should be permitted a fair opportunity to compete in the bulk transportation market. We consider passengers traveling at group rates on scheduled services to be part of that market. Regulatory and promotional policies should give greater recognition to the dimensions, characteristics and needs of the bulk transportation market, as such, and less emphasis to the type of carrier that is serving that market. However, the Government should not allow enjoyment of the right to perform both scheduled service and charter service to result in decisive competitive advantages for scheduled carriers.

Licensing tools (geographic limitations, charter definitions, volume restrictions, etc.) can be utilized to adjust the competition between scheduled services and charter services. However, the widespread public acceptance of charters warrants care in taking any restrictive actions. A determination whether to impose restrictions upon charter services should consider principally the extent to which the ability to obtain frequent and regular travel would otherwise be prejudiced. If it is necessary to restrict charter services because it is found that only scheduled service can provide the required convenience, and it is the charter services that make impossible the maintenance of the scheduled service, the restrictions should be the minimum necessary to have the required effect.

The foreign landing rights for charter services should be regularized, as free as possible from substantial restriction. To accomplish this, intergovernmental agreements covering the operation of charter services should be vigorously sought, distinct, however, from agreements covering scheduled services. In general, there should be no trade-off as between scheduled service rights and charter service rights. In negotiating charter agreements, the continuation of and the nature of the charter rights of foreign carriers will be at issue.

3. Rates and fares and the role of the International Air Transport Association (IATA): Under existing United States policy the Civil Aeronautics Board has permitted U.S. carrier participation in IATA subject to various conditions and disciplines. Within that framework the Board has encouraged pricing policies, including experimentation with promotional fares, which would make air services available on the lowest economic basis to the widest possible market. To this end, the

Board has also encouraged aggressive and free competition in charter pricing by the supplemental carriers.

This approach has been successful in the past five years in bringing about substantial improvement in the level and structure of North Atlantic fares, and traffic growth has been rapid. However, IATA has not made similar progress on North/Central Pacific routes, where normal fares remain well above justifiable levels and there are no individual economy class excursion fares or certain other promotional fares comparable to those in effect across the North Atlantic. The Board is handicapped by its lack of authority to regulate international rates, authority which other governments assert.

The U.S. should work for the broadest range of potentially profitable services designed to appeal to the broadest consumer market and based on the lowest cost of operating an efficient air transport system.

Innovative experimentation with promotional fares and varying service concepts should be encouraged to take full advantage of technological developments.

The U.S. should continue to accept IATA as the machinery for pricing scheduled services, subject to continuing safeguards, but supplemented by increased direct informal exchanges between governments. Continued support should also be given to the establishment of IATA and non-IATA charter rates on a free competitive basis. The effectiveness of the Board in its dealings both with IATA and governments should be enhanced by vesting it with authority to regulate rates and fares between the U.S. and foreign points, subject to Executive review.²

4. Competition among and between U.S. carriers and foreign carriers: Competition among air carriers, as in other areas of economic activity, tends to improve the quality and variety of service to the public, keeps prices reasonable, and enlarges the market for all carriers. The concept of a single carrier or chosen instrument for the United States remains as undesirable today and in the future as in the past.

The United States should maintain a flexible policy on certifying competition among U.S. carriers on international routes. This policy should take into account the public's need for additional or improved air services, including new direct services from U.S. points other than major gateways and improved service to points abroad where this is necessary to meet the challenge of changing market patterns. At the same time, our policy on competition must take account of the economic viability of the additional or improved air services, including a consideration of the probable foreign carrier competition and the new factors of charter competition and wide-bodied jets. The policy should also distinguish between point to point competition of U.S. carriers and services to a particular foreign country from different sections of the U.S. Within this framework, there may be future route possibilities for new U.S. carriers, as well as incumbent carriers.

Every effort should be made to improve U.S. carrier competitive performance vis-a-vis foreign flag carriers in some markets, particularly the North Atlantic. Continuing to improve the quantity and variety of services in such markets would enhance our competitive standing.

U.S. carriers should adequately serve the international routes for which they are certificated. All appropriate U.S. Government agencies should cooperate with the CAB in developing criteria and procedures to assure that the public convenience and necessity is served. The result should be improved U.S.

²Since 1966, the CAB has favored Executive notification rather than Executive review.

flag service and a general increase in economic efficiency which in the final analysis could be translated into lower costs to the public and should result in an improvement in the United States carriers' competitive standing in international air transportation markets.

Generally, economic cooperative arrangements such as revenue or traffic pools between U.S. and foreign air carriers are anti-competitive and as a rule should continue to be discouraged. The United States should continue its flexible policy with respect to other forms of economic cooperative arrangements, such as blocked-space agreements, when these are shown to be in the public interest, improve the air service network, and otherwise meet U.S. international aviation policy objectives.

The United States recognizes that significant benefits to the public can and do result from competition by foreign air carriers. It is important, however, to assure that this competition is fair, non-discriminatory, and in keeping with the provisions of our air transport agreements. There is some evidence that the incidence of air services by foreign air carriers from points behind their home countries may continue to increase. This situation should be kept under review and appropriate consultative and other steps taken as necessary.

5. All-cargo certification and rights: The international all-cargo services of U.S. flag carriers constitute an important national transportation capability serving commercial as well as national defense needs. Demand for cargo airlift will continue to increase. Further operating economies are promised by the new wide-bodied jets.

The U.S. cargo-only carriers are a useful force in the international air transportation market and should continue to be encouraged.

Cargo routing flexibility is an operating right valuable to both combination and cargo-only carriers. The government should be prepared to negotiate for the right as the need arises and to anticipate the need in the negotiation of new or amended agreements.

The exchange of all-cargo rights on the basis of cargo-only bilaterals is neither feasible nor desirable. The present bilateral system for exchanging all-cargo and other rights should be continued.

6. Carrier liability: United States policy on carrier liability for personal injury or death of passengers has recently been reappraised in connection with the prospective revision of the Warsaw Convention as amended by the Hague Protocol. The U.S. position embodies our primary objectives in this field: certainty, speed, and sufficiency of recovery by the injured party. That posture should be maintained.

The present policy of the United States concerning carrier liability to persons and property on the ground is reflected in our position with respect to the Rome Convention on Damage caused by Foreign Aircraft to Third Parties on the surface.

If the Warsaw Convention is revised in a manner which achieves United States objectives, the United States should move ahead as fast as feasible with work on the Rome Convention, and particularly with a view of expanding it to cover the liability of operators in event of aerial collisions and the liability of air traffic control agencies.³

There is an ever-increasing number of operations involving internationally leased aircraft. The United States should therefore urge an ICAO review of international avia-

³We also believe that the Warsaw Convention limits on cargo liability should be reviewed, and we support the recent recommendations of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business that the CAB investigate whether the liability of the carrier for cargo loss and damages is too low.

tion Conventions in order to determine how international leasing affects the responsibilities of States and aircraft operators.

7. Insurance: At the present time, certain foreign carriers of marginal financial resources are not required to maintain satisfactory minimum liability insurance coverage. This results in a lack of assurance for Americans that all carriers can cover losses promptly and sufficiently. A new policy should be adopted and implemented expeditiously, under which the Civil Aeronautics Board would require such foreign carriers to maintain satisfactory minimum amounts of liability insurance. The present requirement that liability insurance be carried by certain groups of carriers (U.S. supplemental and air taxi carriers) should be reviewed by the CAB in the near future to determine whether the minimum coverage limits are still adequate in view of inflation and possible increases in Warsaw liability limits. If it is determined that aviation insurance needs for the 1970's will severely strain the capacity of the worldwide market, attention should be given to measures, such as amendments to tax laws, that would encourage the expansion of the American market. At least to meet defense needs, the war risk insurance program should be extended.

8. Facilitation: We should continue to adopt all practicable measures to facilitate international air movement and to prevent unnecessary delays to aircraft, crews, passengers, baggage and cargo. We should continue to support collaborative efforts in the International Civil Aviation Organization to adopt and implement international standards, recommend practices, and procedures dealing with international aviation facilitation, except that the ICAO endorsement of preclearance procedures is being reviewed in view of the priority program to combat smuggling of narcotics and dangerous drugs. Where U.S. statutes preclude compliance with such international standards, special efforts should be made to change such laws at the earliest practicable moment unless such action is determined to be detrimental to the national interest. We should urge international airlines and operators to collaborate with inspectional agencies in improving clearance facilities and associated services at U.S. airports while present preclearance operations are being reexamined. We should, as circumstances warrant, use the occasion of the negotiation of bilateral air transport agreements with other nations, or consultations under existing agreements, to discuss serious facilitation problems facing the U.S. flag carriers. Any measures taken by other nations which are unreasonable or discriminatory and which hamper or impede the international operations of U.S. international air operators should be strenuously opposed. We should maintain close liaison with regional aviation bodies and the facilitation programs of such groups. The past meetings between U.S. and Canadian government and industry facilitation experts have been fruitful and these meetings should be continued. Any similar efforts to arrange meetings with other appropriate countries should be supported.

9. User charges, fees, and taxes: Existing and proposed U.S. policies are considered to be essentially sound. They seek equitable recovery of federal aviation facility expenditures from special beneficiaries; in doing so, they avoid unduly burdening the general taxpayer. They seek an efficient allocation of national resources among alternate programs; in doing so, they promote needed facility implementation and long-range planning. They assist the U.S. in achieving reasonable facility financing policies in other States and in reaching international agreement

* It should not be inferred that the review is designed necessarily to eliminate preclearance.

through the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO); in doing so, they give greater assurance of equity for U.S. international air operators. By exempting State aircraft from charges, they help us to eliminate impediments to U.S. military aircraft movements overseas. Finally, through active U.S. participation in ICAO user charge programs, sound financing policies by other Governments are encouraged; in doing so, U.S. international aviation overseas is more effectively protected from charging inequities. In light of the foregoing, current U.S. policies in this area should continue to be pursued, and the United States should vigorously oppose inequitable charging of U.S. carriers abroad.

10. Balance of payments: U.S. policy on international air transportation, as in numerous other areas, must give especially close attention and careful consideration during the 1970's to potential effects on the balance of payments.

This will require, first and foremost, an active and on-going balance-of-payments consciousness on the part of all agencies concerned.

A second major requirement is that it must reflect a balanced and comprehensive assessment of potential policy effects on the three major payments accounts which are directly affected by international air transport activities—air transportation, overseas travel, and aircraft exports—as well as the effects of air cargo policies on the foreign trade account generally. In carrying out such assessment, the most important point to be kept in mind is that by far the largest part of the possible effects of air transport policies on all three of these accounts must be expected to relate to, and result directly from, their expected influence on the general growth rate of total international passenger traffic and/or the relative numbers of American, as compared with foreign, travelers making up this total traffic.

Taking account of these balance-of-payments considerations while, at the same time, recognizing the importance of encouraging economically sound growth of air transport activities as a basic objective of U.S. aviation policy, the following further guidelines are also recommended.

U.S. air transport policy during the 1970's should recognize that actions which improve the U.S. flag share of international air traffic also provide some benefit to the U.S. payments.

It should also make a continuing effort (in conjunction with, and support of, other Government and private-sector efforts on this subject) to give some extra stimulus to a faster growth of inbound, relative to outbound, travel by: maintaining a margin of necessary flexibility for, and giving sympathetic and imaginative consideration to various possible means of providing limited directional encouragements. This is especially desirable when incremental costs are lower in a given direction.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 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 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

THOSE BRITISH ELECTIONS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party of England has gained a landslide victory in their recent election and, if we are to believe the news commentators, the Conservative Party leaders do not even understand why they won.

The answer to most informed citizens is suggested from the dodges and distortions attempted by the news media to hide the facts—labor. The working people revolted against the Labor leaders and turned to the Conservatives for leadership out of the morass.

The English workingman has become disenchanted with socialization, controls, and inefficiency. The workers did not bolt the Labor Party—the party leaders abandoned them.

The attempts to explain away the results of the British election by talking around the plain facts with such assertions as belittling the role of Enoch Powell by calling him the George Wallace of England, and discounting the vote from disenfranchised Laborites. Few can accept the reports that such a landslide victory was simply the result of the dull campaign waged by Prime Minister Heath.

Judging from Prime Minister Heath's reactions, he refuses to understand the opportunity given to his party. For the Conservatives and Mr. Heath to stay in power, their efforts must include jobs and resistance to communism. South Africa, Rhodesia, and other nations have been denied commercial exchange with England under the Laborites. Mr. Heath, by refraining from Wilson's picayunishness toward former colonies and reestablishing England's role in the world export market, will find jobs created for the working people of England.

The political ingredient of success was forgotten by Mr. Wilson and his Labor Party until after the votes were counted.

I include several news clippings:

[From the Washington Post, June 19, 1970]

POWELL DOUBLES PREVIOUS MAJORITY

WOLVERHAMPTON, ENGLAND, June 19.—Conservative Enoch Powell, who injected the race issue into British politics, doubled his previous majority in Britain's national elections yesterday despite denunciations from opponents and repudiations from his own party leadership.

The outspoken Tory campaigned for curbs on non-white immigration into Britain and was elected for the seventh time to represent Southwest Wolverhampton in the House of Commons.

Powell, 58, polled 26,220 votes to 11,763 for his labor opponent.

Powell was asked if he was responsible for the surprise Conservative victory nationwide.

"I would like to see my result in the context of the results throughout the country before I attempt to draw any conclusions about it."

Even before the voting began, he complained bitterly that Edward Heath's Tory leadership had turned its back on him. Heath had expelled him from the Conservative high command in 1967 and condemned

his assertions that unchecked nonwhite immigration would produce violence in Britain.

A classical scholar and army general as well as a politician, Powell aroused passions wherever he spoke during the campaign. Epithets greeted him and he frequently was the target of stink bombs and tomatoes.

When his victory was announced at the Wolverhampton election hall, Tory and Laborite women fought each other, pulling hair, scratching and biting.

Meanwhile, Dr. David Pitt, 56, the Labor Party's leading black candidate, failed to retain his seat from the South London borough of Clapham. Pitt, a West Indian, lost by nearly 3,000 votes to the Conservative challenger in what was a significant triumph for the Tories in a traditional Labor area.

[From the Washington Post, June 19, 1970]

CONSERVATIVES WIN SURPRISE VICTORY IN BRITAIN

Virtually every serious political observer in Britain—discounting the formal predictions of victory made by the Tory leaders and candidates—had assumed that Wilson would perform the hat trick, winning three successive elections, with a smashing majority. The virtual unanimity of the polls, which began to show Labor majorities as early as late last winter, had apparently deceived them—and almost everyone else in Britain.

Under British law, the newly-elected government may remain in power for five years from the day of taking office. It may, however, call for a dissolution of Parliament at any time it chooses—for example, in the event of a major vote against it or, alternately, at a time it deems favorable to its chances for reelection. Wilson called this election 11 months before the legal deadline.

Wilson had run a campaign on a "don't rock the boat" theme. He argued that Britain had "put right" its chronic economic dilemma of a deficit in the balance of payments, and that the future looked bright, with a deluge of recent wage increases having put something like 12 per cent more money in the workers' pockets.

Heath and his top lieutenants had branded the forecasts as fraudulent and the prosperity only temporary, to be blighted by an inevitable inflation and a return to a balance of payment crisis.

His campaign, conducted largely over television plus a series of sorties to major British cities, had been deemed dull and unconvincing. But in the last week it appeared much more vigorous and, as Friday morning's results showed, it obviously caught fire.

So devastating were the Labor losses on the basis of the constituency results reported by early morning that some of its notable figures were retired from Parliament. Among them were Sir Dingle Foot, one of Britain's most renowned barristers, and Mrs. Anne Kerr, one of the most vocal and prominent of the party's extreme left wing.

Early speculation centered on the extent which the last week's fiery campaign of Tory Enoch Powell, champion of the anti-immigration movement, had on the results. Trading on the feeling against the entry on nonwhite immigrants in recent years, Powell appeared to have increased the swing to the Tories, particularly in the industrial Midlands, where feeling runs highest.

His own majority, in his Wolverhampton constituency, showed an increase of 9 per cent over 1966, one of the highest among the 270 districts so far reported. In a television interview when his own victory in Bexley in Kent was announced, Heath himself conceded, in roundabout language, that Powell's action may have influenced results "in certain areas of the country."

Heath fired Powell in April, 1968, from his shadow cabinet when Powell launched his

first strident anti-colored speech. Heath has repeatedly declared he would not include Powell in his Cabinet if the Tories won and formed the government.

The small Liberal Party, with 13 members in the last Parliament, lost four seats in the early counting. Among them was that of its whip, the popular Eric Lubbock.

Speculation immediately began over the composition of Heath's government. It was assumed that Sir Alice Douglas-Home, foreign minister in the last Tory government, could have his old post back if he wanted it. Sir Keith Joseph or Ian MacLeod were being touted for chancellor of the exchequer, Reginald Maudling for home secretary and Quintin Hogg for leader of the House. Whether these in fact will be their jobs is not certain, but that all of them will hold high office in the new government seems assured.

Despite Tweedledum, tweedledee charges against the Labor and Conservative parties, it is clear that the new Tory government will bring many changes to Britain, not the least of them in the style of government.

Heath, 54, has stood for a far more activist, innovative role for his party, a more competitive and less protective system of economics at home and a more forceful role abroad.

Among the specifics the Conservative Party has pledged:

A lessening of direct taxation—which is to say income tax—and repeal of the fiercely unpopular selective employment tax payed by nonmanufacturing employers on their payrolls. But the inevitable corollary is higher indirect taxes, very probably the value added, or transaction, tax, obtaining within the Common Market countries.

Labor relations legislation, including elements of the American Taft-Hartley law. The proposal will be bitterly fought by Britain's trade unions. The issue may very probably lead to massive strikes and provide one of the earliest tests of Heath's courage and firmness.

The reversal of Labor's promise to return all British forces from East of Suez. Heath would keep some naval and marine force in the Persian Gulf, and land troops in Singapore and South Asia.

The Tories have sworn not to introduce a system of direct wage and price controls, but it seems clear—unless they are totally unfaithful to their promises and economic forecasts—that they must take some steps to effect wage restraint and forestall, to the extent it remains possible, the inflation that looms ahead, for late this year if not sooner.

Voters, both Labor and Conservative, will doubtless find cause for rejoicing—on the principle that it is always agreeable to see the mighty humbled—at the inaccuracy of the opinion polls.

Besides the 1 per cent Tory forecast of the Opinion Research Center, the final call of the others—all Labor majority predictions—were: Marplan, 9.6; Gallup, 7; Harris, 2; National Opinion Poll, 4.1.

[From Newsweek, June 22, 1970]

BRITAIN: DOWN TO THE WIRE

"Wake up, Britain! Wake up! Throw off your anesthetized slumber!" So pleaded Quintin Hogg, the rambunctious Conservative M.P., as he and other Tory candidates struggled to arouse the British public. But as this week's general election drew near, few voters appeared to pay Hogg's much heed. For one thing, the World Cup soccer matches in Mexico seemed of more immediate importance, particularly after England, the defending champion, narrowly managed to advance into the quarter-finals. A distinctly un-British heat wave also served to take people's minds off politics. And besides, no matter what the outcome of the balloting,

droves of Britons would soon be taking off for summer holidays at the seashore or on the Continent.

The weather and the holiday mood of his countrymen did nothing, however, to dampen the outlook for Labor Prime Minister Harold Wilson, who puffed away at his pipe and beamed benignly as he campaigned around the country. And there was reason enough for Wilson's optimism. Recent polls have consistently predicted that Labor would regain control of the House of Commons by a comfortable margin, and the latest sampling last week gave Wilson a stunning 12 percent lead. Beyond that, the Prime Minister's cause was bolstered by word that Britain had earned a balance-of-payments surplus of nearly \$1.5 billion in the fiscal year ended March 31—a figure that compared rather nicely with the \$1.9 billion deficit with which the Tories had ended their last term of office in 1964.

As the Conservatives saw it, of course, there were other, more important, statistics to talk about—ones that reflected spiraling consumer prices, the highest unemployment since World War II and the heaviest tax burden in history. But somehow, try as he might, Tory leader Edward Heath simply was not getting the message across. "With all this gloom," a heckler shouted at Heath recently "don't you think you'd be better off running an undertaker's parlor?" Adding to Tory woes was the fact that for four days, a printers' walkout shut down the nation's newspapers—most of which are pro-Tory or at least critical of Labor's record during the past six years. With that, Tory prospects seemed to drop to their lowest point yet and at the end of the week British bookies made Heath a 10-1 underdog.

ODD MEN OUT

Paradoxically, three of the most interesting candidates in the British election are men from outside the mainstream of political power. These three—Jeremy Thorpe, leader of Britain's tiny Liberal Party, Tory maverick Enoch Powell and Northern Ireland's fire-breathing preacher, the Rev. Ian Paisley—are the odd men out of British politics. Together, they could at best affect the election results in only twenty or so constituencies, a tiny number in a Parliament of 630 members. Yet each man wields influence far beyond the limits of his own parochial stamping ground.

Race: In some ways, the most enigmatic of the three is Enoch Powell, 58, the former Minister of Defense in the Tory "shadow Cabinet" who emerged as a sort of British George Wallace two years ago, when he issued dire warnings that Britain would one day be swamped by immigrants from the West Indies, Pakistan and India. Now, Powell is running on a platform that is sharply opposed to that of his own party on the race issue, for he demands an end to all immigration into Britain. And in a particular vitriolic speech last week, he even hinted that British immigration officials were deliberately abetting the black influx.

Powell hardly fits the stereotype of a rabble-rouser. He is, for one thing, a brilliant academician, a professor of Greek at the age of 25, a linguist with a command of ten languages, a poet and a historian. But he does look like a prophet of doom in his black pin-striped suit, black boots, black waistcoat, black Homburg pulled down over an ash-gray face, his eyes a chilling blue, his voice flat and rasping. And both major parties take Powell very seriously indeed. The polls show him a shoo-in for election in his industrial Wolverhampton constituency, and although civil servants and race-relations experts have ridiculed his warnings, there is no doubt that Powellism is taking root as gospel in the sooty factory cities of England's Midlands.

For Labor, therefore, the fear is that Powell's appeal to racial distrust could slice away at traditional bastions of Labor support in the cities. And the Conservatives are equally fearful that Powell might so tar the Tory party as to produce a solid immigrant vote for the Labor Party in several marginal constituencies.

Powell, however, is not alone in appealing to fear and prejudice. Across the Irish Sea, Ian Paisley, the hulking, Bible-thumping spokesman of the extreme Protestant movement in Ulster, has been campaigning hard for a seat in the British House of Commons ever since he was elected to Northern Ireland's Parliament last April. And in Ulster, where hatred between the Protestant majority and the Catholic minority constantly threatens to explode into renewed strife and violence, Paisley finds receptive audiences as he rants against the Catholics. "He's a man who says what a lot of people feel," explained a leathery-faced Protestant farmer last week in the village of Ballintoy, where crowds were cheering Paisley's fire-eating speech. Carefully avoiding the Protestant crowd, a Catholic housewife cautioned: "It's best to stay inside when they get like that. He brings out terrible passions in people."

The Wilson government, which dreaded a Paisley victory in the Ulster elections last April, is doubly in dread of a Paisley victory in the general election—not just because of the impact he might have at Westminster but because his success would seriously increase the chances for renewed violence in Ulster, where some 7,700 British troops already stand on guard.

Heritage: In happy contrast to Powell and Paisley stands Jeremy Thorpe, 41, the cheerful, blue-blooded leader of Britain's once-great Liberal Party—a party that held 398 seats in the House of Commons on the eve of World War I but now controls only thirteen. Despite his aristocratic heritage—he is a product of Eton and Oxford, the descendant of a fourteenth-century Lord Chancellor of England and the son and grandson of Tory M.P.'s—Thorpe has long given evidence of a leftward bent. As a youngster during World War II, he delighted in wearing Roosevelt buttons in order to annoy the Republican family with which he was living in the United States. And as leader of the Liberal Party, he has earned the nickname "Bomber" for advocating air attacks against the railways of rebel Rhodesia.

Thorpe expects Labor to win the general elections this week, and he fears that his party's parliamentary strength may be even further eroded. That fear is quite probably justified. But if, unexpectedly, the election should prove close, Thorpe would be prepared to form a coalition government with either major party.

[From the Washington Star, May 19, 1970]

BRITISH VOTING SET JUNE 18; LABOR ELATED BY POLL RETURNS

LONDON.—Britain's Labor government today went into its campaign for the party's first consecutive third term in its history with a narrow lead in the last public opinion poll taken before announcement of the general election June 18.

In a survey taken over the weekend and published today in the Times, Prime Minister Harold Wilson's government led the Conservative opposition 47.2 percent to 44.5. That much of a lead on election day would give Labor a majority of 60 in the 630-seat House of Commons.

Wilson's announcement yesterday on the election date, coupled with seven previous opinion polls favorable to Labor, sent bettors rushing to the book makers to put their money on Labor. Late last night the bookies made Labor a 2-1 favorite to win, which would make Wilson the first prime minister

in more than 250 years to win three straight terms.

HEATH OPTIMISTIC

Conservative party leader Edward Heath said last night after the election date was announced that he was "aching for this fight." He predicted confidently: "We will win."

Despite Labor's consistent showing in the recent opinion polls, a number of factors made the election outcome uncertain.

For one thing, about 50 seats are in marginal districts decided in the 1966 election by 2,500 votes or less. There is no certainty yet how they will go this time.

Nearly 2 million young people between 18 and 21 are voting for the first time, and nobody knows how they will line up.

ECONOMIC TROUBLE POSSIBLE

Britain's economic recovery, the trump card in Labor's campaign deck, could be set back by inflation, strikes, the slump in the United States and rising unemployment.

New violence threatens between Roman Catholics and Protestants in troubled Northern Ireland, which is part of the United Kingdom.

Campaign platforms are expected to be ready by next week. Both Wilson and Heath gave previews last night on the BBC.

Labor claimed credit for Britain's strong foreign trade surplus of \$1.2 billion, a key to economic recovery.

"We now have practically the strongest balance of payments in the world," Wilson asserted.

JOBLESS ISSUE RAISED

Heath concentrated on economic danger signals—booming wage increases, strikes up 60 percent over last year, and "the highest unemployment in this country since the '30s—over 600,000."

Missing this time are the more emotional socialism vs. capitalism issues of past campaigns. The welfare state and nationalization of some key industries are now generally accepted. Labor yesterday dropped a bill to nationalize the ports, the last plank in its program to extend government control of industry.

TAX PROGRAM SIDETRACKED

A controversial Labor proposal to tax capital holdings also is expected to be shelved.

The two parties agree on most key foreign policy issues, including British entry into the European Common Market. They divide on British's future role east of Suez, with the Laborites pledged to withdraw British forces from the East by the end of 1971 and the Tories promising to keep them there if elected.

MOURNING THE DEATH OF BOB MCCORD

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues on the Committee on Education and Labor in mourning the death of Bob McCord last Sunday. Members on both sides of the aisle benefited from Bob's smooth running of the committee operations and from his expertise and skill in so many areas. No matter what the problem, Bob was always happy to offer assistance and helpful information. We will miss his ability and his good cheer, and I extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

CHAIRMAN DANIELS DISCUSSES FEDERAL EMPLOYEE BENEFITS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the National Association of Retired Civil Employees held its 11th biennial national convention in my home city of Buffalo, N.Y.

I was honored to serve as the congressional host and only regret that the press of legislation from my Committee on Post Office and Civil Service made it necessary to leave for Washington before all the meetings were concluded. As you know, House debate on controversial postal reform legislation was scheduled by the House leadership.

The Buffalo convention got off to a fine start with a Sunday breakfast session where the principal speaker was my good friend and colleague on the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS), chairman of the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits.

Chairman DANIELS made an excellent report to the convention on Federal employee benefits, a report which I believe is of interest to every Member. Following is Chairman DANIELS' text:

REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN DANIELS TO 11TH BIENNIAL NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED CIVIL EMPLOYEES, JUNE 14, 1970, BUFFALO, N.Y.

It is my pleasant privilege to bring to you the greetings and best wishes of my colleagues on the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and still more pleasant, to be here myself.

As many of you know, this is not the first time I have had the privilege of taking a small part in a national convention of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees.

In the performance of the congressional responsibilities imposed upon me as a member of two House Committees, and having the honor of chairing two of its subcommittees, the occasions are numerous for my meeting with a variety of people, from various walks of life, and with widely varying interests.

With the Federal retiree group I have the feeling of "being right at home"—in a special kind of way. So, I hope it will not be the last time you invite me.

I looked forward with particular pleasure to being with you this year for two additional reasons—one, that your convention is being "hosted" by my good friend, my leader on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Chairman Thad Dulski; the other, that it is being presided over by my dear friend, your leader, Tom Walters.

LEGISLATIVE GAINS OVER YEARS

In saying this, I do so in all sincerity. Through Chairman Dulski's leadership and support, and with the cooperation and dedicated efforts of Tom Walters, not only during his term of office as a national president of your fine organization, but over the years that he has been on the Washington scene, we have made remarkable gains in legislation of benefit to Federal retirees and employees.

I hasten to add, however, that without your backing we could not have been quite so successful.

Since your last biennial convention a landmark legislative endeavor was enacted into law on October 20, 1969. It is a source of gratification and humble pride to me that, after laboring long and hard for two years, President Nixon approved Public Law 91-93, commonly known as the Daniels-McGee Act.

In the observance of the Golden Anniversary of the enactment of the Civil Service Retirement law last month that accomplishment was singled out as "a masterful and bipartisan accommodation to the divergent pressures for strengthened financing, improved benefits, and a more responsible approach to future changes."

FINANCIAL ASSURANCE

Through the mutual efforts of the Congress, the Executive Branch, the various employee organizations, and this association, the Civil Service Retirement System will be assured of the financial ability to meet its obligations to annuitants and survivors—on time and in full.

Your retirement system has evolved over the years with a mixture of both insurance and humanitarian concepts. With respect to the adjustment of benefits after retirement, fundamental insurance principles would guarantee that whatever annuity the employee had earned upon retirement should be maintained without change.

Humanitarian considerations, however, would urge that the economic welfare of the retiree is of primary concern, and that the earned annuity should be adjusted in response to changing needs. The latter theory has prevailed through congressional action, despite the difficulties of putting that theory into actual practice.

As you know, especially those of you who retired prior to 1965, the Congress had tried a variety of devices to cope with the problem that inflation was causing persons living on retirement income.

Not until 1965 was a really effective method of annuity adjustment achieved—an achievement to which "NARCE", then under the leadership of our good friend Clarence Tarr, can point with pride and to which it can lay claim to much credit of enactment.

BENEFITS IN BETTER BALANCE

By virtue of the 1965 and 1969 acts, benefit values are now in better balance, on the whole, than at any time in previous years. Automatic adjustments are recurring annually, and it is apparent that all annuities will be further increased on August 1st by at least 5½ percent.

In the early days of the current session of the 91st Congress the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits committed itself to promptly pursuing its second paramount legislative objective—a major health benefits bill. This morning I can report to you that we are making favorable progress.

My bill, H.R. 16968, has been unanimously adopted by the Subcommittee and was overwhelmingly approved by the full Committee last month. I recently appeared before the Committee on Rules to arrange for the necessary rule to bring the bill to the House Floor.

I am happy to inform you that a rule was granted a few hours before my departure from Washington on Thursday. That action will pave the way for the bill to be programmed for consideration by the House within the next few weeks.

CONSENSUS ON U.S. PAYING HALF

As many of you who were still in active Federal service when the health benefits program was established in 1959 will recall, it was the consensus of opinion that the Government should pay at least half of the premium charges.

However, because we had no experience in this new field at that time, the Bureau of

the Budget prevailed upon the Congress to set a dollar limitation.

That ceiling turned out to represent only 38 percent of total premium costs at the very outset, with employees and annuitants paying the remaining 62 percent.

We all know the unfortunate history, which found the dollar limit forcing the Government's share ever downward—and the enrollee's burden ever upward."

You know, as well as I, that today it has deteriorated to a point where the Government pays less than 25 percent, while the annuitant and employee picks up the tab for over 75 percent.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD MATCH INDUSTRY

Although it is my personal view that the Government should strive to match the trend in private industry, where the employers are providing their workers cost-free health insurance—and many of my colleagues agree—we all have to be practical when dealing with the taxpayers' dollars.

In fact, we must be especially practical when faced with the strenuous opposition of the Budget Bureau and other executive offices to adequate fringe benefits for active and retired employees in the Federal sector.

So, as a practical matter my Subcommittee proposed a 50-50 sharing of premium charges. This long-overdue improvement will mark a real breakthrough in terms of Government participation.

Final approval should put \$10 or more each month in the annuity checks of married retirees, and about half that amount in the checks of single retirees and widows.

BATTLES STILL NOT WON

I would be less than honest with you if I failed to tell you that the battle is far from won. Spokesmen for the Administration have intimated that an equal sharing of premiums is unacceptable because of cost.

So, it will take all of our joint energies to insure that this worthy legislation becomes law—in spite of that opposition.

I would be somewhat remiss if I neglected to comment upon our efforts with respect to the pre-1960 retiree health benefits program. The Committee took full cognizance of the favorable experience of that plan.

At the insistence of President Walters, we recommended the improvement of the benefits provided under that plan, without any increase in the annuitants' premiums.

I am pleased to report to you that the Civil Service Commission concurs in our recommendations, and contemplates such action in the next few months.

HEARINGS BEGUN ON H.R. 3661

I can also report to you that while awaiting the next step in the legislative process on the health benefits bill, the opportunity arose for the Subcommittee to begin hearings on Congressman Dulski's bill, H.R. 3661—sometimes referred to as "NARCE's" "second-spouse" bill.

The foremost supporter of that proposal—your national president—appeared before the Subcommittee as the lead-off witness last Wednesday, with some very compelling arguments for its favorable consideration and in support of extending its provisions to cover other cases of relative equity.

It was one of the most revealing and stimulating hearings that I have ever had the pleasure of conducting, and the hearing room was overflowing with members of your fine organization. I can assure you that further witnesses will be scheduled to present their testimony at the earliest practicable date.

While it is too early to hazard a guess as to what provisions will be embodied in the Subcommittee's final version of this legislation, I am quite confident that our deliberations will result in the elimination of many of the inequities which still prevail in the retirement law.

GREAT STRIDES SINCE 1920

To be sure, the machinery of Government is not perfect. Nor is the mechanics of your Civil Service Retirement System—nothing human ever is. But, it is a giant step forward over the insecurity that prevailed before its inception in 1920.

Whatever problems beset these programs, we all have a stake in their proper solutions. I have every confidence that by working together we can make them more responsive to our changing times and changing needs. This is what our democratic system demands of all of us.

I could not help being impressed with a portion of your president's biennial report, which appeared in the latest issue of your magazine, "Retirement Life", wherein he prescribes a tonic for loneliness and boredom, and cajoles your membership into "getting involved" in community and political activities.

That is good advice.

AN OBSERVATION

If there were any words of a philosophic or inspirational nature that I might add to that this Sunday morning, it might be this:

One of the famed Greek philosophers once said that "if all men were to bring their miseries together in one place, most would be glad to take his personal troubles back home with him, rather than return with his share of the common stock".

When we become discouraged with our condition in life, we might like to think about this. Everybody has troubles, apparently. Consider the people here—and elsewhere—whose problems dwarf ours.

If we knew about it there are probably people right next door to us with troubles that would astonish us. Every day we pass scores of persons with whom we wouldn't trade our troubles, if we knew theirs.

LIKE LOAD OF FIREWOOD

One writer has likened the worries that come to a person in the course of daily living to an armload of firewood—too heavy to carry sometimes—if you try to lift all of the logs at once.

The trick to handling such a load, it seems to me, is to handle them one at a time. Lift today's troubles today. Leave tomorrow's for tomorrow.

In leaving you with that thought, I pledge you my best endeavors toward further progress to provide for better, happier, more enriching lives in the retirement years of those who serve and have served their country well and long.

Thank you, and best wishes for a fruitful and successful convention.

IN MEMORIAM: WILLIAM HENRY BATES

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. ARENDS, Mr. Speaker, just 1 year ago many of us made a lonely and sad trip to Salem, Mass., to pay homage at the final resting place of our late, great, and noble colleague, Bill Bates, in the district he loved and served so well.

The recently published memorial book, one of the most formidable in the history of the Congress, contains lasting evidence of the exceptionally high regard in which Bill was held by those from all stations in life, of all races and creeds, and of diverse political interests. It was repeated by countless numbers that Bill

Bates would be sorely missed in the Sixth Massachusetts District, in Congress, and throughout the Nation. But little did we realize during those sad hours in that month of June how truly prophetic would those eulogies be until we experienced the void in our personal and public lives through each passing day.

We had said then that Bill's death was beyond our belief. Now, 1 year later, it seems the more so by a thousandfold. But we had said, also, that many of us were richly blessed in our close association with a noble friend and there would remain for us a wonderful treasury of cherished memories: For me, hardly a day has passed in which I have not drawn on that store of priceless recollections, a store that has grown and grown over these passing months to soften the shock of an indescribable loss.

Mr. Speaker, we do miss Bill Bates, and especially his wise counsel that would be so priceless during this most difficult period of change in the history of our great country.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, we again memorialize the passing of that great American, and I know that all who had the high privilege of serving with Bill Bates join in this hour of recollection and tribute.

ROBERT E. McCORD

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I share the views expressed by my colleagues on the untimely passing of Bob McCord.

In this great institution it is the Members themselves who get virtually all the attention. As far as the public is concerned, whatever Congress does is done by elected representatives of the people. But those of us who toil in these halls know that the great bulk of research, bill drafting, report writing, and general conduct of congressional business is done by the staffs of Members and the staffs of our committees. And among the real "pros" in these ranks was Bob McCord.

In the 16 years that Mr. McCord served on the staff of the Committee on Education and Labor tremendous changes have occurred in the country and in that committee. Once the graveyard for progressive legislation in the fields of education and labor—bills like general aid to education—that committee was transformed into one of the most effective committees of the Congress during the years of Mr. McCord's service. While this is a tribute to the Members who have served on that committee, it is also a measure of the contribution made by Bob McCord in his capacity as chief clerk and staff director.

I regret the loss of this fine professional staff member to the work of the Congress and the many unfinished tasks facing us in the cause of improved educational opportunity and labor relations in this country. He will be missed by all who knew him and worked with him these many years.

COMMUNICATIONS LEGISLATION

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I am privileged to serve as chairman, is the congressional committee in the House which deals with communications legislation. In view of transcending importance of communications in the lives of the American people, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent summary of communications matters which were the subject of hearings and reports during the 91st Congress. The report was prepared by Erwin G. Krasnow, chairman of the Committee on Legislation of the Federal Communications Bar Association and cochairman of the Committee on Communications Law of the Federal Bar Association.

The report follows:

COMMUNICATIONS LEGISLATION, 91ST CONGRESS APPROPRIATIONS

On February 18, 1969, the Subcommittee on Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development of the House Committee on Appropriations held hearings on the FCC's budget for fiscal year 1970. The Bureau of the Budget's request for the FCC was \$23,950,000. On June 19, 1969, the House Committee on Appropriations reported H.R. 12307, a bill appropriating funds for fiscal 1970 for 20 independent agencies and executive offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (H. Rept. No. 91-316). Under H.R. 12307, the FCC was allotted \$21,600,000. On June 24, 1969, the House passed H.R. 12307. On June 25, 1969, the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Senate Appropriations Committee held hearings on the FCC's budget. On November 6, 1969, the Senate Committee on Appropriations reported an amended bill (H.R. 12307) which allocated \$22,850,000 for the FCC (S. Rept. No. 91-521). On November 11, 1969, the Senate passed and sent to conference with the House H.R. 12307, as amended by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The Conference Report (Rept. No. 91-649) was filed on November 17, 1969, and budgeted \$22,225,000 for the FCC. On November 18, 1969, both the House and the Senate adopted the Conference Report on H.R. 12307. The bill was signed by the President on November 26, 1969 (Public Law 91-126).

On February 16, 1970, the House Subcommittee on Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development held hearings on H.R. 17548, which included a budget request of \$24,900,000 for the FCC for fiscal 1971. On May 7, 1970, the House Committee on Appropriations reported H.R. 17548, which included a budget of \$24,750,000 for the FCC (H. Rept. No. 91-1060). On May 12, 1970, H.R. 17598 was passed by the House. The Senate Independent Offices Subcommittee held hearings on the FCC budget on May 21, 1970.

BROADCAST COVERAGE OF HOUSE HEARINGS

On November 6, 1969, the Special Subcommittee on Legislative Reorganization of the House Rules Committee held a hearing on coverage of House proceedings by radio and television. On April 13, 1970, the Subcommittee favorably reported H.R. 17654, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, which

contains a provision (Title I, Section 116) which would for the first time allow broadcast coverage of House Committee hearings. Under H.R. 17654, the decision as to coverage would be decided by majority vote of each committee; commercial sponsorship of live broadcasts would be prohibited; and witnesses who were subpoenaed could not be televised without their consent.

CATV

On April 17, 1969, Congressman Stratton introduced several bills (H.R. 205, H.R. 10268, H.R. 10510) to suspend the Commission's interim procedures and rules concerning CATV systems and to amend the Communications Act to limit the FCC's authority over CATV systems. Several other Congressmen sponsored a concurrent resolution (H.C.R. 87) to suspend the proposed CATV rules to permit Congress to consider possible legislation. A hearing on this legislation was conducted by the Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on May 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23, 1969. The hearings were suspended because of the pressure of other legislative activities. It is anticipated that they will be resumed before the end of the second Session.

On March 25, 1970, Senator Pastore introduced S. 3635, a bill to amend the Communications Act to provide for the regulation of CATV systems. The bill was drafted by the FCC in response to a request by the Senate Communications Subcommittee that the agency review Section 111 of S. 543, the Copyright Revision Bill, and determine the impact passage of the bill would have on the Commission's television-CATV regulatory policies. The bill provides clarifying legislation concerning the FCC's authority to regulate CATV systems. S. 3635 would direct the Commission to effect "the orderly accommodation of both the community antenna and broadcasting industries, in order to secure maximum diversity of programming through the maintenance and expansion of broadcasting and the provision via community antenna systems of multiple reception, origination and related services".

On December 10, 1969, the Senate Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights reported, without recommendation, S. 543, the Copyright Revision Bill, to the full Judiciary Committee. The bill proposes a complete revision of the 1909 Copyright Law. Section 111 pertains to CATV systems and includes a compulsory licensing arrangement for all systems on a graduated scale from 1% to 5%; a "basic television service" quota of signals for the top 50 markets and another quota for all other markets; the unlimited use of aural signals; a surcharge of 1% of gross revenues for each distant signal above the allotted quota; and the "grandfathering" of signals presently carried.

CIGARETTE ADVERTISING

On April 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25, 1969, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held hearings on H.R. 1237, to restrict the broadcasting of cigarette advertisements; H.R. 6543, to extend a clause in the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-92) prohibiting any federal, state or local government from requiring health warnings in cigarette advertising; and related bills. The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee held further hearings on H.R. 6543 on June 10, 1969 (H. Rept. No. 91-289). On June 18, 1969, the House passed H.R. 6543, a bill requiring a strong health warning on cigarette packages¹ but preventing advertising restrictions for 6 years.

¹ "Warning: The Surgeon General Has Determined That Cigarette Smoking Is Dangerous to Your Health and May Cause Lung Cancer or other Diseases."

On July 22, the Subcommittee on Consumers of the Senate Commerce Committee held hearings on H.R. 6543 (S. Rept. No. 91-566). On December 12, 1969, the Senate amended H.R. 6543 in the following significant respects: changed the statement required on cigarette packages to read "Warning: Cigarette Smoking Is Dangerous to your Health"; revised the preemption provisions to prohibit health-related regulation or prohibition of cigarette advertising by any State or local authority; and banned all cigarette advertising on radio and television on or after January 1, 1971.

On March 10, 1970, the Senate passed the Conference Report (Rept. No. 91-897) on H.R. 6543, the Public Health Cigarette Smoking Act of 1969, with an amendment that would ban all cigarette advertisements on radio and television as of January 2, 1971,² and require a new warning on cigarette packages that would read: "Warning: the Surgeon General Has Determined that Cigarette Smoking Is Dangerous to Your Health." The health warning must be on cigarette packages six months after the President signs the bill. In addition, the bill would allow the Federal Trade Commission to require warnings on printed cigarette advertisements after July 1, 1971. The Conference Report was passed by the House on March 18, 1970. The bill was signed by the President on April 1, 1970 (Public Law 91-222).

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORPORATION

On January 29, 1969, the Senate Commerce Committee reported S. 17, an amendment to the Communications Satellite Act which modifies the provisions for election of the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corporation so as to reflect more accurately the relative holdings of stock by stockholders who are communications common carriers, and stockholders who are not communications common carriers (S. Rept. No. 91-6). The bill was requested by Comsat and was supported by the State Department and the FCC. The Senate passed the bill on January 31, 1969.

Hearings on H.R. 4214, a companion bill, were held by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on February 3, 1969 (H. Rept. No. 91-24). The House passed S. 17 on February 19, 1969, together with a Committee clarifying amendment. On February 19, 1969, the Senate passed S. 17, as amended by the House. The bill was signed by the President on March 12, 1969 (Public Law 91-3).

DOCUMENTARIES—DECEPTIVE PRACTICES

On March 20, 1969, the Special Subcommittee on Investigations of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce filed a 47-page Report entitled "Deceptive Programming Practices" (H. Rept. No. 91-108). The Report is subtitled "Staging of Marihuana Broadcast—Pot Party at a University".³

The Subcommittee on Investigations has also held a series of executive hearings in 1969 and 1970 on the events surrounding the preparation by CBS of a network news documentary on an attempted invasion in the Caribbean, and their implications on present law and policy.

EDUCATIONAL RADIO AND TELEVISION

On April 30 and May 1, 1969, the Senate Commerce Committee held hearings on S. 1242, a bill to amend the Communications

Act to extend for 5 years a program of grants for construction of educational television and radio broadcasting facilities and to authorize the appropriation of \$20 million in fiscal 1970 for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment on May 8, 1969 (S. Rept. No. 91-167), and was passed on May 13, 1969. The Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee held hearings on June 18 and 19, 1969. The Committee report (H. Rept. No. 91-466) recommended amendment of S. 1242 to provide for a three-year extension of the program for construction of public broadcasting facilities instead of the five-year extension provided for in the original bill and further recommended the appropriation of \$15 million for each of the three years. The House passed S. 1242, as amended, on October 9, 1969. The Senate approved the amended bill on May 14, 1969, whereupon it became Public Law 91-97 on October 17, 1969.

On April 1 and 2, 1970, the Senate Communications Subcommittee held hearings on S. 3558, the Public Broadcasting Financing Act of 1970, which would authorize annual appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting from fiscal 1971 through fiscal 1973 for "such sums as may be necessary". The bill would encourage private contributions where a portion of the federal funding of the Corporation is to be based on money from private sources. The bill was ordered favorably reported by the Commerce Committee on April 22, 1970 (S. Rept. No. 91-879). On May 19, 1970, the Senate passed S. 3558, as amended by the Committee.⁴

On April 14 and 15, 1970, the Communications and Power Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee held hearings on H.R. 16338, a bill identical to S. 3558. On April 27, 1970, the Subcommittee reconvened to consider whether improper outside influence was exerted on WETA-TV, a Washington, D.C. ETV station, to fire a newsman whose wife had been hired as a secretary to Attorney General John N. Mitchell's wife, Martha.

FAIRNESS DOCTRINE

On May 19, 1969, the Special Subcommittee on Investigations of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce filed a 159-page Report entitled "The Fairness Doctrine and Related Issues" (H. Rept. No. 91-257). The Report examined the FCC's policies on the presentation of controversial issues of public importance, broadcast defamation and the equal time provisions of Section 315 of the Communications Act.

GOVERNMENT AGENCY FOR UTILITY CONSUMERS

On February 17, 18, March 10-13, 17, 19-21 April 21, 22, 25, May 12-15, June 26, 27, 30 and July 9, 1969, the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Senate Government Operations Committee held hearings on S. 607, a proposal to establish an independent agency known as the United States Office of Utility Consumers' Counsel

⁴The Committee amendment contained the following provision: "In order to assure compliance with this section and with other provisions of this Act requiring fair treatment of matters in the public interest, the Commission shall prescribe such regulations as may be appropriate to require that broadcast stations which receive assistance under this title (1) keep records, including audio recordings, for a reasonable period of time of each program broadcast which involves an issue of public importance, and (2) furnish such records to the Commission at its request. The Commission shall make such records available to the public at the requesting party's cost under such circumstances and conditions as may be reasonable and appropriate."

which would represent the interests of the Federal Government and consumers before Federal and State regulatory agencies on matters pertaining to electric, gas, telephone, and telegraph utilities. The bill would also provide for grants and other Federal assistance to State and local governments for the establishment and operation of State and local utility consumers' counsels. No report has been issued to date.

HYDE CONTEMPT CITATION

On October 30, 1969, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce met in executive session and voted 20 to 13 to report and refer the refusal of Rosel Hyde, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, to grant access to records subpoenaed by the Special Subcommittee on Investigations together with all the facts in connection therewith to the House of Representatives with the recommendation that he be cited for contempt of the House of Representatives for his refusal to comply with a subpoena to the end that he may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law. The Subcommittee had requested and then subpoenaed confidential grant of a short-term renewal to WIFE AM-FM, Indianapolis.

INVESTIGATION OF NEWS REPORTING

The Special Subcommittee on Investigations of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce investigated the facts behind the television reporting of the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago. The results of their inquiry were presented in a staff report entitled "Television Coverage of the Democratic National Convention, Chicago, Illinois, 1968" (Committee Print).

JOINT BOARD ON SEPARATIONS

See Uniform Procedures on Separations.

LAND MOBILE ALLOCATIONS

On June 9, 10, 11 and July 25, 1969, the Subcommittee on Activities of Regulatory Agencies of the House Select Committee on Small Business held hearings on the allocation of radio frequency spectrum and its effect on small business. The focus of the hearings was on the additional need for spectrum created by new technology. Subsequently, on April 7, 1970, the Committee filed a Report entitled "The Allocation of Radio Frequency Spectrum and Its Impact on Small Business" (H. Rept. No. 91-982).

LICENSE RENEWAL PROCEDURES

On April 29, 1969, Senator Pastore introduced S. 2004, which would amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for the renewal of broadcast licenses. The bill would bar competing applicants for radio or television licenses unless the licensee had his license revoked by the FCC for failure to serve the public interest. The bill was co-sponsored by 25 Senators. In the House, 114 bills similar or identical to S. 2004 have been introduced. The Subcommittee on Communications of the Senate Committee on Commerce held hearings on August 5, 6 and 7, and December 1 through 5, 1969. No further action has been taken by the Subcommittee. Subsequently, on January 15, 1970, the FCC, by a vote of 6 to 1, adopted a "Policy Statement on Comparative Hearings Involving Regular Renewal Applicants". Both the Chairman and the senior Republican on the Senate Communications Subcommittee have indicated that they want to observe the effect of the new FCC policy on license renewals before determining whether or not to report legislation. No hearings have been scheduled by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEXICAN TREATY

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations held hearings on May 27, 1969, on the radio broadcasting agreements between the

²The cutoff date was changed from January 1 to January 2, 1971, to permit cigarette advertisements on the telecasts of football bowl games on New Year's day, 1971.

³On April 15, 19, May 9, 10, and June 17, 1968, the Subcommittee held hearings on "Pot Party at a University", a program broadcast by WBBM-TV, Chicago, on November 1, 2 and 3, 1967, as a special news report.

United States and Mexico concerning radio broadcasting in the standard broadcasting band (535-1605 kHz) and pre-sunrise and postsunset operation (Ex. B., 91st Cong., 1st Sess.). Both agreements were approved by the Senate on June 19, 1969.

MOTION PICTURE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

Senator McClellan has announced that the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights of the Senate Judiciary Committee will conduct hearings on film classification prior to the end of the Second Session. During the First Session, he sent a questionnaire to motion picture producers and the Motion Picture Association inquiring whether they contemplate offering for sale to television stations films which have been classified as unsuitable for viewing by minors. He also sent a questionnaire to the National Association of Broadcasters, the National Cable Television Association, the networks and commercial television stations inquiring whether they believe that the showing of such films on television would be consistent with their responsibility to act in the public interest.

NEWSPAPER PRESERVATION ACT

On January 30, 1970, the Senate passed S. 1520, the Newspaper Preservation Act, which would exempt local newspapers from the antitrust laws and permit them as separate entities to combine their mechanical and routine operations in the interests of enabling failing newspapers to remain in business (S. Rept. No. 91-535). The Senate, by a vote of 63 to 13, rejected an amendment submitted by Senator McIntyre, which would redefine the term "newspaper owner" to mean a person who owns or controls a single newspaper publication, but who does not own or control any other newspaper publication or any radio or television station, and is not a party in a joint venture in any such business activities.⁵ The bill now awaits action in the House, where the Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee favorably reported a similar measure (H.R. 279) on May 19, 1970.

OFFICE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY

On February 9, 1970, President Nixon submitted to Congress Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1970, which would establish an Office of Telecommunications Policy in the Office of the President (H. Doc. No. 91-222). The new Office would serve as the President's principal adviser on domestic and international telecommunications policy and would help formulate policies and coordinate operations for the federal government's communications system. The new office would not acquire any prerogatives or functions of the FCC, but would take over the functions of the Director of Telecommunications Management in the Office of Emergency Preparedness. The Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization of the House Committee on Government Operations held hearings on President Nixon's Reorganization Plan on March 9 and 10, 1970. The hearings also included consideration of a resolution of disapproval (H. Res. 841) introduced by Congressman Gallagher. On March 19, 1970, the Committee issued a report rejecting H. Res. 841 (H. Rept. No. 91-930). Under 5 U.S.C. § 906, Reorganization Plan No. 1 became effective on April 20, 1970, since neither

⁵ On January 19, 1970, Senator McIntyre introduced S. 3305, the Independent Media Preservation Act, a bill to alleviate the trend toward concentration in the newspaper and broadcast media in the United States by prohibiting the ownership by a daily newspaper station located in the same standard metropolitan statistical area in which the paper is published. The bill has been referred to the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary and is still awaiting action.

the Senate nor the House voted to disapprove the Plan within 60 days after its submission to the Congress.⁶

PAY TV

Twenty-two bills were introduced in the House during the First Session which would prohibit the FCC from authorizing pay television operations. The Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee held hearings on this legislation on November 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, and December 9, 10, 11, and 12, 1969.

On April 29, 1970, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, by a vote of 15 to 13, reported favorably to the House H.R. 16418, amended, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 so as to provide for the regulation of subscription television broadcasting in the public interest (H. Rept. No. 91-1110). Under H.R. 16418, as amended by the Committee, subscription television authorizations would be limited to communities having at least four conventional commercial television stations. STV stations would be prohibited from carrying commercial advertisements and would be required to broadcast at least 8 hours a day. The bill also provides that not more than 45% of total STV programming for any day, and not more than 60% in the period from 7 p.m. to 11 p.m., may consist of feature films and sports events.

PHONOGRAPH RECORD PAYMENTS

Section 114 of S. 543, the Copyright Revision Bill, would require broadcasting stations to make an additional payment of 2% of their gross income to be divided between record manufacturers and recording artists. This would be in addition to the stations' payments to ASCAP, BMI, and SESAC. As noted in the CATV section, *supra*, on December 10, 1969, the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights of the Senate Judiciary Committee reported, without recommendations, S. 543, to the full Judiciary Committee.

QUESTIONING OF FCC COMMISSIONERS

See Yearly Review.

REDUCED POLITICAL RATES

The Senate Subcommittee on Communications held hearings on October 21, 22, and 23, 1969 on S. 2876, the Campaign Broadcast Reform Act, a bill to amend the Communications Act to provide candidates for Congressional offices opportunities to purchase broadcast time from television stations at reduced rates (S. Rept. No. 91-751). On March 25, 1970, the Senate Commerce Committee reported S. 3637, a bill which removed the "equal time" provisions of Section 315 for Presidential elections and lowered the maximum amount broadcasters could charge political candidates to the station's lowest charge for the same amount of time in the same time period. On April 14, 1970, the Senate, by a vote of 58 to 27, passed S. 3637 after adopting amendments requiring broadcast stations to maintain records of station unit charges and establishing a formula to govern the maximum amount which may be expended on electronic media in behalf of Presidential, Vice-Presidential, and Congressional candidates in general elections.

On June 2, 1970, the Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will hold hearings on H.R. 13721 and identical bills and S. 2876.

SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS

The Subcommittee on Space Sciences and Applications of the House Science and Astro-

⁶ As of May 31, 1970, the President had not submitted to the Senate nominations for the offices of Director and Deputy Director of the Office of Telecommunications Policy.

nomics Committee held hearings on December 16, 17, 18, and 19, 1969, on the assessment of space communications technology and the applications of satellites to domestic U.S. communication. Comsat and AT&T were the principal witnesses. On March 3, 1970, the House Committee on Science and Astronautics filed a Report entitled "Assessment of Space Communications Technology" (H. Rept. 91-859).

The Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs held hearings on May 13, 14, 15, and 22, 1969 and April 23, 28, and 30, 1970, on international issues in satellite communications. In addition to the testimony of the witnesses who appeared before the Subcommittee, the hearings contain a report entitled "Analysis and Findings", written statements submitted by experts at the Subcommittee's request, copies of pertinent documents on space broadcasting, and a bibliography compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

"TRAFFICKING"

On May 19, 1969, the Special Subcommittee on Investigations of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee filed a Report (H. Rept. 91-256) entitled "Trafficking in Broadcast Station Licenses and Construction Permits".⁷ Subsequently, on June 30, 1969, Congressman Staggers, Chairman of the Committee, introduced H.R. 13257 which would permit the transfer of station licenses or construction permits only after the FCC made additional findings and held additional proceedings before approving the transfer.

TV RADIATION

The Public Health and Welfare Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee held hearings on television radiation hazards of electronic products on May 23, 1969. Testimony was received concerning the administration of the Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-602).

UNIFORM PROCEDURES ON SEPARATIONS

On December 9, 1969, the Senate Commerce Committee held hearings on S. 1917, a bill to amend the Communications Act to establish a Federal-State Joint Board to prescribe uniform procedures for determining what part of the property and expenses of communications common carriers shall be considered as used in interstate and intrastate telephone service. On February 24 and 25, 1970, the Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee held hearings on H.R. 12150, a companion bill introduced by Representative Rooney. Neither Committee has acted on this legislation because of the efforts of the FCC to create a Federal-State Joint Board on separations with the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC). On May 6, 1970, the Commission, acting pursuant to the provisions of Section 410 of the Communications Act, convened a Joint Board to preside over a rulemaking proceeding on jurisdictional separations procedures. The Joint Board will be composed of the Commission's three-member Telephone Committee and four state commissioners nominated by NARUC and approved by the FCC.

VIOLENCE ON TELEVISION

Twelve joint resolutions sponsored by seventy-four Congressmen were introduced

⁷ The Special Subcommittee conducted hearings on the D. H. Overmyer acquisition and transfer of five UHF television station construction permits on December 15, 1967, July 16, 17, 19, 31 and August 1, 1968. The above Report was subtitled "Acquisition and Transfer of Five Overmyer Television Construction Permits."

in January and February 1969 to direct the FCC to conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the effects of the display of violence in television programs. All resolutions were referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and await action.

On March 12, 19, and 20, 1969, the Subcommittee on Communications of the Senate Commerce Committee held a hearing on the effect which television programs with crime and violence have on young people and the Surgeon General's study on this problem. At the hearings, Surgeon General William H. Stewart announced that the National Institute of Mental Health would sponsor a year-long, \$1 million study on the effects of televised violence. On December 30, 1969, the Surgeon General submitted to the Senate Commerce Committee an interim progress report on the study.

In March 1969, the Senate Commerce Committee released a staff report entitled "Analysis of the Character of Violence in Literature and Violence as Expressed through Television". The report was prepared for the Subcommittee on Communications by the Library of Congress.

WELLS AND BURCH NOMINATIONS

The Senate Committee on Commerce held hearings on October 15 and 27, 1969, on the nominations of Dean Burch and Robert Wells to be members of the Federal Communications Commission. The Senate confirmed the nominations on October 30, 1969.

X-RATED FILMS

See Motion Picture Classification System. YEARLY REVIEW OF FCC ACTIVITIES

On March 4 and 5, 1969, the Subcommittee on Communications of the Senate Committee on Commerce held hearings for the purpose of receiving a progress report on the activities of the Federal Communications Commission during the past year. On March 6, 1969, a review of activities of the Federal Communications Commission during 1969 was also the subject of hearings by the Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Chairman Hyde and several other Commissioners appeared before both Committees and reported on the activities and problems of the FCC during the past year.

PENDLETON FARMERS' SOCIETY

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Pendleton Farmers' Society is the oldest agricultural society in America. John C. Calhoun once belonged to this society. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I noticed an article which first appeared in the February 16, 1927, *Summerville, S.C., Journal* which will be of interest to many agriculturalists and historians throughout the South. This article is as follows:

PENDLETON FARMERS' SOCIETY

Pendleton, February 16—America's oldest farmer's organization, the Pendleton Farmers' society, held its 112th annual meeting here last week, electing officers, thirty new members, two honorary members and voting to turn over several historical books, 200 years old, to the library of Clemson College.

The two honorary members elected were Wilton E. Hall, editor *Anderson Independent*, and Hubert F. Lee, *Columbia newspaperman*.

Officers elected were Rev. W. H. Mills, of

Clemson College, president; James Hunter, Pendleton, vice-president; J. J. Sitton, Pendleton, secretary and treasurer while Professor W. H. Barre, of Clemson College, was elected to succeed Col. J. C. Stribling as corresponding secretary.

Colonel Stribling, famed for action with his company of "Red Shirts", the first to wear that color during the troublesome days of '76 has been instrumental in keeping the Farmer's Society intensively active and has served as its president.

SPEECH TO THE TEXAS BREAKFAST CLUB BY RANDY PENDLETON

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, a group of Texans gathers for breakfast in the Rayburn Building on alternating Thursdays, and at the most recent meeting we were privileged to have as our guest speaker, Hon. Randy Pendleton, director of State-Federal relations for Gov. Preston Smith.

Since Randy Pendleton accosted the problems of politics in such a light-hearted vein, and since many of our colleagues are notoriously in need of some new jokes, I thought they might enjoy reading these remarks, which I include at this point in the RECORD:

SPEECH BY RANDY PENDLETON

First, I want to dispel the rumors that this inflated \$2.25 price includes a \$2 breakfast and a two-bit speaker. This speech is worth every penny I'm being paid for it. I also want to thank you Hutch for that well prepared, well presented and well deserved introduction. Seldom, (if ever), have I heard anything that I enjoyed more or agreed with so completely.

You know, introductions are always interesting—I recall one gentleman who used that old phrase "The next speaker needs no introduction—he went on to add "even if I told you all there is to know about him—you still wouldn't remember him".

Even at that its better than the M.C. of a political rally who decided to liven things up by allowing the opponents to introduce each other. As a matter of fact, the first introduction took twenty of the thirty minutes allotted for his opponent's speech. He evidently knew too much about his opponent—what a crook he was, how loose his morals were, what a long line of horse thieves he came from—as a matter of fact he told everything! After the introduction his opponent arose and said, "I don't know that I can add anything about myself that my opponent hasn't talked about except my nationality—I am a Phillistine and I've just been slain by the jaw-bone of an ass!

I first began preparing my speech to tell you what I, as Director of State-Federal Relations do in Washington. We operate from crisis to crisis—the important matters ranging from who manufactures the pickled okra served at a San Antonio convention to oil imports, to natural disasters. My duties are so diverse they are difficult to relate. I sometimes feel I am the most underpaid legal researcher in Washington and at other times I feel like the most overpaid errand boy. Nevertheless, I want to say at the outset that the assistance, guidance and cooperation I have received from our Texas delegation has made the past eleven months a great experience.

Having exhausted the first topic I then thought I'd tell you about what I know

about our Federal Government and its operation, but then I was at a loss as to how we could kill the next twenty-five of my thirty minutes.

So I finally decided to tell you something that I know a *great deal about* and which requires *no expertise—Texas politics!*

I could talk the rest of the day about the brilliant and unsurpassed record I made during my eight years in public office. I like to speak on this subject wherever there is the slightest interest in it, and frankly you have shown the slightest interest of any group I ever appeared before. Like the first Texas political casualty of Medicare, I left the political arena because of "illness and fatigue"—the voters were "sick and tired of me."

I actually retired a winner—as a matter of fact I was the only man from the 73rd Legislative District to ever run unopposed for three consecutive terms. I wasn't much, but I was all they had. Recently my dad was asked, "Has Randy's being in politics had any real value?" Dad replied, "Yes, it cured his mother from bragging about him".

I remember what a sage old member told me when I first went to the Texas House, "The first six weeks you will walk around in amazed wonderment asking yourself what in hell you are doing here—then you'll spend the rest of your time wondering what the hell ole so-and-so is doing here."

I have heard some voice a concern that we are producing few statesmen and I think I have found the reason why. We put them in debt running for office in ridiculously expensive campaigns; run them to death going to unimportant, ill-planned meetings and ceremonial affairs; keep them in debt with extra travel, office expenses and expected increased living standards; make a messenger boy of them by non-duty related demands; pay them poorly and furnish them with inadequate help; give them no time to meditate, plan, create or actually administer the affairs of office. We then destroy their effectiveness as well as their reputation by subjecting them to vulgar, irresponsible and vicious campaigns; and are too willing to believe slander, libel and unjustified criticism of them after they take office.

Frankly, Texas and Texans have been getting a lot better public officials and government that we deserve.

I hope the *luck holds* or that someday soon the people will decide to stop playing games and will resolve to start thinking and investigating and will clean-up a hodge-podge of archaic statutes and constitutional restrictions and demand that our Oulja board selection system will be supplanted by a dignified and in-depth discussion of the real issues confronting our State; and accord to those in public office, the respect due what should be a worthy profession and a noble calling. I remember two of my mother's friends told me they didn't vote for me. Disappointed I asked why. They responded that I was a fine young man and they didn't want me ruined by service in the Texas Legislature. They weren't joking like the fellow at the drug store who said he would vote for the Devil before he'd support me. I responded by asking for his support in the event his friend declined to run. Really don't think his first preference could have afforded the campaign anyway.

However, I was lucky—I ran four times and spent less than \$2500 (the last three were unopposed). The election came and went and the people of Texas so universally recognized ability and merit that I was accused of stealing votes.

Luckily, I didn't have to raise money because nobody wants to gamble on a twenty-four year old who hadn't proven himself. It should be noted for the record, that there are a large number of sincere, public-spirited citizens in Texas who understand campaign costs and related expenses and who donate money because they want to keep good men

in office in order that Texas might continue to have responsible government.

Unfortunately, there aren't enough to go around and with campaign and other expenses skyrocketing, it becomes more and more of a problem. Will Rogers once said, "Politics has got so expensive that it takes lots of money to even get beat with". He should be around today!

A man's conduct, background and moral scruples seem to be of little value in a campaign. I remember asking a gentleman for his support and with the vildest of language he told me he wouldn't vote for me if I were St. Peter. That was obvious—if I were St. Peter there was no way he could have lived in my district.

In governing the conduct of men and women in office, there is a point at which the law stops and the public official proceeds on moral conscience. That area of conduct too, should have some written standards or guides embodied in a practical but strict code of ethics.

I am sure that you would say an official should accept nothing from those who have matters pending in his office, but what about those who have no pending matters or none anticipated? There are many in the latter category in Texas. What about the appreciation dinners that are now being sponsored, coupled with widespread solicitation for high-priced tickets to help raise campaign and related expense money? Are they proper vehicles to pay a deficit; if so, should the deficit include unusual living or office expenses?

Busy people require relaxation. Is it proper for a public official to accept a deer hunting, football game or fishing trip from an individual or corporation? Should a public official accept an honorarium for making a speech? Would the nature of the organization affect your answers?

To what extent should an office holder assist constituents and where does it become undue influence peddling by him or his staff? I leave these questions for you to answer because your elected officials face them daily.

Let me say that most public officials I have known have been dedicated, honest, sincere and hardworking men and women. In fact, many of them could be making much more money in business and could at the same time have a more pleasant life. Public officials work under more pressure than a deep sea diver—take more criticism than a poor man with an ambitious mother-in-law—suffer greater temptations than a shoplifter in Fort Knox—and are expected to be everywhere at once—with his eyes like a chaperone at a prom on a warm spring night.

A public official must have the eyes of an Indian Scout so he can follow the trail of public opinion—avoid being ambushed along the way—and cover his tracks from the voters.

It helps for the public official to have a good appetite so he can eat crow, with humble pie for dessert—a big mouth is an occupational necessity so he won't be too uncomfortable when he puts his foot in it!

Sometimes a good public official must be a busybody and at other times he must be like a stubborn mule—having a strong will and stronger *won't*. Now and then it means getting mad and very often standing alone in the belief that you are right and the crowd is wrong. It means being a wet blanket and sacrificing your popularity on the altar of self-respect.

It isn't easy to be a good public official and a real leader when every issue has two sides with good people—and perhaps campaign contributors—standing on both of them. It even gets tougher at election time when there are two sides to every office—*inside and outside*.

A good public official must be as lively as a cheerleader so he can be up in the air one

minute and flat on his face the next, and still have the voters roaring for him.

He has to be a contortionist too, so he can keep his ear to the ground, his finger on the pulse, his shoulder to the wheel, his nose to the grindstone, and straddle the fence all at the same time.

When an individual makes a commitment to public service, he should be reconciled to the fact that he and his whole family must live in an open-doored glass house with the windows clean and the curtains open. He has to be adept at dodging rocks and it takes only a short time until he questions whether it is a glass house or a dog house.

The hardest thing for me to get used to was unjust criticism—and I'm still not used to it. I don't mean differences of opinion, criticism of the way a public official votes, runs his office or what he says—these are and should be fair game.

I mean the "loose talk", rumors and outright lies about public officials and the all too prevalent belief that a person turns crook the minute he enters public office. I realize the truth in Harry Truman's statement, "If you can't stand the heat, stay out of the kitchen", but a fellow just passing through shouldn't get scorched. Holding public office is hard on the families too. The wife has to learn early that every morning she has to keep her temper and be content to stare at the Want Ads on the back of the political section until her husband reads what everybody says about him. How is it possible for wives to understand politics when they have to depend almost entirely on their husbands for their political education? Fran has learned something since coming to Washington. She proudly explained, "If a conservative doesn't understand something he opposes it, whereas a liberal supports it". Too bad we can't simplify things to where someone could understand.

I know at this point you don't understand why I chose this topic.

I chose it for three reasons:

- (1) all of you are interested in Texas
- (2) all of you are interested in politics
- (3) all of you have experienced some of the things I have talked about—or will if you stay around the political arena

My speech teacher in college told us if we couldn't be informative in public speaking, be kind enough to select a subject you have in common with your audience.

Texas Politics—I've planned to write a book but my publisher looked at my material and suggested we keep it a secret. Rumors are part of the stock and trade as well as a trial and tribulation of office holding. Who's going to run for what? Did you know that so-and-so was out to get whatcha call him?

Therefore, as all good speakers say in closing—I'll leave you with two thoughts. For those of you *not* holding public office, you have to be careful in Washington not to get to believing your own rumors. For those of you holding public office, I ask you to remember, a statesman makes the occasion, but the occasion makes the politician.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I have, on occasion, submitted for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the work of Colorado's poet laureate, Milford E. Shields. Mr. Shields has written a poem in recognition of the 25th anniversary of

the United Nations and I include it in the RECORD:

OUR MARCH OF HEARTS

The minds of men march on in conclave here,
The words of science cadencing the tune;
They weigh the masses moving high and clear,
They count the strata of the modest moon.

They know there is a rhythm still to find,
For there is tension in the static air;
There is an essence that is unconfined,
Companionate to science and as fair.

A quality completes the lives of men
In which their tauting tensions find release;
The history of life defines again
The longing, searching excellence of peace.

The hearts of men must move in cadence sweet,

They must mark love upon ascending scroll;
Our marching hearts must make this world complete—

Lord God of Love, make Thou our nations whole.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce for the consideration of my colleagues the commencement address given by Daniel Patrick Moynihan at Fordham University. His concern centers on the necessity for everyone to be reminded of the need for truthful discussion of issues and intellectual tolerance. Mr. Moynihan is to be commended for making these points very clear.

We all know of Mr. Moynihan's authoritative and respected works in the field of social science. His understanding of the complexities of society deserve recognition. Mr. Moynihan's attempts to offer insight into society and subsequent channels for solutions to our problems are meritorious. Since his concern is exemplified by his desire to understand the direction of society and offer suggestions to make America a healthier country, we must attend his remarks and value his insight.

The address follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN

Some years ago the Al Smith Dinner, which the New York Archdiocese gives in support of its hospital program, took place on an occasion that Cardinal Spellman's presence was required in Rome. Father Gannon substituted as host and upon rising confronted at the outset what had to be the disappointment of the bespangled, affluent assembly gathered at the Waldorf for the annual ritual. "I can imagine how you feel," said he. "Here you've paid a hundred dollars apiece to see a bird of paradise, and what do you get but an old black crow in a protestant suit."

You might well be thinking similar thoughts of your commencement speaker. Not exactly what you paid for. But I would ask that you consider my plight. For years I was thought too radical to be invited to Fordham. Of a sudden I am not radical enough to be assured a welcome. Life, as President Kennedy used to say, is not fair.

But there is something to be learned from everything, and I would like to set this subject of differing perceptions of a single reality as the subject of my address.

A quite striking instance of this phenomenon, or so it seems to me, occurred early in the life of the present administration. Secretary Rogers arrived at the Department of State to find that part of his daily routine was an early morning briefing by a young Foreign Service Officer on world events of the preceding twenty-four hours. Day after day went by, and while the principal topics of the briefing occasionally changed, the central message was singular and sustained. Everywhere, everything was going wrong. Always, the United States was to blame. One morning the Secretary's cheerful nature rebelled, "Don't you," he asked, "have any good news?" The young Foreign Service Officer paused, shuffled through his papers, and then in a flat voice replied, "Well, Mr. Secretary, there is an item here that the Aswan Dam is leaking."

Anyone who has been much involved with government or public affairs in, say, the last decade is likely, I believe, to have pondered this phenomenon. It is not just a matter of one man's gain being another's loss. That is the least of it. Rather it has to do with a gestalt of politics in which the summation of the same set of events for one individual or group produces a wholly different result than that for another. It is the clash of perception just as often as the clash of interest that shapes the politics of a society such as ours. It is a subject worthy of greater attention.

There has not, I think, been a time in recent history in which this phenomenon has been more in evidence. It is, I further believe, an essential clue to the nature of the American crisis.

That there is such a crisis no one need doubt. But it is not, as some seem to believe, and others behave as if they believed, an instantaneous crisis, the work of a very few men, and a very few events. It is rather a condition that has built up over some years of the past, and which we must not expect to recede, if indeed it is to recede at all, for some years to come.

Those who seek to anticipate movements in the politics and culture of a society such as ours are exposed to the perverse danger that when, on occasion, one is right, the events anticipated arrive with something less than the impact of reality. I would imagine this to be the experience of those—I was not among them—who early perceived what would be the inevitable course of military involvement in Southeast Asia. One recalls Benjamin V. Cohen refer, in 1962, to Vietnam as the "Top Secret War" or Richard Goodwin leaving Washington in 1965 with a terrible certainty as to what would happen. One wonders if there has not been, for them, an almost *deja vu* quality to the reality as inexorably it has come to pass.

I can attest to something of this sense with respect to the matter of youthful protest. In the spring of 1967, I gave the Phi Beta Kappa oration at Harvard University. I began with a simple assertion, "One of the defining qualities of the period of current history that began, roughly, with the assassination of President Kennedy has been the emergence of widespread, radical protest on the part of American youth." The generation was already marked "by the belief that its government is capable of performing abhorrent deeds." A central problem, as I saw it, was trust. Trust was eroding, I cited Richard Rovere on the state of Washington, a capital he described as "awash with lies and deceptions."

In a series of commencement addresses in 1968 I returned to the theme, this time with greater conviction. I had just returned from California where I had campaigned for Robert F. Kennedy. I had been shaken—I

believe that is a fair word—by the intense distrust even of Kennedy that one countered among students. A year ago at Notre Dame, I said it all over again, adding only that our institutions were beginning to be changed by the fear and anxiety around us. Academic freedom had diminished on our campuses, and would diminish further, the result not of external but rather internal forces oppressing dissident opinion in the name of an increasingly virulent ideology that combined the comforts of orthodoxy with the exhilaration of seeming dissent.

Now it is 1970, and things are even worse than I, certainly, ever expected. Still, having expected them to be bad enough, the reality does have a certain disembody quality. This makes for insufficient passion, perhaps, but possibly also for a measure of detachment in seeking to understand what went wrong, and in trying to analyze what might make things, if not right, at least better.

What went wrong, what is going wrong, is that the fund of public trust has been grievously depleted. It is a good rule of social science that the most important thing to know about a man is the things he takes for granted. This is true of society as well. The most important thing about our society over the generations is that citizens have more or less routinely taken for granted that the appearance of things could be trusted, that their principal institutions, and the men who embody them, were truthful.

Once that presumption erodes, or disappears, all things are changed, "Changed utterly," as Yeats wrote. I don't think we have reached quite that point in America, but I think we are near enough to it to warrant a cry of genuine alarm and a plea for a greater recognition of what is going on.

The matter may be put simply. For a long period the distrustful responses of youth, and of others of course, to national events and the seeming course of national policy was essentially rational. Much begins, more than we yet know, with the assassination of President Kennedy. A whole generation was marked—and in ways deformed—by the crashing recognition that the world was not a safe or pleasant place at all, that the world was blind, destructive, unheeding.

Then came the war. The same generation learned that things need not be what they seem if they are coming out of Washington. And so outrage and distrust mounted.

But in retrospect, it would appear that from the outset the outward, and in ways aggressive emotions and actions elicited by the war have been mixed with a measure of genuine, if often suppressed, fear. The unavoidable impression of events of the past several months is that this fear has come to be a pervasive emotion among great elements of educated, or educating, youth. If it sometimes expresses itself as plain fury, the true emotion is surely more involved. There are doubtless many and complex sources of this state, but at bottom it derives from and manifests itself as a growing distrust of all social institutions.

The precise danger is that this response is increasingly nonrational—even irrational. Increasingly it is not anything government does, or anything that actually happens, that triggers responses of rage and anxiety, rather it is imagined events that do. Less and less is organized society seen as a disaster. More and more it is seen as a conspiracy.

How could this have come to pass? Easy enough. Attend the work of Erving Goffman. For some time now, in his careful, quiet, undemanding way, he has been telling us that the foundations of rationality are far less secure than we have supposed. The irrational is not opposite to the rational, it is rather tangential. A very slight tilt of perception can turn a seemingly orderly and benevolent environment into a nightmare fantasy of peril and threat.

This condition is epidemic on American

campuses at this moment. It commands our concern. I do not know, at this moment do not care, who is responsible for bringing it about. Blame is precisely what is not at issue. What is at issue is the question of how we are to respond to the fact that a great many young persons at this moment in our history, persons to whom so much has seemingly been given, have been somehow denied the one essential a society must give to youth, which is to say trust in that society. (If you are a revolutionary, you will not think that. But I am not a revolutionary.)

I would offer an example, of no greater or lesser consequence than a dozen others that could be cited, but one for which there is rather more documentation. I refer to the belief, now rampant on American campuses, that the administration, using radical student protest as a pretext, is planning to cancel the 1972 elections.

This is not a paranoid fantasy of a few unbalanced extremists. It is rather a proposition seriously believed, or at least seriously entertained, by educated persons all across the land. To my knowledge, it was raised by a delegation of Harvard Law School students in a meeting with administration officials. More recently, a group of young White House staff men, returning from visits to campuses across the land, reported having encountered the belief, or at least rumor, in every college or university they'd been to.

The etiology of the rumor is mildly interesting, but what is important is the degree to which it illustrates Goffman's principles, and by extension, the very great difficulty we must expect in the effort to restore confidence and trust.

The story began this spring with an item in the Washington News Scope, a feature distributed by the Newhouse National News Service. On April 5th, this appeared in the Staten Island Advance as a four-paragraph story. The wire service had reported, "The White House is ordering up several hush-hush security studies and one of them is reported to address the question: What would happen if there is no Presidential election in 1972?" The President's Advisors were said to be concerned with "the chances of radical elements disrupting governmental operations including the national elections." The Rand Corporation had "apparently" undertaken the study.

Now this is not so. Or at least I think it is not so. And this is the point.

Without exception, everyone in a position to know denies that there is any truth whatever in this proposition. The President of the Rand Corporation, a distinguished economist who went to Washington with President Kennedy, flatly denies it. "The Rand Corporation," he writes, "has not undertaken such a study; it does not contemplate making such a study; nor has it been approached by anyone with a proposal for such a study." Equivalent statements have been forthcoming from others in similar positions.

Reassuring? Not at all. *Not if you consider the possibility that Henry Rowen may be lying.* And the more you think about it—if you once begin thinking this way—the more grounds there are for doing so. After all, if Rand was doing the study, it would be essential that it deny doing it, wouldn't it? Does it not then follow that the denial is *evidence* that the study is going on?

It is possible to think this way. People do.

The story spread. A reporter on the Village Voice picked it up from "a man whose girl friend had heard about it from a Staten Island cab driver." He called Washington and got hold of the reporter who had filed the story. The Newhouse reporter stuck to it, adding that "the wife of a Rand Corporation executive had been overheard talking about such a study." The Village Voice reporter then called the White House, where an assistant press secretary allowed that he

had received some queries on the subject, but had checked it "and I haven't found anything to this story at all." The follow-up story nonetheless appeared April 16, with two critical paragraphs. Reporting his conversation with the press secretary, the Village Voice article reported:

I asked him whether, if the report actually existed, and was highly secret, he would have to issue a denial anyway. He told me that "If the report were secret the Rand Corporation would have called me and said 'we are doing this thing and this is how we're brushing off inquiries' so that we could get our stories straight, but Rand called and said they had been getting calls they didn't know anything about it."

I decided it would be futile to ask him whether, assuming the report did exist and the Rand Corporation did call him and say "this is how we're brushing off inquiries," he would then tell me. "Yes, the Rand Corporation called me to tell me it exists and this is how we're brushing off inquiries." Too metaphysical.

The story concluded that we won't know whether the November 1972 elections will be cancelled—until November 1972.

And that, alas, is true. It is by definition true. We will not know whether the sun will rise tomorrow morning, until tomorrow morning. But the implication of the article was that something is going on, and as the story spread to the more politically radical press, all doubts on that score disappeared. By late May the rumor hardened—barely six weeks having passed—and the belief was to be encountered on just about every campus in the nation. The Rand Corporation has done its best to knock it down, but the odds are simply against doing so in the present climate. One quite respectable West Coast newspaper, having run the original story, carried a retraction which began, "The Rand Corporation has denied any connection with a study reportedly being made for the White House on possible disruption of the 1972 elections." Oh? Perhaps then it's not Rand that is doing the study. The Hudson Institute? Who?

This is the situation that confronts us. The erosion of trust in the nation has reached the point that the most confirming, cleansing events are the ones most feared, most misinterpreted, precisely because if they were other than they appear they would be so dangerous. A respectable, responsible man denies he is doing something, and that is taken as evidence that he is. For how better to conceal such an activity than to entrust it to a person with a reputation for concealing nothing?

I do not know what we are to do about this, but I think it well that everyone understand that this is where things have got to. For all the seeming aggression, there is a mood of fear and helplessness abroad that we simply must respond to, as individuals and as a society. Much of it results, surely, from the nature of electronic communications, a genuine discontinuity in human experience. David Riesman has recently remarked that, "It is possible that our instantaneous knowledge in the absence of instantaneous remedy increases our sense of helplessness." Certainly it confirms it. But widespread distrust of society is not a modern phenomenon; it is a recurrent one; and it has ever been a harbinger of bad times, indeed.

At least we can try to understand what is happening. From the student's point of view there is, as it were, evidence that a study is being made. (And evidence also for a dozen dozen not less grotesque fantasies.) After all, hasn't Harry Rowen denied it? It would then seem to be incumbent on all persons whose actions are watched for such signals to behave with a maximum sensitivity to such responses. (For example, as a young man in the White House put it to me recently, surely

the argument could have been made that anyone who is orderly enough to think of such a study would be much too careful to contract it out.) And there is at least one other possibility. The desire to listen to youth, who have much that is true to say, has perhaps inhibited older persons in offering other truths in exchange. Of these, the transcendent one is that to think of the world in paranoid terms is a form of work avoidance. That the idea of conspiracy is a vulgar idea. That submission to nameless fears is a form of concession to those anything but nameless elements who wish very little good for this society and who are capable of doing it endless, even permanent, damage.

If this society is to be made whole again, we need a period of sustained, systematic truth telling. But these, too, are among the truths that need to be told.

CONGRESSMAN GLENN
CUNNINGHAM

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, station KETV, the ABC affiliate in the Omaha-Council Bluffs and Lincoln television area, carries as its motto "Responsible Broadcasting."

In the station's editorial on June 17, 1970, it could not have produced a more responsible and effective piece of newscasting than its tribute to the past and present dedicated service of a great American and neighbor of mine, the distinguished colleague and gentleman from Nebraska, Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM.

GLENN has ably and effectively labored for his State and the Nation for the past 14 years during his service in the House of Representatives. It has been my distinct honor, pleasure, and privilege to have his wise counsel and guidance for the past 10 of those years he has spent in Washington.

So that my other colleagues in Congress might know of this fine tribute to GLENN, I am including this editorial with my remarks:

CONGRESSMAN GLENN CUNNINGHAM

A big part of Nebraska's history is going to pass us by soon . . . and it shouldn't leave us without giving more than a footnote of thought to it. Congressman Glenn Cunningham is leaving his post of serving Nebraska in Washington at the end of this year. Congressman Cunningham has served as Second District Representative longer than any other person in history in that post. His years of service have not been spotlighted with oratory aimed at getting headlines. He has been described as a work horse . . . and not a show horse.

During this past campaign he was called back to Washington to work on the Postal Reform Bill. He was badly needed during that crucial time of postal strikes because of his long seniority on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee . . . and his efforts may have a great effect on the future of the Post Office and its service to the people. His work against smut peddlers will lead to a decent future for America's children . . . and adults. Through the years, many opponents have called Cunningham a do-nothing Congressman . . . but his record would prove them wrong. He has introduced many bills to stop flooding in Nebraska, for con-

servations . . . on drugs . . . crime . . . social security . . . higher education . . . on draft dodgers and persons who desecrate the American Flag . . . to help Indians . . . education . . . protect consumers . . . and on and on.

Although in the last election, there was campaign oratory criticizing the fact that Cunningham has been in office too long, hopefully Nebraskans will be able to find another such person who would devote fourteen years to the people . . . instead of using the job for a stepping stone to higher aspirations . . . or a showcase for self interests.

NATICK TOWN TREASURER
RETIRING

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I regret that a highly esteemed resident of the 10th Congressional District of Massachusetts, which I serve, Richard Potter, has announced his intention to retire as town treasurer of Natick, Mass. His retirement is some time off, but the Natick Bulletin has paid him a well-deserved editorial tribute which I am inserting in the RECORD. He has been an outstanding public official, and I think the editorial clearly indicates his dedication and contributions to his community.

Natick will, of course, miss Dick Potter's services. I think he has set an example which other town officials might seek to emulate. I want to wish him continued success as his term expires, and for his retirement. The text of the editorial follows:

TOWN TREASURER TO RETIRE

This week Town Treasurer Richard Potter announced that he would retire from his municipal post at the conclusion of his term next March.

Few men in the Commonwealth are as knowledgeable about municipal fiscal details as the Natick Treasurer and few have experienced the enormous changes that have come to a growing community over the past sixteen years.

In 1954, when he succeeded the late Walter Leavitt, it was the practice to "post" approximately 20,000 checks annually by hand. Today more than 80,000 checks are issued from the local treasurer's office each year.

In talking about his retirement Treasurer Potter said, "I wanted to announce it in sufficient time so that the Finance Committee or the Selectmen could propose legislation to the voters if they wanted to combine certain offices as recommended by the government study report." He also suggested that the work is becoming more time-consuming so that it is necessary to devote several hours on Sundays, Saturdays and in the evenings.

Few men have been more civic-minded than the Treasurer. During the past thirty-five years he has served several terms on the school committee, has been chairman or a member of six or seven building committees and has seldom missed a town meeting. When he was initially elected the treasurer's salary was \$1800 as compared with \$4100 today. Four years ago State statute made all municipal treasurers the fiscal officer of the Town's retirement system. His initial income from this source was \$750 and today it is \$1500.

"Dick" invariably topped the ballot on election day and this is an indication of the esteem in which he has been held by his fellow townspeople.

**STRATEGIC ARMS LIMITATION
TALKS**

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the urgent importance of achieving success in the current SALT negotiations now being conducted in Vienna with the Soviet Union was recently highlighted in an excellent editorial appearing in the Los Angeles Times on Sunday, June 14.

After outlining the tremendous economic cost and increasing military danger posed by the spiraling world arms race, the Times' editorial writer concludes, "it is in the interest of both countries to make the SALT negotiations succeed. We and the Russians should have better things to do with our money than to pour it into an arms race that, in the long run, will produce less rather than more security for us all."

The editorial follows:

RUSSIA MAY FORCE OUR HAND

Defense Secretary Melvin Laird told a NATO meeting in Venice a few days ago that the United States has just 18 months in which to decide what to do about the increasingly ominous buildup in nuclear striking power by the Soviet Union.

The Nixon Administration, he said, will be basically marking time in 1971, postponing decisions on new weapons systems to give the strategic arms limitations talk a chance.

But if the Soviet buildup continues, Laird indicated that the United States in 1972 will have to take the necessary steps to preserve our side of the nuclear balance.

One hopes that his words will have a salutary effect on the arms control talks—the so-called SALT negotiations—which are currently under way between U.S. and Soviet representatives in Vienna.

Laird's warning also deserves attention in this country, where there has been a widespread reluctance to face up to the fact and the implications of growing Russian military power.

Thanks in part to the cost of our Vietnam involvement, the United States has been pretty much holding down our side of the nuclear arms race since 1965. The Soviets have not.

Five years ago, we had five times as many land-based ICBMs as the Russians. Today, they have substantially more than we do.

Five years ago, the Soviets had no Polaris-type submarine fleet worthy of the name. Today, Russian missile-firing subs are on station in the Atlantic, and the latest estimate is that they will pass us up in this field by 1975.

To put it in monetary terms, the Soviet Union since 1968 is estimated to be outspending us on strategic offensive and defensive forces by a ratio of \$2 to \$1.

We all hope, of course, that the Russians' main concern has been to overcome the massive U.S. superiority which existed before—and that, now having achieved parity, they will be willing to taper off their side of the arms race.

Unfortunately, however, evidence to support such a hope is still lacking.

Their factories and shipyards are still turning out ICBMs and Y-class, missile-firing submarines.

Since the first round of the SALT talks opened last fall in Helsinki, the Soviets have test-fired more than twice as many strategic missiles as we have.

And, with a gross national product only half of ours, the Soviet Union is now outspending us on defense-related research and development by a margin of \$2 or \$3 billion a year.

As President Nixon told key congressional leaders at a White House briefing not long ago, "If present trends continue, the United States, a very few years hence, will find itself clearly in second position—with the Soviet Union undisputedly the greatest military power on earth."

The campaign to tilt the nuclear balance of power in the Soviet Union's favor has been accompanied by a parallel buildup of conventional military capabilities.

There is a strong Soviet naval presence in the Mediterranean. Soviet warships prowl the Indian Ocean and, occasionally, the waters around Cuba. Helicopter carriers and marine infantry units are being added to the Soviet fleet, suggesting a growing new capability for armed intervention in places far removed from the traditional Russian sphere of influence.

It will be a long time, if ever, before Soviet seapower is, in the total sense, a match for ours. The worry, however, is not that the Russians will drive us from the seas, but that the buildup may reflect a dangerously adventurist mood in the Kremlin.

Signs of such a mood can be read most clearly in the Middle East, where Soviet pilots and missile men are playing a direct role in the Arab-Israeli confrontation. Reports that three long-range Soviet bombers are now stationed in Cuba are disquieting, too.

In short, it seems that the Nixon Doctrine, under which this country is trying to reduce its overseas involvements, may coincide unhappily with an era of Soviet expansionism.

The danger is that the Russians will misread the current mood of neo-isolationism in this country for weakness. This, in turn, could lead to miscalculations—in the Middle East, the Caribbean or elsewhere—which could bring on a Big Two confrontation which nobody really wants.

The chances of this happening are all the greater if the Soviets are allowed to acquire an intimidating edge in the nuclear balance of power. It becomes important, therefore, that a true balance be maintained.

The best way of going about this, of course, is through an arms control agreement that would effectively prevent the balance from slipping too far in either direction.

The Nixon Administration has an obligation to try very hard to get such an agreement—with appropriate safeguards—at the SALT talks.

Falling that, the United States will have no choice, as Laird indicated, but to look after its own side of the nuclear power equation.

Surely it is in the interest of both countries to make the SALT negotiations succeed. We and the Russians should have better things to do with our money than to pour it into an arms race that, in the long run, will produce less rather than more security for us all.

ROBERT E. McCORD

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, the death of Robert E. McCord last Sunday is of special significance to me because besides being the highly qualified senior specialist of the House Education and

Labor Committee he was a longtime and wonderful friend.

Bob was a native of Wellsburg, W. Va., which I represent in my First Congressional District. He and I, plus other members of his family, have enjoyed a warm friendship for many years. He was a loyal native son and maintained the closest ties possible to his home area.

West Virginia has good reason to be proud of Bob's work with the House Education and Labor Committee. So, too, are the many Members of Congress who sought his guidance and counsel and imagination when attempting to draft effective legislation to improve our labor, welfare, and education systems.

To his wife, Audry, his brother, George, and to other members of his family, I extend my sincere and heartfelt sympathy in their sorrow.

MINE SAFETY FUROR

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Rand Guffey, a staff reporter for the Wall Street Journal, has brought to the attention of the American people the scandalous mismanagement of the 1969 Coal Mine Health and Safety Act recently enacted by Congress.

Mr. Guffey deserves the highest commendation for his laborious research and shocking revelations.

The Coal Mine Health and Safety Act came out of my subcommittee and throughout the proceedings, I had warned time and again that the Bureau of Mines could not be trusted to properly administer this act.

Mr. Guffey's excellent article tends to support my view when he says:

The law appears trapped in a web of politics, controversy, confusion and in the view of some critics, bureaucratic bungling.

I have said before that if there is another major disaster like the one we saw near Farmington, W. Va., I shall urge a Federal grand jury to seek indictments against all those public officials who are charged with the administration of this law, but who are failing to carry out their responsibility.

It is quite apparent that in the interest of serving the coal mine industry, those responsible for the administration of this act are cowering under threats and recriminations, and we have a right to ask how long will the White House tolerate this situation.

Must there be another Farmington, W. Va., or another Centralia, Ill., before the administrators of this act will finally realize the extreme hazards to which coal miners are exposed every day and take effective steps to remedy them? If there is another tragedy in this country and deaths or severe injury ensue, we shall not permit the Bureau of Mines and all other parties having anything to do with coal mine safety enforcement to plea that they do not have the tools with which to

crack down on dangerous coal mine operators.

Those in the Federal Government charged with the responsibility now have all the laws they need and there shall be no more excuses. I reemphasize that I am serving notice now that I shall seek indictments against those responsible for mine safety enforcement and full prosecution if there are any future disasters which could have been avoided by effective enforcement of the act.

I did not labor long hard months on this act to see it now scuttled by the special vested interests who apparently have persuaded the bureau to forfeit its responsibility under this act.

Mr. Guffey's excellent article follows:

MINE SAFETY FUROR: ENFORCING OF NEW LAW BOGS DOWN, STIRRING UPROAR IN COAL-FIELDS

(By Rand Guffey)

Laboriously and cautiously, squads of searchers are digging through the methane-filled tunnels of Consolidation Coal Co.'s No. 9 mine near Farmington, W. Va., where 78 miners died in an underground explosion and fire on Nov. 20, 1968.

The five-man recovery teams had been making good progress until a week ago, when they encountered massive rock falls that may take months to dig through. The search mission began 10 months ago but has turned up only two corpses. The remains of 76 other miners still are sealed in the mine nearly 19 months after the worst U.S. mine disaster since 1951.

There is a grim irony to this tragic recovery mission. The deaths of the 78 miners prompted a public outcry for a safer working conditions in the coal mines and led directly to the passage of the 199 Coal Mine Health and Safety Act. But, just as the bodies of the men remain trapped deep in the earth, the law that their deaths inspired appears trapped in a web of politics, controversy, confusion and in the view of some critics, bureaucratic bungling.

A RANGE OF PROBLEMS

A formidable list of problems is keeping the Federal law from becoming the effective prescription for protecting miners' lives that Congress intended. The problems range from White House delay in picking a man to enforce the law to a shortage of mine inspectors. Most observers believe it will be many months, if not longer, before the problems can be overcome.

The nation's coalfields are seething with anger and disappointment over the new law. This feeling, combined with a bitter feud within the United Mine Workers union boiled over in an outbreak of wildcat strikes that closed scores of mines in several states this week.

The coal mine law, signed by President Nixon last December, covers the general areas of safety and health. Its safety provisions include bans on underground smoking and open-flame lighting, both of which can cause explosions of the methane gas often found in coal mines. It also calls for clearly marked escape routes and requires spark-free electrical equipment, adequate ventilation and other technical improvements.

The key health section is aimed at reducing coal dust levels to fight pneumoconiosis, or "black lung," a common respiratory disease among miners.

TEMPORARY REGULATIONS

The passage and signing of the law did not mean that it could automatically be put into effect. First, the Interior Department's Bureau of Mines had to write a set of detailed regulations implementing the broad provi-

sions of the law. The detailed regulations took effect on April 1—but only temporarily.

The coal industry immediately complained that the regulations would "paralyze" it because they were too tough. A number of mines were shut down, and a lawsuit filed by mine operators in Virginia won a delay there in implementation of the regulations.

In response to all this, the Bureau of Mines had suspended enforcement of most of the new safety regulations. Similar delays are expected to develop in enforcing the health provisions, which are scheduled to take effect July 1.

The stop-and-start enforcement, coupled with personnel problems at the Bureau of Mines, has triggered charges and countercharges from all sides in the controversy. Industry executives charge the Bureau of Mines' inspectors with unneeded stringency in the early enforcement, forcing mine closings. Safety advocates charge the bureau didn't gear up properly for enforcement and backed off too fast when the miners complained.

SOME UNCONTESTED FACTS

Whatever the merits of these and other charges, some uncontestable facts help explain the situation:

President Nixon, only a month before the new law was to go into effect, fired its chief enforcer, John O'Leary, who had headed the Bureau of Mines since 1968. Democrat O'Leary, a holdover from the Johnson regime, was disliked by the coal industry and was expected to be a tough enforcer of the law. "He was the one man at the bureau who knew the law and had the backbone to stand by it," claims Rep. Ken Hechler, a West Virginia Democrat who is an outspoken critic of the industry. A coal industry official who is highly critical of the new law says Mr. O'Leary's firing was "the best news" he had heard in a long time.

Since Mr. O'Leary's departure on March 1, the bureau has remained leaderless. Mr. Nixon waited more than two months before nominating J. Richard Lucas, head of the mining engineering department of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, for the post. But that nomination has run into stiff Congressional opposition that threatens to delay indefinitely the installation of a full-time boss at the bureau.

The complex, highly technical safety regulations written by the Interior Department to implement the law weren't made public until March 28—only two days before they were to become legally binding and nearly four weeks after a deadline set by Congress. A bureau spokesman, calling the regulation-writing "an enormous task," contends the writers did well to get them out as soon as they did.

Though the Bureau of Mines estimates that it needs about 1,100 safety inspectors to enforce the new law, it currently has only about 220, plus another 80 trainees. Officials say a recent crash recruiting program will provide only about half the number they need; it netted about 300 qualified applicants, who won't be in the field till early next year.

A Federal district judge in Virginia, acting on a request from local coal mine operators, enjoined enforcement of the belated safety regulations in late April on the ground that the Government didn't publish them 30 days before putting them into effect as the law requires. The court order, which legally applies only to that district of Virginia, is to run at least until Sept. 1, while an appeals court panel studies the case.

The Interior Department puzzled and angered safety advocates with its decision to suspend enforcement of the safety regulations throughout the nation. Critics contend the move proves the department caves in too easily to coal interests. But the Interior

Department responds that it would have faced similar lawsuits all around the country if it had tried to continue enforcement.

WORSE OFF?

The Bureau of Mines' undermanned inspection staff is continuing to inspect mines, but it isn't assessing any penalties because of the court order. Under a 1952 mine safety law, however, it can still order the closing of mines where it finds "imminent danger."

Some critics say miners are actually worse off now than they were before the new law was passed. "There is much less Federal enforcement (of mine safety) now than there was before" the new law, contends Joseph A. (Chip) Yablonski, lawyer for a UMW reform group called Miners for Democracy and son of the late Joseph (Jock) Yablonski, who ran unsuccessfully for the union presidency last year and was later shot to death with his wife and daughter. Chip Yablonski charges the Interior Department with "raging stupidity" in making the Virginia Judge's order, in effect, a nationwide "reprieve" for the coal industry.

"BUREAUCRATIC LAG" CHARGED

A spokesman at UMW headquarters in Washington blames much of the trouble on the Bureau of Mines itself, which he calls "a monster of bureaucratic morass." He acknowledges that the bureau hasn't been given the money and manpower that it needs to do the job, but he says it also seems to suffer "bureaucratic lag" in getting on with it.

It's clear that the new regulations had some impact in the short time they were in effect. In the first 10 days after they became effective April 1, the Bureau of Mines reports, a total of 272 mines closed. There are varying explanations, depending on whose point of view is involved.

The coal industry contends that the closings prove the law is harsh, punitive and unworkable. Some coal executives complain that a combination of Federal and state laws cause inspectors to be "one on top of another."

Many of the closings involved small, non-union mines that employed only a handful of miners each. But some big mines shut down, too, triggering temporary layoffs or permanent unemployment for hundreds of miners.

VOLUNTARY CLOSINGS

The Bureau of Mines reports that only 10 of the 272 mine closings in the early days of enforcement were ordered by Federal inspectors. The bureau says the rest of the closings were voluntary. Harry Perry, acting deputy director of the bureau, says, "Miners were confused about the provisions of this act and didn't want to be fined. A good many have reopened, and it is my understanding now that less than 100 still are closed."

Some critics of the industry contend that the voluntary closings are part of an industry plot, perhaps backed by the bureau and the union, to sabotage the law by making it appear so harsh as to be unworkable and in need of softening.

"It's very peculiar," says Rep. Hechler. "It almost seems like some people at the coal companies and at the Bureau of Mines don't want to make the law effective." Specifically, he charges that a "cozy little group" that includes small-mine operators, the National Coal Association, the UMW and the bureau itself are "sabotaging" the new law. They deny any conspiracy.

For their part, some coal industry officials claim to see another kind of conspiracy. Says John Kilcullen, an attorney for the National Independent Coal Operators Association: "Those legislators who railroaded this bill through are finding out that it can't be enforced—if they didn't know that already—and they're not going to stand by and take

the blame when it comes." They "are going to do a political hatchet-job on the Administration—on (Interior Secretary) Hickel and Nixon—and blame them for not enforcing a law that can't be enforced," he asserts.

UNAVAILABLE EQUIPMENT

One reason Mr. Kliccullen and others contend the law is unenforceable is that some of the equipment required simply isn't available. They say that some items, such as automatic brakes for underground haulage cars, haven't even been developed yet; other equipment is in production but at rates of output that would take months or years to supply all the coal mines needing it.

Despite the controversy over mine closings, the economic impact so far is small. Actually, coal production nationally has run 3% ahead of the 1969 pace since April 1, though individual coal companies and mining associations claim their operations have been hampered.

The controversy and confusion swirling about the new law are likely to increase next month, when the provisions intended to combat black lung are scheduled to take effect. They prescribe that mine air should contain no more than three milligrams of coal dust per cubic meter and that this level should be reduced to two milligrams within three years.

DUST STANDARD TOO RIGID?

A large proportion of U.S. mines currently have dust levels far in excess of the proposed limits, and mine operators say that at present the technology for reducing dust isn't available. Strict enforcement of the dust standards will force widespread mine closings, coal operators say, and this time their critics appear to agree.

Dr. Ronald Rasmussen, a West Virginia physician known as a crusader against black lung, admits the dust standard is "technically a little too rigid now." But reducing the dust level to the 3.0 milligram standard "has really got to be done" as soon as possible, he insists. Many observers believe that the court battles and controversy over the safety standards will be repeated soon over the health standards.

Amid all this turmoil, one set of statistics underscores the lack of progress in coal mine safety so far. These numbers come from the Bureau of Mines, and there's no debate over them: In April and May of 1969, before the new safety law was passed, there were 29 fatalities in U.S. coal mines. In April and May of this year, the first two months after the law was scheduled to begin saving lives, 34 miners were killed on the job.

GOLDEN EAGLE PASSPORT PROGRAM

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the House of Representatives renewed the Golden Eagle passport program by an overwhelming vote of 314 to 1.

According to the American Automobile Association, more than 40,000 sales of the Golden Eagle passport, amounting to \$282,000 in revenues for the land and water conservation fund were made in 1969 alone. Since more and more families have learned to enjoy a vacation of camping in our great national parks it seems to me we should do everything

possible to encourage this wholesome, family-type vacation.

I have been especially interested since some of the most beautiful national parks in the Nation are in my home State of Tennessee and the Great Smokies welcome thousands of visitors from the other 49 States every season. I hope the continuation of this program will encourage them to continue to enjoy the parks in our Southland and the famed hospitality of the Volunteer State. Unfortunately, previous commitments prevented my presence in the House when the vote on this legislation was brought up and for this reason I want to again express my support of the Golden Eagle passport program and say "Ya'll Come."

THE EASY WAY COULD BE OUR UNDOING

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, the quality of being steadfast is not always given the commendation or claim it deserves. Far too frequently it is easy for a person to let their anxieties overcome them. It is far easier to succumb to a mood of frustration than it is to stand fast and hold on as the going gets rough.

One of the editors that publishes a paper in our congressional district that has hit the nail on the head is Les Simpson, editor of the Holden Progress of Holden, Mo. in his column called "Progressing."

Mr. Simpson so correctly points out that those who argue once the Vietnam war is over all of our problems will be solved and we will be on the way to unprecedented prosperity. He is so right when he says the Communists and the far left and other agitators will have new problems to rant and rave about and that it just may not be true that billions now spent in Vietnam will suddenly become available for the domestic front and everybody will be happy again.

My hat is off to Mr. Simpson for his charge against those few dove Senators and Congressmen who feel it is no longer important that we should remain strong in the world and cut back militarily so we can spend all the money on the home front. Our good editor friend points out we are dealing with a cruel and relentless enemy and once the Soviets get the upper hand in technical weapons it will be all over for the United States.

The easy way out could be our undoing. It is a privilege to share this excellent editorial with my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

PROGRESSING

The American people are experiencing a mood of frustration and no one seems genuinely happy or contented. So many things are happening in the course of a day that no one seems to have an answer to the problem of what ails America.

To some the Vietnam war is the key to

all our problems—end the war and our Nation will be on her way to unprecedented prosperity. These people have the idea all the billions now spent on war will go to the domestic front and everybody will be happy again.

The Communists and the far left group are not about to let us wax prosperous and contented. With the war's end these agitators will be constantly bringing up new problems to rant and rave about.

America is due for a long period of unrest until all of us get back on the path of sanitary in our everyday lives.

To those who are of the opinion this country is the aggressor in Vietnam a recent item in the Metropolitan Press should be enlightening. The Soviets are earmarking more than a billion dollars to North Vietnam to keep the war going. To the Commies this is a sound investment as they want to weaken American public opinion to the point they will not only win in Southeast Asia but it will be a prelude for takeover of this Nation within the next twenty years.

A few dove Congressmen and Senators now feel it is not important for us to be the dominant Nation of the world and that we should cut back militarily and spend the money on the home front.

This would be good reasoning except we are dealing with a cruel and relentless foe and once they (the Soviets) get the upper hand in technical weapons it will be all over for the United States.

Never in our history have we needed a more united front in the cause of freedom and for our own lives. Listening to those who advocate the easy way out could be our undoing.

BAN LEADED GASOLINES NOW

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, H.R. 17255, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970, was before this House. All amendments offered were defeated, despite the fact that many of them put effective teeth into the fight against air pollution. This was extremely unfortunate. Rhetoric deploring pollution is merely form without substance. It is easy enough to say that our air must be cleaner and our water cleaner and our land cleaner. But effective, forceful legislation, followed by action of like kind, is what will make the difference.

One place where action is possible and where it can have significant effect is in the area of leaded gasolines. The perils which the current automobile gasolines pose are too great to delay action. This is why I proposed in H.R. 17113, my bill amending the Clean Air Act, that leaded gasolines be banned within 1 year of passage of the legislation. Lead-free gasoline is technologically and economically feasible. The fact that at least one company currently markets such a product establishes his clearly.

While the 1970 amendments have now passed the House, there is no reason why further amendments cannot be enacted into law. For that reason, today I have introduced legislation to ban leaded gasoline within 1 year of passage of this bill.

A recent article by Edward Olsen, curator of mineralogy at the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago, graphically explains the need for this legislation. Mr. Olsen, in the June 1970 bulletin of the museum, explains that since the late 1940's, the amount of lead particles in snow samples from the Arctic has increased by 300 percent. This enormous increase is due to leaded fuels. As Mr. Olsen reports, over 103 billion gallons of leaded gasoline are consumed in the Northern Hemisphere every year. This consumption generates over 310,000 tons of lead annually.

In our urban areas, the concentration of lead is particularly high. For example, in Chicago in 1968 auto fuels generated about 2¾ tons of lead per square mile. In a recent study conducted in New York City, the lead content of the air on 45th Street was almost ten-millionths of a gram per cubic yard at street level during rush hours. This is about 200 times higher than natural levels.

Edward Olsen reports that for many Americans the blood level concentration of lead is about 0.25 parts per million. According to Mr. Olsen, the threshold for classical lead poisoning is considered to be 0.8 parts per million. However, there are eminent medical authorities who place it at 0.5 parts per million. As Mr. Olsen says, "These numbers are clearly too close together for comfort."

His excellent—and frightening—article follows:

GEOCHEMISTRY—A STUDY OF AIRBORNE LEAD POLLUTION

(By Edward Olsen)

Among the several major branches of the geological sciences the one called *geochemistry* is perhaps the most rapidly growing. The word itself means *chemistry of the earth*, and since the earth consists entirely of chemical combinations of elements into liquids, gases, solid minerals, and biological forms there is very little it doesn't cover. It overlaps such diverse disciplines as mineralogy, petrology, petroleum geology, and economic ore geology; and is currently pushing into subject matter traditionally considered the reserve of paleontology.

Traditionally geochemists have considered such problems as where various chemical elements are situated in the internal make-up of the earth. In more recent years they have become more and more concerned with the chemistry of the earth's exterior as well: the dissolved and suspended chemicals in the oceans, lakes, and ground waters; chemistry of the atmosphere; chemistry of soils; chemistry of the ice caps.

Because of current interest in the polar regions more and more data have been gathered concerning them. Probably one of the most interesting and disturbing of recent arctic geochemical studies has been the work of the geochemist, Dr. Claire Patterson of the California Institute of Technology.

In making borings into the Greenland ice it is possible to see each year's accumulation of new snow by the banding that occurs. Thus, by boring out a column one can tell the year in which a given layer was deposited by counting backward, layer by layer, from the present year. The ice for each layer can next be sliced out, melted, and analyses made for the chemicals contained in it. Dr. Patterson has examined a number of such samples and his findings with respect to their year-by-year content of the element *lead* are remarkable. In the graph [graphs do not appear in RECORD] we see the lead content

in northwestern Greenland ice plotted against year from 800 B.C. to the present.

The first question that arises is: From where do these small amounts of lead originate? Besides lead, analyses were made for other elements—sodium, magnesium, silicon, etc. Some of these are due to sea salts blown inland from the nearby North Atlantic; some are due to clay dusts blown in from adjacent unglaciated land and islands. Lead, however, is not a significant constituent in any of these sources. It has been known for a long time that there are large rotating systems of air that rise in equatorial regions, and because of the high solar heat levels there, move towards the poles at high altitudes. Then by cooling off they fall slowly to low altitudes and break into systems of surface weather patterns and move slowly southward again. On their way northward any warm rising air can add itself to this giant air movement and be carried poleward also.

Large urban areas are areas of rising warm air due to the heat output from the many sources of energy that men utilize in heating, making electricity, transportation, and normal human activity. Thus, some of the many gases and dust particles that arise from populous areas are added to these poleward moving air masses and portions of them are carried all the way to the arctic regions where some fall out with snows and rains and become incorporated into the seas, and icecaps. Thus the yearly icecap accumulations can act as a sort of natural sample collection system which can show relative changes over periods of historic time.

Mankind has been extracting and using lead since about 2500 B.C. It was about the mid 18th century when industrialization began to grow. This growth was steady with western-world population increases, and demand grew for more kinds of products made of metals, of which lead is a significant one. It is utilized in ceramic glazes, paints, machine bearings, insecticides, fungicides, alloys of many kinds, ammunition, solders, plumbing fixtures, and indirectly in photography and coinage systems. As demand grew more lead has been mined and smelted from its ores. Because lead is easily vaporized in any process that heats it, such as smelting, a certain amount goes up the smelter chimneys, is added to the air, falls in adjacent areas with, however, a little of it being carried aloft and ending up in northern snows. The graph in Figure 1 reveals this steady increase in utilization of lead; around 1750 it shows an upward change in slope. The graph, in addition, shows a dramatic feature. In the late 1940's there is a sudden upward spurt in lead in these ice samples. In less than 20 years it increased by 300%.

It was in the late 1940's that automotive manufacturers began building cars with higher and higher horsepower. Gasoline engine horsepower can be increased in two ways: one way is to increase what is called the compression ratio; the other way is to increase the size of the engine. The manufacturers have done both. To obtain the best efficiency from such engines it is necessary to operate them on fuels that have high octane ratings. We will not go into the meaning of this term here but only point out that the octane rating of a gasoline is a rough measure of how much efficiency one can obtain from a high compression engine. Such engines require gasolines rated near 100 octane. Natural gasoline fractions from petroleum crude oils are about 55 octane. To bring up the rating to the desired level it is necessary to perform some chemical changes on the natural gasoline.

The major change involves a process called *cracking*. By repetitions of this process, plus performing distillations, it is possible to produce 100, or even higher, octane fuels. In 1920 a chemist, Thomas Midgely, made a synthetic metal-organic compound called

tetraethyl-lead. It is a chemical combination of the elements lead, carbon, and hydrogen. It was found that addition of less than 1% by volume of this compound to gasoline the octane rating could be raised by as much as fifteen octane points. Tetraethyl-lead was less costly to produce than other means of obtaining the same octane increase. It was natural then that it be added to gasolines in the late 1940's.

Gasolines are usually marketed in two forms: so-called "regular," which is around 90 octane, and what is called "premium" (or "high-test" or "ethyl") which is around 100 octane. Both forms contain tetraethyl-lead. Although there are limitations on the amount of tetraethyl-lead that can be added to aircraft fuels, there are no limitations for automotive fuels. In general, auto gasolines contain about 3 cubic centimeters of tetraethyl-lead per gallon. In terms of the actual lead content this amounts to slightly over 3 grams (about one-tenth oz.) of lead per gallon.

When gasoline burns in the engine the tetraethyl-lead decomposes and the lead is released. In order to remove it so that it will not form thick deposits, compounds called ethylene dibromide and ethylene dichloride, are put in the gasoline also. The lead combines with these to form lead bromide and chloride. These, and other lead compounds, come out the exhaust system where they cool in the air, combine with oxygen and moisture, and form several bromine and chlorine acids, and a dust of lead oxide so fine that some of it can be carried along in the air, even as far as the arctic snows.

The pronounced effect of this use of lead on the Greenland snows appears remarkable. The average gasoline automotive vehicle (cars and trucks) runs about 13 miles on a gallon of gas and releases only 3 grams of lead in the process. The great impact lies in the fact that over 103 billion gallons of such fuel are consumed in the northern hemisphere every year. This generates over 310,000 tons of lead. In Figure 2 the graph shows the total of tetraethyl-lead used since 1920. At first its use was small; however, by the late 1940's its annual increase is more and more marked. In total from 1920 to 1970 over 5 million tons of lead have been utilized in auto engines in the northern hemisphere. Averaging this over the hemisphere it comes to 120 pounds of lead per square mile!

Such an average is of course quite high for some low population, rural areas that are not crossed by many roads. On the other hand, it is far too low for city areas. In Chicago, for example, in 1968 auto fuels generated about 2¾ tons of lead per square mile!

The question arises where all this unrecoverable lead goes, besides the relatively small amount that finds its way into the upper atmosphere and then to the arctic. In an area such as Chicago, where the output is very high, a great deal of it settles out in the city dust that covers the streets and gets into homes. The black, oily dust of a typical Chicago windowsill has small amounts of lead in it. Most of it, however, is flushed away by prevailing winds into the Lake Michigan water supply and beyond. Rain water carries down a portion of it into the rivers and then to the sea. Ultimately most of this lead ends up in the oceans. Some of this lead, however, is absorbed by all creatures that breathe air, including people.

It is well-known that lead is a poison. Public health officials point out that lead poisoning falls into two categories: toxic poisoning and chronic poisoning. Toxic poisoning is the result of extreme exposure to inhaled or ingested lead compounds. It usually results in death. A great deal of medical information is available on toxic lead poisoning. Not so much is definitely known, however, about chronic poisoning, which is due to continued exposure to small amounts

of lead. It is known to affect the central nervous system, blood vessels, and intestinal tract, as well as other organs. At present there are no clear data on the effect of long term exposure to small amounts of lead. It is known, however, that lead compounds which are swallowed, either directly from the air or with food and water, are only poorly absorbed by the body. Less than 10% of ingested lead is actually absorbed into the blood stream. In terms of ingested lead man is exposed to it in water supplies, canned foods, paints, some dishware, cigarette smoke, most fresh fruits, etc. Unfortunately the lungs are much less discriminating. 25-50% of inhaled lead compounds are absorbed into the blood stream. Inhaled lead seems to be the largest source for it in the human body.

When tetraethyl-lead was originally introduced into auto fuels there were considerably fewer cars, so the problem of adding lead to the air was not considered serious. In addition, it was believed that the body had the ability to eliminate lead (below toxic levels) as fast as it was absorbed. As time has gone on, however, the number of cars has increased. We have also learned that lead builds up in the body. The natural body content of lead, of a primitive man thousands of years ago, was about 2 milligrams. Today the average in the United States is about 100 milligrams, with some city dwellers running as high as 200 milligrams. About 91% of this is deposited in the bones. The bone content of lead increases with age. This, in itself, means that there is no body balance for lead, that is, it cannot be totally eliminated as it is absorbed, otherwise beyond some certain age everyone older than that would have a similar amount in their bones. Instead it keeps accumulating with age—the older you are the more you have. If you live in an urban area, as most Americans do these days, you are exposed to higher amounts and accumulate it faster.

Because the great majority of Americans live in cities where the exposure to lead in the air is great, a number of recent studies have been made to determine the exposure levels. On the average there is about 1 millionth of a gram of lead per cubic yard of city air as opposed to a natural level of about 50 billionths per cubic yard. That is, the city air averages about twenty times higher! In a recent study on 45th St. in New York City, the lead content of the air was almost 10 millionths of a gram per cubic yard at street level during rush hours. This is about 200 times higher than natural levels. Rural dwellers are exposed to only a fraction of such amounts except, however, in highly agricultural areas during the growing season when crops are sprayed with certain lead compounds that act as fungicides and insecticides. Because of such agricultural uses on tobacco crops, smokers expose themselves to more inhaled lead than non-smokers.

The effects of such exposures are not certain by any means. Public health and industrial health doctors vary in their view of it. In reality there are no good scientific data giving a measure of the effect on humans. It is known that for many Americans the blood level concentration of lead is about 0.25 parts per million. The threshold for classical lead poisoning is considered to be 0.8 parts per million, and some medical authorities place it at 0.5 parts per million. These numbers are clearly too close together for comfort!

The question arises whether this addition of lead to the air is necessary? Clearly it is not. Reduction of auto horsepower would allow lower octane ratings and tetraethyl-lead could be eliminated. On the other hand, additional refining and chemical changes can make high octane gasoline without tetraethyl-lead. At least one major petroleum company in the eastern United States sells both regular and high-test unleaded gasolines of high octane ratings for high compress-

ion engines, and at competitive prices. Thus, it is not a matter that would greatly increase the cost to the consumer.

Early this year one major auto manufacturer announced that in the 1971-72 period it would begin production of a lower horsepower engine that does not require leaded fuels. Unfortunately this step is being taken for the wrong reason. Anti-smog devices (required on vehicles by many states) become quickly clogged with lead oxide deposits and require frequent cleaning to operate properly. It is for this reason the change is being made.

In any event, numerous public health officials, as well as university researchers, are becoming alarmed by the addition of lead to the air, which goes eventually to the oceans. Each year over 250,000 tons of lead are added to the seas to be absorbed by fish and lower forms of life. Dependence on the sea for food will increase over the next century. In addition, from certain microscopic sea plants comes the bulk of the world's supply of oxygen. Addition of known toxic elements to the sea can have effects that last forever.

With Dr. Patterson's work the field of geochemistry seems to have entered a new area—the area of public health. The dramatic effect which man's use of lead has had on the geochemical record, as seen in Figure 1, is a clear illustration of the fact so often overlooked: we are living in what is called a closed system. Nothing goes "away"—it only goes somewhere else. Lead is only a part of the picture. It is but one element that man in concentrating, utilizing, and allowing to accumulate ultimately in the oceans. Elements such as mercury, bismuth, and tin are significant elements that are less obvious in their use and less understood in their cycles through the biological world.

If a clear-cut case could be made that lead had no effect on human and other life its use in fuels would never be an issue. With the long-term effects unknown it seems to be folly to continue its use only to learn the effects the hard way.

AN ADDRESS BY HON. MICHAEL COLLINS, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE AT ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE, WINOOSKI, VT.

HON. ROBERT T. STAFFORD

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, it has been called to my attention by the distinguished president of St. Michael's College, Mr. Bernard Boutin, that that great college's commencement address was delivered by the Honorable Michael Collins, Assistant Secretary of State.

This meritorious address deserves the utmost recognition as an excellent presentation of the hope and optimism that is so necessary for the growth of our great Nation. As the Assistant Secretary pointed out, this hope and trust in the success of our country is not unfounded but is realistically based upon the efforts of those Americans who creatively participate in this democracy. Truly, deeds are what count.

The address referred to follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE MICHAEL COLLINS, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE, JUNE 8, 1970

Some years ago Albert Camus, in ceremonies in Stockholm, received the Nobel Prize for literature.

As he accepted the award, he spoke briefly saying, "What makes work a vocation is the service of truth and the service of society . . ."

And I believe that Saint Michael's for over sixty years has been serving both the cause of truth and society.

For you have graduated men who have become teachers and researchers, business executives and government servants—men who in Cardinal Newman's words, "are clear-headed and common sense people 'who see things as they are . . . who go right to the point' . . . people 'who are on common ground with every class and who are at home in any society.'"

It has served the cause of society because it has trained people to assume the professional tasks of teaching the young, managing our commerce, running our public services.

It has served the cause of truth because it has prepared students to question the status quo, to analyze conditions and to seek for better solutions.

And God knows better solutions are needed today to keep ahead of tomorrow's burgeoning problems.

But Graduation should be a happy time, and I am darned if I am going to stand up here and preach Doom and Gloom, because I don't believe it, not one whit.

This age has been described (it doesn't seem possible, does it, to make it through a commencement address without describing an age) as the Age of Aquarius, the Age of Disillusionment, the Age of Despair.

I think the Age of Introspection, or better the Age of Sensitivity, would be a more apt description, because God knows today we are aware (super-aware, thanks to the various media) and sensitive to the many imperfections we see around us.

Despite these imperfections, I took upon 1970 as the beginning of an Age of Optimism, and I say this not as a starry-eyed idealist but as one who considers himself a fairly hard-bitten pragmatist.

Everywhere I look I see small steps backward and large steps forward.

I see the people of Alabama voting with a jaundiced and prejudiced eye cast back over their shoulders, but I see the great majority of the country outraged and closing ranks against inflammatory politics and racial discrimination.

I hear the clamor over the President's decision to deny the enemy privileged sanctuaries in Cambodia, but I see the reality of massive troop withdrawals—on schedules as promised.

I see smoke emerging from many chimneys—as it has for years—but I see for the first time the determination to fight the resulting pollution of our atmosphere.

I hear our young wailing that they are unheard, but I see real progress toward lowering the voting age to eighteen.

Unfortunately, the small steps backward seem to receive much more attention than the large ones forward.

In a way I suppose it is good for us to impose on ourselves a double standard, to look down one end of the telescope at our faults and down the other end at our accomplishments.

But somehow we must be able to see our world in perspective.

Perhaps one of the most overlooked, but nonetheless significant contributions of the space program is that it has allowed us to see ourselves, for the first time, from without ourselves.

You have all seen the pictures of the tiny blue and white sphere, a fragile voyager through the black expanse of space.

No longer does the earth appear infinitely large, with resources to be squandered.

No longer does it seem large enough to allow people on one side of it to ignore those on the other.

No longer can we pretend to either solve our problems or move off somewhere.

Move where, the moon?

In a curious way, then, going to the moon has focused attention on the earth and its many problems.

How will you, the new graduate, fit into all this?

Above all, I am supremely optimistic that you will have plenty of challenges, and ample opportunity to transfer your college-acquired skills to practical problems.

Who knows where your life will take you?

As the caterpillar said as he saw the butterfly go by overhead, "You'll never get me up in one of those danged things!"

I don't propose, incidentally, that you go up in one of them, or go to the moon, but I think it might not be a bad idea to consider for a moment how we did go, and whether our methods might not be of value to you in planning your own ventures.

First off, our objectives were clearly and starkly defined, with no possibility of misunderstanding: to land men on the moon and return them safely to earth before the end of this decade.

How clearly are your objectives defined?

It is a wonderful and satisfying thing to be able to work toward a goal, to be able to measure your progress toward what you have selected as your objective.

Give it some thought.

Take some time off and really think about what your objective in life is.

Second, the Apollo program—complicated as it was—had to use *all* available talent in this country.

No source was left untapped: universities, government, industry—all provided the experts required.

You can do the same.

Once your objective is defined, *Think* about what resources will be required, what talents needed to achieve your goal.

You will probably find that you yourself possess most of what you need, but if not, others do and will certainly help you if properly approached.

Third, take some time from the hustle bustle of everyday life to reflect, to plan ahead, to ask yourself "what happens if . . ."

In our preparations for going to the moon, we daily pondered the "what happens if" question and quite literally wrote libraries of detailed answers to that most basic question.

The value of that library was made dramatically clear during Apollo 13's recent emergency.

It was a lifesaver.

Now libraries of this type you don't need, but a page or two wouldn't hurt a bit.

And I'm not talking about your life insurance plans either, I'm talking about alternate paths you may be forced to take to the goals you have defined for yourselves.

Fourth, and last: work to construct, not destruct.

In the space program we have had some horrendous arguments such as should we reach the moon by an earth orbit rendezvous or lunar orbit rendezvous technique, but once the decision was reached, all hands pitched in to build on that decision, not to tear it apart.

I don't mean to imply that criticism is not warranted; dissent if you must, but always keep in mind your objective in doing so.

Dissent reminds me of the airline story about the old navigator who was trying to break in a new pilot.

To get back on course, he said, turn starboard one degree.

Impossible, said the pilot, no one can fly this old tub that accurately—give me a decent correction.

OK, said the navigator, "turn starboard six degrees."

Much better, said the pilot, pleased with himself.

Fine, said the navigator, now turn port five degrees.

In similar fashion, dissent and counter-dissent rock our country back and forth, with little overall change of direction.

(Which way has New York moved in response to student and hard hat demonstrations?)

This is plainly no way to fly an airplane or guide a nation.

In the great majority of cases, the time and energy would be better spent in quietly presenting views to our elected representatives, as so many young people have been doing lately.

This is a form of communication which those representatives understand and need.

But it is not the only type of communication needed today.

I am appalled by the fact that in this age of instant and total communication, when we can hear voices clearly from the moon (¼ million miles away), we apparently cannot hear what is being said right here in this country.

Oh—there is a lot of talk, but most of it is within groups, not across them.

Farmers speak to farmers, students to students, business leaders to other business leaders, but this intramural talk serves mainly to mirror one's beliefs, to reinforce existing prejudices, to lock out opposing views.

Now good schools like Saint Michael's require, for a diploma, a broad base of education, a store of knowledge which stretches across many academic disciplines.

When you look at that diploma, remember that it permits—indeed demands—that you keep an open mind and open lines of communication with others who may not share your background or viewpoints.

The world today is so complex that specialization is required in most jobs, and success requires an even widening dedication to an ever narrowing field of endeavor.

In other words, the tendency is to learn more and more about less and less.

Some people even know everything about nothing.

Don't be that kind of specialist; don't become so engrossed in your job that you haven't time to explore, to expose yourself to the new and different, whether it be a new and different viewpoint or friendship or hobby or political commitment.

I am frankly jealous of you, today's graduate, and the opportunities you face.

I don't share the Doomsday view so popular today among some students and press.

As I said before, I am an optimist, and I am optimistic that you will be able to make great contributions to our society.

You will find our country at a point in its history where constructive changes are welcomed as never before.

If you define your objectives clearly, use all the resources available to you, and prepare a plan for meeting personal setbacks, I don't see how you can fail, not only in meeting your personal goals but in helping reach national ones as well.

Of course, talk is cheap.

Deeds are what count, just as grades are required for graduation, and I wish you high grades all your lives.

Whether you get them or not is your decision, and yours alone.

Centuries ago a wise man was presented with a cruel dilemma.

An enemy appeared before him, to discredit him, holding in his hand a small bird.

The question put to the wise man was this: was the bird dead or alive?

If the wise man said dead, the bird would be released and allowed to fly away; if he said alive, the bird would be crushed and dropped lifeless to the ground.

The wise man hesitated only a moment and replied, "Sir, the decision is in your hands."

RESEARCH FUNDS URGENTLY NEEDED IN CANCER FIGHT

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the fight against cancer goes on, with prospects of a cure brighter than ever.

One of the world's foremost research centers, Roswell Park Memorial Institute in my home city of Buffalo, N.Y., has developed what appears to be a cure for certain types of skin cancer.

The institute, which already has made great strides in cancer research, has many other projects in various stages of development. As with most any type of research on unknown factors, no one knows when the final clues will emerge.

The research must go on and our national budget must carry its share of the load in finding the answer to this scourge against mankind. There are many demands on our Federal pocketbook, but none has reason for a higher priority than cancer research.

Budget requests for the new fiscal year beginning July 1 are still under consideration by the Committee on Appropriations of the House. There is no indication yet of the committee's recommendation for the National Cancer Institute. I hope the recommendation will be generous.

Mr. Speaker, the legislature of Erie County, my home county, has adopted a resolution urging adequate research funds for Roswell Park. The resolution was offered by legislator Frank C. Ludera and has my full backing. Following is the text:

A RESOLUTION

JUNE 15, 1970.

Whereas, the Roswell Park Memorial Institute appears to have developed a cure for certain types of skin cancer, and

Whereas, such method of treatment could well be of great value in attacking other forms of malignant diseases, and

Whereas, financial resources are inadequate to forward the investigation of the usefulness of such treatment in attacking other forms of the diseases, and

Whereas, the sum of \$15.6 million is necessary at this time to further the development of the aforesaid treatment from a research tool to a routine procedure, and

Whereas, Dr. Edmund Klein, Chief of the Department of Dermatology at Roswell Park Memorial Institute has made a statement explaining the above facts to the Congress of the United States, and

Whereas, the development of such a cure would benefit all mankind, Now, Therefore, Be It

Resolved, that this Honorable Body memorialize the Congress of the United States to appropriate the funds necessary for research to develop the aforesaid treatment for cancer and that a certified copy of this Resolution be forwarded by the Clerk of this County Legislature to the United States Senate and House of Representatives and to this County's Representatives therein.

FRANK C. LUDERA.

"THE FACTS PROVE OTHERWISE"**HON. JOHN M. ZWACH**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the birth date of our beloved country, it would be well for us to dwell for a few moments on what America means to us, what it stands for in the eyes of the world.

The United States has been much maligned the past few years by ungrateful people at home and abroad. One of the favorite charges is that we are an imperialistic Nation.

This charge was very adequately answered in a recent editorial appearing in Publisher Ed. Morrison's the Morris Tribune in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District.

With your permission, I insert this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where it may be read by my fellow Congressmen and all of the other people who read this journal:

THE FACTS PROVE OTHERWISE

This is not exactly a Flag Day editorial, but it concerns a subject that can appropriately be discussed at this time. Charges that our government is following an imperialistic line in world affairs have been leveled against this nation by some of its own citizens, some of whom certainly ought to know better.

A look at the events which have transpired in the world during the past 25 years ought to dispel any such notions. In May, 1945, when the European phase of World War II ended, the allied armed forces, principally supported by the United States, had absolute control of much of Western Europe including all or most of the following countries: Italy, France, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Belgium, Holland and Luxembourg. If we had imperialistic designs, we could have at least attempted to subjugate these peoples indefinitely.

In August, 1945, when the Japanese surrendered, we had control of most of the oriental Far East, as well as the Philippines and sundry other islands in the Pacific. If we had territorial designs, we could have permanently dominated these countries as well.

Instead, what did the United States do? It immediately undertook a massive foreign-aid program, which in large measure was responsible for rebuilding these nations. We restored their industrial capabilities with machinery and equipment more modern than our own. Then, not only did we allow these nations to resume foreign trading, we also permitted them to compete for the U.S. dollar in our own country in competition with American manufacturers.

The other major allies of the United States, with the exception of Russia, began a process of divestiture which culminated with independence being granted to the majority of these countries' colonial possessions. Notable among these were India, Pakistan and the African states.

Russia, on the other hand, maintained dominance over Eastern Europe, politically, economically and militarily. When the neo-colonial possessions of the Soviet Union tried to assert their inalienable right of self-determination, they were immediately invaded and their quest for freedom from Russian domination was thwarted. Hungary was invaded and its freedom fighters were annihilated. Czechoslovakia was overrun.

This review of history for the past quarter of a century clearly indicates the imperial-

istic motivation of the Soviet Union and the absolute absence of such motivation so far as this country is concerned.

This is not to say that we may not have made some mistakes, that there is nothing we might have done differently given the benefit of what we know now. Questioning the wisdom of some of the moves we have made is perfectly proper. Charging us with improper, imperialistic motivation just is not substantiated by the facts.

SUPREME SACRIFICE OF YOUTH A TRIBUTE IN MEMORIAM**HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, Nettie Brown is a newspaper publisher in the Imperial Valley of California. She is a constituent of mine and a longtime friend. She has demonstrated remarkable courage in singlehandedly raising a large family of seven children with only her own earnings. As she so often has told me:

I don't know how not to work. I refuse to go on welfare as long as there is a vibrant sinew in me.

Mrs. Brown is not only courageous but she is also a very talented writer. Her understanding of the human condition and the pathos and irony which plays such a large role in the lives of so many of us is displayed week after week in her newspaper, the Imperial Hometown Review. Her sensitive awareness of the deep tragedy confronting parents of a fine young man killed in Vietnam is found in the following editorial which appeared in her newspaper June 16, 1970. I want each of my colleagues to have a chance to read this editorial:

SUPREME SACRIFICE OF YOUTH—A TRIBUTE IN MEMORIAM

(By Nettie Brown)

Throughout the Nation young and old, in different ways, have been protesting the war in Vietnam. Some through accepted means and some through violence that has often led to mass riots and more bloodshed.

But there are times when students gather with older folks when there is mutual understanding—and yet a disbelieving lack of understanding—as the war protests of both young and old take the form of tears . . . Bitter, grief-stricken tears that fall on flag-draped coffins of young men who will never return to their mothers and fathers, the loving relatives and friends and sweethearts who had been waiting for them . . .

On Tuesday there was such a scene at the First Baptist Church of El Centro when a military guard of honor brought in the casket of Army 1st Lt. Dennis Dotson, 20.

The only son of Bill and Joyce Dotson, who had been only recently promoted for his valorous actions in leading his men in Cambodia, was in a helicopter that was shot down and burned in the jungles of Vietnam on June 5.

Many students, school and Sunday school chums of Dennis Dotson, were among the nearly 300 persons in attendance. Lovely, tender-hearted girls wept openly, while long-haired boys dabbed at their eyes . . . as did the older people present.

After the flag denoting his service to this Nation—for which he made the supreme sacrifice—had been removed from the casket, three young girls, crying audibly, covered it

with sprays of roses. Then, as the military honor guard, composed of buddies of the fallen soldier, played taps, the tears of everyone present mingled with those of his bereaved family and special friends.

Why? Why this brilliant young man who was a well-liked leader in his school and church before the military recognized these leadership qualities? Why this helpful, outgoing youngster who had volunteered to serve his country while still a boy, just out of high school?

A young life cut short . . . leaving broken hearts . . . ended dreams . . . a shattered family.

But the same strength that Dennis showed when he helped those near him while here, and then led him to volunteer to serve his country in a war he didn't quite understand, will help those left behind to pick up the pieces of their lives and try to fill the void his passing made, in the best ways they can . . .

On an individual basis, of course, longevity is not the measure of the value of a person's life. And the reasons why the very young are often called to a higher life after a few years on earth will be revealed only in the great beyond.

Also, on an individual basis those who make the supreme sacrifice, even in a war which they or their families do not understand, have not made that sacrifice in vain. Rather, it has added to the sum total of human freedom, for no one can be secure in liberty while his brothers are being subjected to fear and exploitation.

Many of us whose sons or husbands or brothers are still in Vietnam, or did suffer there, have come to realize this truth.

The tragedy is that it is mainly the very young who pay the price of war with their life's blood . . .

We of the older generation, who do not understand all the protests about life today by the young, may point with pride to our accomplishments. We have mechanized most of the earth, banished many dread diseases, and reached the moon . . .

But we have not conquered that most dread disease which has taken the cream of the youth of each succeeding generation—war.

Many of us were born about the time our fathers or uncles were fighting in World War I; and had barely reached adulthood when our brothers, sons, husbands, or ourselves personally were called to combat in World War II. And since that time there has been few years of peace.

But what would the future of America have been had no one answered the Nation's call to service in these wars? Would ours now be a free or slave nation?

Many have paid the supreme sacrifice of their lives in our Nation's wars—and it is for us who were left to carry on to make sure that we never betray those whose blood has guaranteed our freedoms; that we do not allow our dearly won liberties to be eroded away because we are too apathetic to hold our flag and our principles high—and defend them on our streets as Dennis and thousands of youth like him have defended them in the war-torn jungles of Cambodia and Vietnam.

THE FRANKENSTEIN LITIGATION IS HERE**HON. JEROME R. WALDIE**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, ever since 1960, when the voters of California barely approved a gigantic bond issue to com-

mence construction of the State water project, there has been talk of a massive lawsuit to clear up what opponents of the water project consider to be legal deficiencies of the entire plan.

Last week, in San Francisco, the first of what promises to be a number of such water litigations was filed in the U.S. district court.

The specter of this litigation has hung over the water project with such ominousness that worried officials have termed it "The Frankenstein Lawsuit."

Those officials, Mr. Speaker, have every reason to be concerned. I believe that the State water project is not only deficient of water and funds, but is indeed culpable of legal deficiencies.

Though this lawsuit is the first, I do not think it will be the last.

The "Frankenstein Suit," Mr. Speaker, is stirring. An excellent article on the most recent development in this matter was in the June 17 edition of the Sacramento Bee.

The article follows:

SUITS CLAIMS RECLAMATION LAW VIOLATION
(By Lee Fremstad)

SAN FRANCISCO.—Four San Joaquin Valley growers filed suit yesterday afternoon charging that federal reclamation law is being violated to the benefit of large agricultural corporations in the west side of the valley.

The lawsuit in US District Court challenges the legality of water deliveries to growers served by the San Luis unit of the State Water Project who have holdings far in excess of the 160 acres permitted under federal law.

The attack is regarded as a continuation of efforts by conservationists led by Alvin Duskin, San Francisco dressmaker, to "bury the project in litigation."

The sale of \$200 million in bond anticipation notes to continue construction went ahead yesterday in Sacramento despite the service of a court summons on State Treasurer Ivy Baker Priest.

A suit was filed earlier in San Joaquin County by Douglas Morris, a taxpayer, contesting the state's right to sell the bonds at an interest rate higher than 5 per cent. The voters in the June 2 primary authorized a boost in the interest to 7 per cent on state bonds and bond anticipation notes.

William R. Gianelli, state director of water resources, called the San Joaquin suit "just another effort by those who are trying to frustrate the purposes of the project."

He charged the San Francisco federal court suit is "out of line because the state project is not a federal reclamation project" and Congress and the courts have already ruled that this is so.

The thrust of the 32-page complaint is that because of a federal investment of more than \$250 million in the State Water Project the west side growers must be bound by the 160-acre limitation.

Sought is a permanent injunction restraining federal and state governments from supporting such joint undertakings until the federal reclamation laws are applied to all users.

Plaintiffs are Victor Bowker, who grows oranges, lemons and avocados on about 150 acres near Porterville, Tulare County; Berge Bulbulian, who with his father grows raisins and grapes on 150 acres near Sanger, Fresno County; Gus Stamenon, who owns 40 acres planted to almonds and walnuts near Livingston, Merced County, and Mary Mendes Bettencourt, with 80 acres near Hanford, Kings County, where she grows cotton and alfalfa.

Bowker, Bulbulian and Mrs. Bettencourt receive Central Valleys Project water which,

as a federally financed project, restricts their holdings to a maximum of 160 acres. The suit is a class action on behalf of all growers similarly situated.

Named defendants are Interior Secretary Walter Hickel; Floyd E. Dominy, commissioner of the US Bureau of Reclamation; Lt. Gen. William F. Cassidy, chief of the Army Corps of Engineers, and William R. Gianelli, director of the California Department of Water Resources.

The growers are represented by James D. Lorenz Jr. acting in this case as a private attorney and on his own time. Lorenz is a staff attorney for California Rural Legal Assistance.

"This inconsistent enforcement of the federal reclamation laws is the main thing we are complaining about," declared Bowker.

"Why should the smaller farmer be bound by the antiland monopoly provision of the reclamation laws but not the big agribusiness corporation on the west side?"

"In fact, the antiland-monopoly provisions should apply most of all to the big operations."

In a related development Duskin has published full page advertisements in San Francisco newspapers and the Wall Street Journal soliciting money for a legal effort to halt the California Water Project altogether.

The implication in the ad is that Duskin's conservation organization is financing this lawsuit but Lorenz said late yesterday his four clients are solely supporting the litigation. Duskin's "Legal Committee to Stop the California Water Plan" has offered financial help with subsequent appeals, however, Lorenz declared.

The attorney also noted that his effort, unlike Duskin's, is not to stop the project, but only to have the 160-acre limitation apply consistently.

The suit is a threat to the so called "State Service Area" of the San Luis unit. The area includes more than 700,000 acres, about the size of the State of Rhode Island, said Lorenz in his heavily documented complaint.

In addition there are another 300,000 acres of farmlands in the Sacramento Valley and Southern California which the complainants contend will receive State Water Project water financed in part by federal funds.

"This represents the most substantial evasion of the federal reclamation laws that has ever been perpetrated in the United States," says the complaint.

It charges that most of the land in the service area is owned by 34 corporations. Tenneco Corp. owns about 162,000 acres, Standard Oil about 100,000, Tejon Ranch has 54,000 acres and Southern Pacific has 37,000 acres, said Lorenz.

According to the lawsuit the 1959 San Luis Act as adopted by Congress provides that the secretary of the interior is to be governed by all federal reclamation laws.

"Incredibly, approximately a year and a half after the San Luis Act was passed, the US Department of the Interior issued a legal opinion determining that the act could be interpreted to allow exemption of the state service area from the requirements of the federal reclamation laws," said the plaintiffs.

"The opinion grossly and invalidly disregarded the congressional action of 1959. It circumvented the long-established prohibitions against windfalls gain and land monopoly."

The complaint estimates that the value of arid land once irrigation is available increases by \$577 to \$750 an acre. Assuming an average appreciation of \$577 an acre the Tenneco holdings appreciated at least \$93 million, Lorenz computed.

Said Bulbulian: "We find ourselves in a curious position for, as federal taxpayers, we are helping to subsidize the development of vast corporate holdings on the west side which have thus far not been limited by the federal reclamation laws."

"Those large corporations are then turning around and competing with farmers like myself. We are paying a double subsidy, one for the water and one for the crops grown by the water."

The suit seeks a declaratory judgment that all federal or state spending on the State Water Project is illegal until the 160-acre limitation is enforced. It asks also a judgment that federal reclamation laws apply to the State Water Project, including the "State Service Area."

HARTUNG SAYS GIFTS MUST REPLACE TAX FOR SCHOOL GROWTH

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, in the June 10 issue of the Idaho Statesman, there appeared an article concerning the problem of funding our State colleges and universities.

It was predicted that the Nation's colleges will have to depend more on voluntary contributions from alumni and others for any expansion rather than on tax funds. Idaho is in the 10 top States as far as money spent for higher education compared to personal income, and the University of Idaho gets 86 percent of its income from the State. The solution expressed in this article is that individual contributions will have to increase. President Ernest Hartung of the University of Idaho is to be commended for his forthright analysis of the problem.

I feel this article is relevant to most State supported colleges and universities and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

HARTUNG SAYS GIFTS MUST REPLACE TAX FOR SCHOOL GROWTH
(By Jerry Gilliland)

Idaho's colleges will have to depend on voluntary contributions from alumni and others for any expansion rather than on tax increases, University of Idaho President Ernest Hartung predicted Tuesday.

Hartung told the State Board of Education in Boise he feels Idahoans are "over a barrel" as far as financing of higher education is concerned and will be unwilling to pay any increased taxes for expansion of the state's colleges.

The board also approved plans for construction of a new stadium at the University of Idaho.

He said the state already is in the "top 10 states" as far as money spent for higher education compared to personal income.

His solution: "the individual has got to be taught to contribute."

The University of Idaho gets 86 per cent of its income from the state, which is "much too high" a percentage, Hartung said.

He cited the census figures which showed an increase in population in Idaho of only 30,000 over the past 10 years which, he said, indicates the tax base is not increasing to match need for higher education.

The University already is initiating programs to raise money privately and hopefully will raise some \$30,000 in its first alumni fund drive this year, Hartung said.

He also proposed that the permanent building fund tax, the "head tax" of \$10 levied on state income tax forms, be increased to perhaps \$15.

The university alone could use all the money in the Permanent Building Fund for

needed buildings, such as a new administration building, computing center, museum and others, he said.

The same situation exists at Boise State College and Idaho State University, he said.

In other action, at the meeting at BSC, board member Steele Barnett, Boise, objected to the hiring of either a director of intercultural programs or an advisor to American Indians attending the University of Idaho.

He said filling such positions now will mean they will have to be included in the university budget for 1971. He questioned whether money will be available then.

Later in the university's agenda, Barnett criticized the university's proposal to have a part-time fraternity adviser at the school.

"We have had suggestions that we have a full-time fraternity adviser," Barnett said.

Hartung replied that the position could be made full-time if the state board wished but "it is our feeling that we should spend more of our energies (in counseling) in the dormitories."

A "student bill of rights" was proposed to the board by university student body officers. The proposal, which spells out the rights of students, will be considered at the state board's July meeting.

The state board approved hiring an executive officer for State Advisory Council for Vocational Education who will coordinate evaluation of vocational education programs in Idaho.

Also approved was a study by Rulon Garfield Associates of Ogden of Idaho's vocational education system. Cost for the study will not exceed \$17,000.

Dr. James Taylor, Twin Falls, chairman of the advisory council, said both the salary of the executive secretary and the cost of the study will be paid by federal funds and both are required by the federal government in order for federal vocational education funds to be expended in the state.

STRONGER MEDICINE NEEDED FOR THE ECONOMY

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has at last publicly recognized the seriousness of the Nation's economic problems. His announcement last week of a plan to create a National Advisory Commission to spotlight inflationary price and wage increases is commendable. But, in my judgment, this move alone is too little, too late.

The administration's "Inflation Alert" plan is a timid response when the need is for strong action. Unacceptable increases in prices and wages should be spotlighted for the public's benefit, but they should also be combatted by an effective Federal system that will prevent future increases.

Joseph R. Slevin, in an article this week in the Washington Post sums up the weakness of the administration's approach:

The way to discourage outsized wage and price boosts is to call attention to them before they happen, rather than afterwards, but that is what the Nixon alert carefully does not do.

The plan points in the right direction, but again the administration makes the mistake of approaching only one aspect

of the problem. As I have said before, we cannot repair today's economy without employing all the available tools.

I urge the administration immediately take the following four steps:

First. Place a tight ceiling on price and wage increases by establishing clear and firm Federal guidelines.

Second. Control available credit in the financial markets by implementing the authority granted by Congress last year under Public Law 91-151. This law gives the President authority to request the Federal Reserve Board to control all aspects of credit, including interest rates and down payments. It also directs the administration to funnel additional funds into the area of small business and housing which are suffering from tight money policies.

Third. With these controls firmly fixed to limit inflationary side effects, the administration should then expand Federal spending through an accelerated public works program, infusing up to \$10 billion into the economy for schools, anti-pollution projects and other programs of social priority. This would be accomplished through open-market purchases by the Federal Reserve Board.

Fourth. Combine this move with a real, long-range effort to cut back our spending overseas. This means a commitment to review our military posture in Western Europe and sharply reduce its scope where our national security will allow. It also means a commitment to an irreversible withdrawal of all American forces from Southeast Asia on a clear timetable consistent with maintaining the safety of our troops.

This may sound like strong medicine. But the economy is not healthy, and it is not improving.

A prescription of lesser strength is not likely to provide a cure, as Slevin observes in his article. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

NIXON PLAN WILL NOT STOP INCREASES

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

President Nixon is setting up an "Inflation Alert" that will be about as useful as a burglar alarm that rings six weeks after the robbers have left the scene.

The "Inflation Alert" won't stop excessive wage and price increases and it wasn't meant to. Nixon tossed it into last Wednesday's television speech as a sop to those who have been urging him to bolster his anti-inflation program with a system of wage and price restraints.

The way to discourage outsized wage and price boosts is to call attention to them before they happen, rather than afterwards, but that is what the Nixon alert carefully does not do.

The President's Council of Economic Advisers is ordered, instead, to spotlight big wage and price increases in periodic, after-the-fact reports to a new 23-man National Commission on Productivity. The Commission then will publish the CEA analyses.

The Nixon plan is a heart-breakingly weak response to Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur Burns and a small cadre of Administration officials who have been urging the President to shorten the time it will take to stop inflation by adopting a mild income policy to check wage and price increases.

Nixon did do some jaw-boning in his speech. He belatedly reversed the hands-off policy he adopted at his first press confer-

ence, in January, 1969, and told labor and management it will be in their own best interest to lower their demands.

But it was what the White House calls "preaching" and a "soft jawbone." It fell short of the attempt to rally the country in a cooperative self-restraint campaign that once might have been expected of a President who made much of voluntary national efforts during his campaign for the White House.

What Nixon forgets is that the original attempt to muster national support for reasonable wage and price standards came not from his immediate Democratic predecessors, Presidents Johnson and Kennedy, but from President Eisenhower.

It was Eisenhower who tried to slow wage-price inflation in the late 1950s by telling the country that wage boosts must "remain within the limits of general productivity gains."

That was the guideline that Kennedy's CEA later made specific when it pointed out that the national average gain in productivity has been 3.2 per cent.

But Nixon never gave guidelines a chance in his speech. He misrepresented their nature by misleadingly talking of using guidelines "to dictate specific prices and wages without authority of law" which they do not do and which Eisenhower, certainly, never intended.

Establishing standards to suggest the point at which wage increases become inflationary is one thing. Having a President intervene in individual wage and price situations is something quite different, as Nixon, who rammed through the inflationary 1960 steel settlement, well knows.

Yet Nixon and an Administration official who briefed reporters at the White House, repeatedly talked of guidelines and overt Presidential intervention as though they were the same.

The briefing official twice identified guidelines with bringing labor leaders and businessmen into the White House and "vilifying" them.

For this part, Nixon spoke to the American people about "grandstanding" and the "dangerous misuse of the power of Government" that comes with having an "individual businessman or labor leader called on the carpet and browbeaten by Government officials."

But there must be standards, and when the CFA begins its "Inflation Alert" operation, it doubtless will discover—and belatedly report—that some prices have gone up because companies tripped productivity gains. It would have been more useful, though, if those same facts had been pointed out before the inflationary acts were committed.

UTAH SALUTES EUGENE JELESNIK

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, we need not remind ourselves that we are living in a period of deep social trial. About 2 years ago, the sensitivity of the times was expressed in simple nobility by a young lady who stood in a crowd in an Ohio railroad station holding a sign which read "Bring Us Together Again." These few words deeply moved a man who at the time was a candidate for the highest office his country can offer—the Presidency of the United States. Since then, the words have moved

many other Americans, but none, perhaps, as much as Eugene Jelesnik, a Russian-born professional musician who loves his adopted land as few can. Mr. Jelesnik, in collaboration with the noted lyricist Jack Meskill, amplified the words of the young lady, Vicki Lynn Cole, and put them to music in a song entitled "Bring Us Together Once Again."

The words, in part, express the hope of a nation:

Things are looking brighter than they ever did before

Ev'ryone is waiting, hoping, praying

As we all unite behind our country more and more

Suddenly you hear the voices saying

Bring us together once again. . . .

We in Utah are proud of Eugene Jelesnik. He is a man who speaks with his heart. He is a man whose personal ideology reflects his feeling for all humankind. And he is a man who has continually endured the challenges our Nation has faced during the past three decades by participating in the cause of liberty the best and most rewarding way he knows how—entertaining our troops around the world.

Mr. Jelesnik has traveled hundreds of thousands of miles with professional USO shows to perform before countless servicemen in three wars. In each case, his show played to combat troops near the frontline.

For his efforts in World War II, he was awarded the Civilian Service Award Ribbon. As the result of his activities during the Korean conflict, he received the Silver Medal Citation. After performing for servicemen in Vietnam, he was awarded a Certificate of Appreciation signed by Gen. W. C. Westmoreland.

It is in this spirit of patriotic devotion that Mr. Jelesnik has created a musical composition dedicated to the hope of a nation, as expressed in the words of an Ohio teenager.

Indeed, if all Americans were as conscientiously committed to the welfare of their communities and their country as Eugene Jelesnik, the fulfillment of that young lady's prayer would be a reality. This talented Russian immigrant, who came to our shores as a young man in 1925, has truly enriched his new land, not with his musical gift alone, but also his humanitarianism.

Traditionally, he leads an entourage of musicians from his Salt Lake Philharmonic Orchestra into local hospitals to play for patients at Christmas time.

His contributions to his community are now beyond measure, but his untiring pursuit of wholesome entertainment was recently rewarded when he was honored at a luncheon by the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, Salt Lake Lodge No. 85.

Perhaps the words of the citation received by Eugene Jelesnik offer the sum of his existence:

Mr. Jelesnik exemplifies the four principles of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks—brotherly love, justice, charity and fidelity. By such actions he has extolled the privileges of living in America, repairing and renewing America and the greatest privilege of all—the privilege of loving America.

We who know this man, and we all do, one way or another, owe him an immeasurable debt of sincere gratitude. Long before we even start to repay our obligation, however, I am confident it shall have increased beyond our capacity to amortize it. The State of Utah and this great Nation give their thanks to Eugene Jelesnik.

PROBLEMS OF WITHDRAWAL

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that I cosponsored the house resolution which established the House Select Committee on Southeast Asia. This committee has now undertaken the investigation which this resolution called for.

However, prior to the committee's departure for Southeast Asia, I, as others did, responded to the request by the committee for suggested directions for the investigation. I had cosponsored the original resolution on grounds not popularly entertained by many in the country. I am concerned over the practical aspects and ingredients of our withdrawal from Southeast Asia and I spelled out these concerns in my letter to the chairman of the select committee, my good friend, Congressman MONTGOMERY. I would now like to draw the attention of the Congress and of the general public to these areas and am, therefore, including the text of my letter in the RECORD at this time:

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

HON. GILLESPIE V. MONTGOMERY.

DEAR SONNY: Thank you for your letter requesting my observations as to the directions for the Select Committee formed by H. Res. 976.

The questions in need of consideration at this time are not related to the efficacy or inefficacy of the troop withdrawals or the Cambodian invasion. These matters are history and as such, and of extreme importance regarding the coming directions of America at home or abroad, should be logically considered in the formulation of those policies. I am much more concerned over the state of the country we will leave behind for the Vietnamese when we have completed our withdrawal.

The most significant aspect of this approach must be the impact our withdrawal will have on the economy of South Vietnam and on the socio-economic infrastructure which has developed under our tutelage. Specifically, we must know what steps are being taken to permit the necessary adjustments in the economy of South Vietnam when the input of American dollars—in 1969, this input exceeded \$345 million—is terminated. We must know, for example, what provisions, if any, are under consideration for finding employment for the 150,000 South Vietnamese now working on American bases who will gradually be "laid off" as our commitment of troops decreases.

In a more substantive vein, it is important for us to explore the impact on South Vietnam's international trade of the loss of American dollars which have literally been

pouring into the country since 1965. The suspension of this most vital financial resource will have untold effects on South Vietnam's balance of trade and balance of payments.

Finally, we must face a certain unpleasant fact about our involvement. To too many in this country, the loss of more than 50,000 of our finest young men cannot be explained or rationalized. This Committee should not expend precious energy on this fruitless task. In another area, however, this Committee has a very definite responsibility, both to the American people and to the South Vietnamese people. Since 1965, the United States has spent more than \$258,789,000 on public works in South Vietnam. The South Vietnamese have grown to expect a given standard of living which these roads, sewers, buildings, and so forth have made possible. This Committee must determine what will happen to this expenditure when our withdrawal is completed. Will the United States terminate its material and financial aid to these projects or will it assume the responsibility it has brought upon itself to show the American taxpayer some return on his investment and to permit the South Vietnamese to continue their ongoing economic and social growth?

These are but a few of the areas which I feel this Committee must concentrate on and to which it must pledge its limited time and energies. I do sincerely appreciate being given this opportunity to relate some of my feelings on this matter. I wish you success on your journey and in your investigation and look forward to hearing your usual comprehensive and conscientious report to the House on your return.

With best good wishes, I am

Yours sincerely,

RICHARD T. HANNA,
U.S. Congressman.

LEGAL SERVICE LAWYERS SPLIT OVER EMPHASIS OF PROGRAM'S GOALS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the highly distinguished columnist for the Washington Post, Mr. William Raspberry, has written an excellent article which shows the depth of intrigue which exists here in the District of Columbia against the local Director of the Neighborhood Legal Services Program.

Mr. Raspberry has performed an outstanding public service in showing how a group of renegade lawyers are conspiring against Director James W. Hill, who obviously is trying to do an honest and sincere job in providing legal services for those people in the District who otherwise could not afford legal counsel.

I am comforted by the fact that this whole legal services program is up for review by Congress in the not too distant future and there is no question in my mind that Congress will surely want to restructure this entire program in the light of the skulduggery which presently exists and obviously is being tolerated by the National Director of the Legal Services Program in the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. Raspberry's penetrating article follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 23, 1970]
LEGAL SERVICE LAWYERS SPLIT OVER EMPHASIS
OF PROGRAM'S GOALS

(By William Raspberry)

Racial dissension at the local Neighborhood Legal Services Program has stolen the headlines, but the real source of the program's internal problems may be more philosophical than racial.

This is not to suggest that race isn't a problem: It is. An evaluation report done by the Office of Economic Opportunity, which finances the NLSP, indicated as much.

But what really is splitting the local NLSP staff is the question of whether the program's emphasis should be on legal service to poor people or on law reform.

And one of the reasons NLSP Director James W. Hill has been the target of criticism from his staff—some of whom suggested that he resign—is that he places the emphasis on service.

The question is a real one. Some poverty lawyers, including many of the white lawyers who make up about four-fifths of Hill's staff, contend that law reform should be central.

If the emphasis is on day-to-day legal service, they say, poor people will be no better off after NLSP goes out of business than they are now. They see run-of-the-mill service as a band-aid approach with few long-term benefits.

Law reform, they insist, is the only NLSP contribution that can outlive the NLSP itself.

On the other side of the question are those lawyers who contend that poor people suffer not so much from a failure to establish new case law but from the unavailability of lawyers to help them garner the benefits of existing law.

They see the emphasis on law reform as taking away from what they consider the real NLSP function—providing the same quality of service to poor people that private lawyers routinely provide for paying clients.

Both sides, insist, of course, that service and reform are needed. But they butt heads over the question of emphasis.

Hill himself declares a need for both, but he acknowledges that his emphasis is on service.

"I take the position that we've got to do both," he said. "It's important to remember that we work out of neighborhood centers located in (nine) neighborhoods where there is a need for legal service.

"Imagine rejecting a client because his problem doesn't raise any significant constitutional issues. When you do get significant issues, you haven't got any clients."

The only way for NLSP to build credibility in the neighborhoods it is supposed to serve, Hill believes, is for it to provide services on the basis of need alone.

But he insists that to emphasize service is not to deemphasize reform. "When you give service, you get reform," he said. "But when you sit around and wait for a test case, you don't get anything at all."

The philosophical quarrel goes beyond the question of emphasis, however. It inevitably involves personalities and jealousies.

Several NLSP lawyers seem to be interested in poverty cases primarily because they offer the opportunity for precedent-setting case law—which is to say, they give a young lawyer a chance to build a reputation for himself. Some members of the local staff already are building reputations in housing and welfare rights law.

And this is where the jealousy comes in. The bulk of the 47 lawyers are "in the field," with only seven or eight assigned to the law reform unit.

When a "field" lawyer uncovers a case with potential for a legal breakthrough, he usual-

ly turns it over to the law reform unit—partly because such cases can be so time-consuming that they leave little time for the day-to-day services.

But when the case hits the papers, it is the reform lawyer who gets the credit, although practically any lawyer in the program could have done the same work.

The resultant of jealousy has been the source of much of the increasingly public name-calling.

The white lawyers, one hears more and more, don't want to perform the routine drudgery of fighting garnishments and ghetto merchants and slum lords, they want only the glamorous stuff that builds reputations.

While these charges are as misleading as most generalities, they do highlight a very real conflict.

To use a medical analogy, some physicians choose to seek a cure for cancer while others see their role as treating sick people.

Hill's problem is that he has to do both.

CURBING NARCOTICS TRAFFICKING

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the eighth article in the Christian Science Monitor's series on the international narcotics traffic deals with the ineffectiveness of the United Nations in controlling this problem. In the final analysis, however, this is a problem which can only be solved if each nation which is involved decides to take firm steps to stop the smuggling of illegal narcotics. I was pleased to read recently that the United Nations has implemented new policies by means of which they hope to assist in the control of narcotics. Those announced efforts of the United Nations not only include giving training to police officers to equip them with additional narcotic-detection skills, but also provides moneys to "sweeten the pot" by helping governments develop other farm crops to replace opium. It is hoped that these United Nations' efforts will encourage the various governments to take firm steps to stop the flow of illegal narcotics.

The article by John Hughes follows:

ONUS FOR ANTINARCOTIC ACTION RESTS ON INDIVIDUAL GOVERNMENTS

(By John Hughes)

GENEVA.—At first glimpse, Geneva seems far removed from the sordid world of the drug trafficker.

It is a city with all the well-ordered stability of the Swiss.

Parks are trim. Streets are spotless. Traffic flows without a hitch along the shores of Lac Lemman. Officials are polite, hotel service impeccable.

Geneva's busy burghers are steeped in the traditions of industry, economy, propriety, and can hardly, one imagines, provide the local police force with much in the way of electrifying crime or midnight shenanigans.

Occasionally some African delegate to the United Nations swirls through town in a blaze of golden kente cloth. Or there is the flash of exotic Oriental silk on some Asian emissary to one or other of the international conferences to which Geneva plays host.

Yet this peaceful city is in one sense the headquarters of the international effort to cut back the world's narcotics traffic. The action takes place at the European headquarters of the United Nations, on the outskirts of the city.

LEGAL PRODUCTION TABULATED

This is the home of the UN's Commission on Narcotic Drugs, and of the International Narcotics Control Board. The commission is the UN's watchdog on narcotics. It drafts international treaties on narcotics and oversees their application. The International Control Board monitors legal production for medicinal purposes.

As the basis for their operations, the two agencies draw on a string of international conventions and agreements over the years, consolidated in the 1953 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs. This agreement limits narcotics to medical and scientific use. It provides international supervision over production, trade, and possession.

Countries which legally produce raw narcotics are obliged to keep the control board informed of estimated production and stockpiles. The board also keeps close tabs on legal requirements throughout the world. When production exceeds demand, the board is supposed to negotiate cutbacks with the producing countries involved.

Valuable though all this may be, it does nothing to touch the vast illegal narcotics production. This production, according to the International Control Board, is "extensive and prolific" and "constitutes an enormous reserve."

Thus the UN assessment is gloomy.

Many narcotics-growing areas are remote and beyond the reach of their respective governments. In some countries, such as Laos, Burma, and Thailand, opium is the growers' livelihood, their sole cash crop.

A problem of this scale and intricacy, says the control board, will not yield to "preemptory treatment." It is too much to expect that progress toward its solution can be other than "very gradual indeed."

All this makes an early start more imperative. Both UN agencies involved in the anti-narcotics campaign have repeatedly called on governments to tackle a problem which "year by year becomes more imperatively urgent."

Herein lies the rub. Though the UN agencies may have done good work, they are themselves toothless and without real power. The UN is no more than a collection of diverse governments. Upon the sincerity and energy of those individual governments depends the vigor with which the campaign against illegal production and trafficking is prosecuted.

USEFUL MACHINERY

Over the years the UN agencies have built up some useful antinarcotics machinery. UN laboratories at Geneva undertake important research. By analysis, chemists can detect which country, and sometimes which region, a specific shipment of narcotics came from.

Experts and chemists from different countries are brought to Geneva for periods of specialized training. The UN itself assigns experts in various phases of narcotics control to countries which welcome them.

The UN agencies are also able to exert pressure in their various reports. A country which does well in limiting narcotics production gets a public bouquet. Lebanon's attempts to replace hashish-producing cannabis with sunflowers has drawn warm comment. India has been complimented for its incentive system of licensing, under which its 170,000 opium farmers get higher rates for higher yields turned over to the state.

By contrast, the UN agencies have been thoroughly put out with Iran for resuming legal opium-production after banning it for 13 years. The International Narcotics Control

Board called the decision a "sharp disappointment."

Afghanistan is another country rebuked. The control board says it is "much disquieted" by the extensive flow of illegal opium out of that country.

Nevertheless, diplomatic delicacies make the finger-pointing necessarily cautious.

As their weapons, the UN agencies have persuasion of member governments, publicity for defaulters, support and encouragement for countries making special efforts. These are slender weapons. If governments choose to ignore the UN's exhortations and injunctions, there is little in the way of UN muscle to make them comply.

The UN's own reports are littered with complaints from the Secretariat about governments which have failed to submit statistics on narcotics production, or whose reports are inadequate.

The control board reports bleakly that it is without information from Communist China (which creates a "lacuna of great importance") and North Vietnam. Some governments are late sending in their required reports. Others "fail for no apparent reason to reply, perhaps for several months, to requests from the board."

The control system, it warns, can only succeed "if all national administrations can be brought to a reasonable standard of efficiency and recognize that wholehearted participation is an obligation which they owe to others."

Despite cajoling, nudging, and judicious snapping, by the UN, it is thus upon individual governments that the responsibility for cutting back narcotics production primarily falls. Only one, that of the United States, has the inclination and the finances to send narcotics agents of its own beyond its own borders.

American agents are stationed in such cities as Paris, Marseille, Rome, Istanbul, Beirut, Bangkok, Hong Kong, and Mexico City. In many other countries, the tendency is to dismiss the narcotics traffic as an "American problem." The argument is that as most illegal drugs are consumed in the United States, it is the responsibility of the United States, not the producing country, to halt the flow.

This attitude changes sharply when addiction figures soar at home. A number of West European countries now are taking much keener interest in the problem, following the discovery of a burgeoning addiction problem within their own borders.

TROUBLE IN SWEDEN

One country particularly afflicted by the use of synthetic drugs, especially the amphetamines, is Sweden. Swedish officials have reported to the UN Commission on Narcotic Drugs that a "grave situation" has been created in their country. Thousands of young Swedes are dissolving amphetamine tablets in water and taking them by intravenous injection. This, say the Swedes, has created "acute health problems."

According to the official Swedish report, the effect among many users has been one of "hyperactivity which was almost maniac, accompanied by feelings of omnipotence, and lack of judgment."

The Swedish report described users as becoming aggressive, roaming the streets, driving dangerously, causing accidents, and even attacking peaceful pedestrians.

Sweden has thus been one of the most vigorous proponents of a new international treaty to control the so-called psychotropic drugs—LSD, the amphetamines, and barbiturates. If enacted, this would place them under similar international control to that presently applied to opium and other "hard" drugs.

The U.N. Commission on Narcotic Drugs hammered out a draft treaty in Geneva early this year. This has been passed to the UN's

Economic and Social Council. Next step would be a conference, early next year, to adopt the treaty. It could be in force within a year or two.

One controversial aspect is likely to be the control over barbiturates, or sleeping pills. Some countries with major pharmaceutical industries—the United States among them—are ready to argue that less stringent controls should be applied to barbiturates than to amphetamines and the hallucinogenic drugs like LSD.

Such measures as the new treaty on psychotropic drugs underline the constructive aspects of the UN role. But the UN can only draft the laws and guidelines. It has no power at its disposal to enforce them.

There is little prospect of the UN's becoming its own policeman of the international narcotics traffic. That puts the ball right back in the laps of individual governments.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN E. HORNE

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a person well and favorably known to nearly every Member of this body made an important speech at the annual meeting of the Pacific Northwest Conference of Savings & Loan Associations.

I refer to John Horne, immediate past Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and now chairman of Investors Mortgage Insurance Co., an insurer of conventional home mortgage loans. As many of you know, John was an outstanding Chairman who, prior to joining the Board, had established an enviable reputation by his dedicated work with Congress and the executive branch in support of programs to assist small businesses and to make possible a better housed America.

He was appropriately introduced by the president of the conference, James A. Sinclair, who is also president of First Federal Saving & Loan Association of Twin Falls, Idaho.

I ask that Mr. Sinclair's introductory remarks and John's speech be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

INTRODUCTION BY JAMES A. SINCLAIR

Our next speaker is John E. Horne, Chairman of the Board of Investors Mortgage Insurance Company, an insurer of conventional home mortgage loans. He is a longtime friend of our industry. He first went to Washington in 1947 as Administrative Assistant to Senator John Sparkman of Alabama, a powerful and influential member of Congress who also has benefitted greatly the entire housing industry including those of us who supply home financing.

John Horne was appointed a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board by President Kennedy in 1963 and was made Chairman by President Johnson in 1965. Both while with Senator Sparkman and as a member and Chairman of the Board, John worked closely with Congress in developing legislation that is greatly benefitting our industry. In fact John contributed in great part to many of the programs that are proving so helpful to our industry today.

Fortunately he retains a deep interest in our behalf and continues to assist in pro-

moting legislation designed to benefit the thrift industry.

John is also a former Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of the University of Alabama. He was granted an Honorary Doctor of Laws degree by that institution on May 31, just a few days ago. He is listed in Who's Who in America. We are glad to hear from a friend of many years.

SPEECH BY JOHN E. HORNE

President Sinclair, the Honorable Hal Clarke, Chairman Robert Holmes, President John Kleeb, ladies and gentlemen.

I appreciate the gracious introduction, and I share your pride in your Regional Bank, its Board of Directors, and President Kleeb and his excellent staff. Also, I congratulate the members of the Seattle District Bank for your superior performance and integrity of operations. It is good that Hal Clarke, who is doing an excellent job on the Board in your behalf, can attend your convention and get at first hand the flavor of the excellent record you have made over the years.

On your program this morning I am following a real student of your industry, Norman Strunk—a trade executive of which there is none better. You'll understand if I feel some slight misgivings in speaking after one who has just given an outstanding talk.

It is hardly necessary for me to say that I appreciate being on your program. I do. Ever since 1947 when I became Administrative Assistant to Senator John Sparkman, working with the homebuilding and home financing industries has been a way of life with me.

My activities, though, as you know have largely been legislative and administrative. Like you who have managed associations, I have experienced both frustration and satisfaction. And also like you I consider it a privilege to have labored over the years to enable the citizenry of this nation to practice thrift in safety and to have a decent place in which to live.

While the great amount of effort expended by so many in and out of government has meant a better life and improved home surroundings for tens of millions of our people, the job is far from being completed. Unfortunately, there are periods such as 1966 and 1969, when not only is progress retarded but the gap between what is needed and what accomplished is widened.

It was suggested that I express my views on the shortage and the longrange outlook of housing generally and the savings and loan industry in particular. Understandably I am a bit timid in this undertaking because conditions change too rapidly these days for even the most erudite to predict with exactness. I'll begin with the statement that there is no reason now to believe the year 1970 will show improvement over 1969 in housing starts. In fact, many experts, including the National Association of Home Builders, forecast housing starts will be about 1¼ million or 15 percent less than the 1969 levels. Early in the year, though, I forecast approximately 1,400,000 starts, and recently Secretary Romney suggested the same number. Neither figure would be adequate and, as I have indicated, the condition of our economy is so uncertain that one can only guess.

As a well known housing economist wrote a few days ago under a heading entitled *The "Heaven Help Us" Phase*:

"We are now at a stage in the current business cycle when patience is running out, confidence is weakening, frustration is epidemic, and apprehension is growing. The pervasive misgivings stem from the seeming ineffectiveness of measures so far taken to bring about a greater degree of price stability without disrupting orderly economic growth. Has the timing gone awry? Is the approach taken by the Administration a mistaken one? Can a recession be avoided? Must inflation be

accepted as a way of life? Such questions have recently been raised in numerous Congressional committee sessions. In virtually every such inquiry, the concern has focused on the downtrend in mortgage lending activity and residential construction, which have been the most obvious although by no means the sole victims of monetary restraint; and a major point at issue has been that of how to relieve this troubled sector of the economy."

As you know, Congress is showing concern over the critical housing shortage. The Executive branch is also evidencing a deeper interest, and this is a primary reason I am somewhat more optimistic than are some others as to the number of housing starts in 1970.

I confess, though, that my optimism may be unfounded. Obviously, the Administration's strategy is not developing as planned. There is disturbing evidence that inflation and accompanying loss of purchasing power will continue throughout the year. There is also evidence that the recent ease in credit and the overall increase in savings inflows will not be sustained.

In this regard, as you know, there is complaint that despite prodding from most of the Republican Senators as well as Democrats, at least one Cabinet member, labor leaders, business leaders, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and nearly all segments of the home building industry including both Leagues of your industry, the President so far has refused to utilize any part of the powers given him by Congress to impose credit controls, or wage and price controls.

Speaking personally, the use of such powers to halt inflation would not be a partisan matter. Members of both major political parties, in and out of government, have urged the use of these weapons. Of course their use has also been opposed, but this is the first time during this century that this nation has waged an expensive war without some form of credit or price and wage controls. Admittedly they are not palatable to many of us if to any, but they are more acceptable in my opinion than is rapid erosion of purchasing power, spiraling unemployment, higher and higher prices, and all the other disadvantages that ever increasing inflation entails. So far the economy has been slowed down, but not inflation. I read a quip a few days ago from one concerned person. He said, "The way inflation is running now, old folks can file for Social Security and bankruptcy at the same time."

Well, we have not reached that stage to any large degree, but because of factors to which I have made reference, and others, the Federal Reserve System most likely will not relax credit curbs as much as it otherwise would.

Most certainly there will be less money than would otherwise be available for mortgages, and home interest rates will decline less impressively, if at all, than predicted by some Administration spokesmen. And as you well know the cost of land, labor and building materials continues to rise and more and more families are frozen out of the residential market, be it single homes or apartments.

The major burden imposed by these conditions has fallen on the home builder, those who finance homes, and those in need of shelter. Perhaps current conditions were best summed up by my former boss and mine and your friend, Senator John Sparkman, on the Senate floor while managing the Emergency Housing Bill of 1970 a few days ago. He said, "The drop-off in housing starts comes at a time when (1) housing demand is at its highest level since World War II, (2) vacancy rates are the lowest since World War II, and (3) interest rates are the highest since the Civil War." He also pointed out, "This situation reflects poorly on the money managers of our economy. We seem to have plenty of money for office buildings, new plants, and

for all kinds of consumer frivolities, but not for homes."

Senator Sparkman's bill would afford needy relief. A bill similar to the Sparkman measure but one that in some respects includes more help for your industry has been cleared by the Banking and Currency Committee of the House. That Committee, as you know, is chaired by another true friend of your industry, Congressman Wright Patman. Since you have already been told their contents, I won't repeat what the two bills include. I will say that I believe many of the provisions will substantially benefit savings and loan associations and indeed all sectors of the home building industry. My guess is that the differences between the House and Senate versions will be easily resolved and the bill will be signed into law late this month or in early July.

Despite, though, growing inflation and unemployment and other impeding factors, I still predict that residential starts in 1970 will not fall far behind that of 1969—perhaps no more than 100,000 units. Among the reasons that influence my thinking are the following:

1. Wider utilization of the Housing Act of 1968. Rent and interest subsidies; improved methods to tap pension funds (GNMA); and the savings and loan packages that accord your industry many advantages never available before are just several of the many tools offered by that Act.

2. Continued financial assistance insofar as they can supply it from FNMA and the Federal Home Loan Bank System.

3. Improved savings flow to the thrift industry. This could be temporary, but in my judgment the total net savings for 1970 will be appreciably greater than in 1969.

4. Increased commitments to housing in 1970 (\$2 billion) made by commercial banks, insurance companies, and pension funds.

5. The action taken in early 1970 to set higher minimums on Board and FNMA issues and Treasury bills in order to reduce the outflow of funds from the thrift industry. FNMA and the Farmers Home Administration restrict their issues to \$25,000. Maybe the other agencies and the Treasury will raise their present denominations to a higher level.

6. This being an election year, both Congress and the Administration are more likely to respond to pressures for housing. The 1970 bill to which I have already referred is one of several evidences already shown.

Time is slipping by though—already five months of 1970 are behind us—and somehow we must build a head of steam or Secretary Romney and I will have predicted incorrectly. A chief problem now is to find buyers who can afford the high prices. Another is to bridge the time lag that inevitably occurs when there is a huge drop in homebuilding volume. Even so, it is obvious that most of your industry, at least today, feel more comfortable than a year ago.

As to the longrange outlook for home building and home financing, there are simply too many considerations even to list to say nothing of discussing them.

Will Operation Breakthrough succeed? How can we better utilize land and thus reduce the cost of homes?

How can we restore and maintain the inner city?

What can be done to disperse both workers and industry from their present and often inadequate locations but have the two located close together to minimize the transportation problem?

Until this is solved, how can we transport existing employees to their jobs?

Can we build adequate shelter at prices they can afford for those families—about one-half the total—now priced out of housing?

Do we have the will to establish a priority for housing and do whatever is necessary to

meet that priority even though there will be less money for other purposes? Far too long, builders and homebuyers have stood at the end of the credit line.

Should we restructure our mortgage lending facilities and procedures, including our specialized institutions?

These are just a few of the many questions concerning housing which this nation has to answer in the years immediately ahead.

Perhaps some light on home financing will come from the Commission to be appointed by the President to study financial institutions and their role in the nation's economy.

Personally I have always believed that there is a compelling need for specialized institutions whose major responsibility is to finance housing. I also believe that such institutions restricted in investment authority as they are, are entitled to special consideration by state and federal legislative authorities. In some ways special consideration has been granted, but not enough. For example, your industry must have more flexibility in action and broadened investment authority and in time you will have it. The legislation to which I have referred will be helpful, but it is not all inclusive as regards your needs.

There is one more question I want to pose, and briefly discuss. If this industry is to continue to be the main source of home financing, if it is to remain a highly significant force in housing our citizens, it must have money.

The question is—from where is that money to come, or how is it to be obtained?

It cannot be secured by discontinuing Regulation Q, at least not until savings and loan associations have been granted powers and concessions not now available to them. It is true that during the 1960's a long list of new investment authorities was given you. Among these is the authority to invest your liquidity in several items and not just government bonds and thus to increase your earnings; to finance mobile homes; and to establish service corporations which themselves open many opportunities not otherwise permissible. But these and the others are not enough to enable you to pay as high rates for savings as banks could pay if Regulation Q is removed. For many reasons, including their much greater permission to make short term investments, banks can earn more and thus pay more for deposits than can the thrift industry.

Wider investment authority than presently allowed, tax reduction on interest paid depositors, and all those things that make for full family services are among the added changes I have in mind. Several members of Congress have already introduced legislation that would exclude from taxation the first \$750 of interest earned on deposits. The opposition to such legislation is based on the loss of tax revenue, but more tax revenue rather than less could be the result because of the resulting higher employment and increased profits made by various sectors of the home building industry. If currently proposed tax credit plans are rejected, perhaps we should get behind another plan adopted by some European countries. Under that plan, tax credit is given only to those depositors that invest in a home within five years after opening a savings account. However, there are many variations of a tax credit plan—the important consideration is that we all support the principle and persuade Congress and the Administration to approve something that will be helpful.

Competing institutions are increasingly becoming more like financial supermarkets. Your associations must move in that direction even if they do not go all the way.

The 1966 experience taught several lessons. One is that under then existing restrictions on your industry, the commercial banks

could drain your savings and otherwise impair your viability. It was necessary for you to be allowed to pay more for savings than could banks and for bank rates to be set low enough that you can afford the differential. Fortunately, the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, once they had the facts, understood the necessity and agreed to it. As I have stated, during the 1960's legislative and administrative decisions were made that have moved your industry into a much stronger competitive position. However, the new advantages are not yet sufficient, in my opinion, to enable you as an industry to withstand wholly unrestricted bank competition for funds.

As much as I believe in utilizing the Home Loan Bank System for funding both for withdrawal and for expansion, I caution that we exploit even more fully than in the past the building of savings accounts. The Central Banking System and FNMA performed exceptionally well in 1969 even though unfortunately part of the funds raised by those sources came from your associations. Fortunately, also, the Board began 1969 with a surplus of between \$1½ and \$2 billion. I know from experience, though, that there are times when the System cannot raise all the money desired. The needs of the Treasury must always come first, and with the heavy funding that Department has to undertake the last half of this year I am afraid that the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and FNMA would experience great difficulty in increasing their outlays to the degree they achieved in 1969. Let us hope your savings gains will make such an undertaking unnecessary.

Moreover, the cost of System money is usually in excess of that paid depositors. The excess cost may appear to be compensated for by a subsidy, but we should bear in mind that the subsidy comes either from the stockholder of the regional Bank, the undivided profits of the Bank, or as is now proposed in the 1970 Emergency Housing Act from Congressional appropriation. You may know that System borrowers have been subsidized since 1966, but understandably there is a limit as to how long and how much the System can sustain a subsidy. Thus I repeat, let us use the System as necessary, but also let us make every effort to develop other sources of funds.

One such source is funds from public authorities. Provision for this would be made in the bill recently approved by the House Banking and Currency Committee. Another possible source is Treasury accounts. Hundreds of millions of dollars of such accounts are maintained in banks. It seems appropriate that some of the funds be deposited in associations. Deposits of public funds and Treasury accounts could be handled in a manner to avoid liquidity problems.

Still another source is to generate savings from all sectors of the home building industry—the builder, the mortgage banker, the product manufacturer, the unions, and all their employees. My company is working intensively to encourage these sources to open savings accounts with the thrift industry. With a concerted effort on the part of us all, the results can be substantial.

However, I continue to believe that we must continue to make supreme efforts to raise money from depositors. It was with this in mind that, among other provisions, we included in the Housing Act of 1968 the authority to permit a great variety of savings instruments in order to appeal to various groups; that we authorize consumer loans on many items of home furnishings, yet to be implemented by regulation; and that we authorize change in terminology from share accounts to deposits and from dividend to interest.

I am fully aware that during very recent years, you have lost some of the advantages

you once enjoyed over other sources of competition. I see no likelihood that these advantages will be restored soon if ever. I hope, though, that you can avoid, and I think you can, becoming nothing more than a conduit of funds raised by sources other than your own associations.

In this connection I fear we have not done as effective a job of appealing to the youth market as we can. I know that the Savings and Loan Foundation has stressed the importance of this. Some of you have, and much of my Company's expenditures are directed toward this area. The youth market is the major source of your potential growth and survival both for savings and for home sales in the years ahead.

Already 52 percent of our population is 30 years of age or under. Twenty-five percent is between 18 and 34 years old. During the 1970's population growth is projected to be 26,000,000 with the fastest gain between 20 and 34 years of age. In fact, nearly 60 percent of the growth will occur in the young adult group—the age bracket in which people take their first jobs, get married, start families, and borrow and spend in a big way. It is estimated that 90 percent of this age group will buy their first home by age 35.

The importance of reaching this market is further demonstrated by the fact that the average age of association savers today is between 45 and 50 years of age. These savers of course should not be neglected. To the contrary they, too, should be courted, but to sustain your savings it is necessary that those of younger age be tapped.

It will be more difficult because they have far greater access to credit than did their elders. They have never experienced a depression. In many ways they simply have different thoughts and use a different language than do your present savers. Yet people who want to do business with them today, or tomorrow, better learn how to talk to them today. We may not always agree with them, but we need them. They are a large part of our population, a major part of today's market, and all of tomorrow's.

Just imagine! If even 5,000,000—less than one-fifth of those between 20 and 35 years of age—could be persuaded to save \$25 per month the monthly inflow into your industry would be \$125,000,000. The annual inflow would be \$1,500,000,000. A savings of \$50 per month would, of course, double this amount. For all practical purposes this would be new savings to you because hardly any of this age bracket has a savings account today.

Or to give you another possibility: there are fifty-one million families in the United States. Twenty-two million of these families, or 43 percent, are in the 25 to 40 age group—a group among which there are relatively few savers. More than 40 percent of these twenty-two million families have incomes in excess of \$13,000. Let us assume that 25 percent of them (5½ million)—and this appears to be a conservative assumption—will buy a home costing at least \$30,000 this year or in the near future, and that the only way they can buy it is to save a 10 percent down payment. This means saving \$3,000 each or \$16,500,000 total.

The potential plainly exists. The problem is how to reach them. There is proof that they can be reached, but *how* is another speech within itself. Other businesses are reaching them through various means.

As I have stated, to persuade the youth market to save systematically for a down payment on a home, or whatever the cause may be, will not be easy. It is a challenge, though, that I commend to you.

The Bank System and the industry have changed greatly during the last ten years—even the last five. The Regional Banks have been called upon to offer a greater variety of services to its members. This is as it should be. More case-by-case supervision is

now possible, and this enhances a more liberal branching and merging policy. In fact in 1968, 68 mergers were approved out of 71 applications.

Associations are being asked to help house the socially and financially disadvantaged. You can do so safely under the 1968 Housing Act.

If you do not meet these and other challenges that encompass the whole panorama of housing, other institutions will be created, and your industry could be relegated to financing mainly the upper income groups.

Finally I want to emphasize that in my opinion the savings and loan industry is in its infancy as regards its potential growth and contribution to the national well-being. We need only to have the vision and the will to accept change, in fact to create change, in keeping with the nation's needs, and to persuade federal and state authorities that efforts to make possible an adequately housed America under the private enterprise concept should be channeled largely through the thrift industry.

RUSTY'S LETTER FROM VIETNAM

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Examiner there appeared a letter from Pfc. Walter R. Wade, a young constituent of ours who lives in Independence, Mo., but who is presently serving with Company C, 46th Engineer Battalion in South Vietnam.

The parents, Mr. and Mrs. David Wade, 608 Ponca Drive, Independence, Mo., asked the consent of their son to publish his letter, which in my opinion, is one of the most revealing letters of the attitude of our servicemen about what it is really like in Vietnam. It tells how our brave young Americans wonder whether the Congress will cut off the money to provide them with supplies and the necessary funds to be assured they will have a chance to return home safely.

Young Walter Wade is known to his parents as "Rusty." In his letter he explains how badly he felt to have to kill a human being. He hastened to point out it was a matter of shoot and run and with six fellow Americans with him in a bunker he emphasized you do not run.

I thought it was significant that Rusty told his parents that the South Vietnamese were good friends and believe they could win. In the next breath he asked himself the question, will the American public let us win? He indicated that we were so close to winning that if the Congress cut off the money and the people back home did not care any more about their troops in Vietnam, than to stop the funds, when he was discharged, he would feel like emigrating to Australia.

Finally, our friend Rusty said some things in his letter to his parents that need to be said over and over and that is that our demonstrators over here should realize that every demonstration encourages "Charlie"—the Vietcong—to hold on 1 more day. One more day means

35 or 40 more American lives. No one could put it more eloquently than young Rusty Wade when he said the peace marches and moratoriums are killing my friends as surely as if they were Vietcong who pulled the triggers.

In the newspaper account following the letter Mr. and Mrs. Wade added a note addressed to the editor. Therein they suggested they were not certain how much of the letter the editor would want to print, but they were certain their son and all the other sons deserve better than a riotous college minority complaining about their presence in Southeast Asia. Mr. and Mrs. Wade emphasize these young soldiers are not in combat by their own choice. They are trying to do the job that, because of physical limitation of age and infirmity, those who are described as the establishment cannot accomplish. They added that it is most important that the older generation support these men all the way to see they are brought back home safely.

The letter from Rusty Wade to his parents follows:

LETTER FROM PFC. WALTER "RUSTY" WADE

DEAR MOM AND DAD: Its monsoon here, and raining 24 hours a day with 10-minute dry breaks. I'm back on full duty after my injury last month, but I may have to go in and get my back worked on. I can sit only leaning forward, otherwise I get a hard pain right in the center of my back. And I can only sleep on my side. I have some new scars, but my hand looks better than I thought it would. The scars are where the shrapnel went through my left palm and out again—first one small, the second larger. But no booby traps have been set lately. We think Charlie's hurting for explosives. But it is hard to sleep. I got two sticks of 60 percent nitro and wired it to the blasting cap off a trip flare and set it on my doorway when I go into the shack at night. But it blew the front of the shack off and cracked some roof beams when a rat tripped it. We were able to fix things up with some tin, though.

I got back from medevac just in time for a three-hour mortar attack followed by a "human wave" ground assault. And I finally killed a human being when on guard week before last—maybe I got two, it was so quick. They each carried two pounds of C-4 (an explosive) with grenade blasting caps, and it was shoot or run—and with six of our guys on a bunker with me, you don't run. But it still took some thinking about. Not for long, though, because they came right back in short order, and I spotted and killed about a dozen more. We later counted 54 dead outside the perimeter fence, but no bodies there by morning. It was pretty bad—the first really bad attack we've had here. They say that if I get one more zip (wound) I'll be eligible for three days off (R & R), but can't go anywhere. I could probably sleep three days—if the back would let me, and they'd slow up on the shelling.

It's funny—I started out not wanting to get to know anyone over here. Now I keep getting shocks as old faces are gone and new recruits take their places. Seems a long time since I came over last December. We just got four new corba (helicopter) gunships (ours are in Cambodia) and that'll help. And you might tell our congressmen and senators that if they really want to be quitters, they can start by quitting their jobs. Over here, we need more money and weapons, not less.

We live in a bog of angle-deep mud, and the monsoon has two more months to go. Maybe not much is going to happen now that the mud is here, although radio Hanoi

says next month will see stepped-up attacks against American bases in South Vietnam. But if Charlie gets me I'll have earned my own ticket. I can't tell you now how many I've got, but it's a two-figure number and the first number is high. I don't get sick about it anymore, although each alert I wonder if my number might come up today. I take it easy in the club, though (Serviceman's Club) I never have more than two beers each night. We don't have sodas anymore. I definitely don't think that any more than two beers around here shows any sense. It's for sure being drunk during an alert has cost some people the ultimate price. But I can understand it. It's so hard to sit through a two-hour mortar attack and not die of fright. I don't want to be a hard-core V.C. hater, but dammit, they keep pushing and shelling, and all we want to do is build a simple little road and get the hell out of here. Dad, I know you've been through this. What does one do when all I want to do is sleep, or mostly come home to my wife and six-month old baby girl, and forget this place ever was? But what can I do—we can't quit here. The ARVN's (South Vietnamese Army) that built the asphalt plant beside us are good friends, and they believe we can win. But I wonder—will the American public let us? What a mess if we come so close only to have Congress cut off the money. If they do I'll feel like emigrating to Australia or some place when I get out of the army, if the people back home don't care more than that.

If they think they're tired and sick of this war, how about us over here? And we want to win. Why, oh why don't they bomb North Vietnam? And how can Cambodia be a V.C. staging and supply area and a neutral country at the same time? They just help to keep us always on edge with their snipers and mortars and infiltrating. We never get as much as a couple of days rest. I'm terrified each morning that I'll trip a booby trap, and thankful each night I didn't.

Doesn't every demonstrator over there realize he helps Charlie hold on one more day, at the cost of 35 to 40 U.S. lives, 70 to 80 wounded, and three or four missing or presumed dead? Damn them with their peace marches and moratoriums. They're killing my friends as sure as if they were V.C. and pulled the triggers.

But hell, I guess its nothing to write you folks about. Better close, and love,

Your son,

"RUSTY."

NATURAL GAS SITUATION

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the potentially chilling fact in the natural gas situation is the drop in proved reserves in this country during the past 2 years.

This means that while consumption is on the increase, our future ability to sustain that consumption is a matter of serious concern. Unless something is done quickly, shutdowns of industrial production in cold periods will occur in many Northern States, as they did in parts of Ohio last winter. More importantly, it will not be possible to expand the use of natural gas in industry in pursuit of our efforts to reduce air pollution. We are approaching an extremely serious problem, the nature of which is forecast in the following press release:

NATURAL GAS PROVED RESERVES DROP; PRODUCTION CLIMBS TO PEAK FIGURE

NEW YORK, April 5.—The urgency of stepping up oil and gas exploration was underscored today when the American Gas Association reported the nation's proved natural gas reserves declined in 1969 for the second year in a row.

The A.G.A. Committee on Natural Gas Reserves estimated year-end proved reserves at 275.1 trillion cubic feet compared with 287.3 at the end of 1968. The committee, which has reported annually since 1946, is presently headed by John C. Jacobs, senior vice president, Texas Eastern Transmission Corp., Houston.

This 4.2 percent drop resulted when production climbed 7.0 percent to a record 20.7 trillion cubic feet, while gross additions to reserves totaled 8.4 trillion, compared with 13.7 trillion a year earlier.

"We are disappointed but not surprised by the reserve figures," said J. W. Heiney, A.G.A. president. "Unless this situation is corrected, the natural gas industry will be severely hampered in its efforts to expand output to meet the rapidly growing demand. Similarly, its contribution to combating air pollution, by providing a clean-burning fuel, will suffer."

Mr. Heiney, president of Indiana Gas Co., Inc., Indianapolis, emphasized that such a brake on the industry's ability to play its full part in the energy economy would be an artificially-induced shortage. Although proved gas reserves have declined, potential gas reserves—that is, gas believed to be in the ground but yet to be discovered—are larger now than ever before.

The Potential Gas Committee, in a study released last summer by the Colorado School of Mines, estimated potential gas supply—in addition to proved reserves—to be 1,227 trillion cubic feet. Nearly double the committee's estimate of two years earlier, this would be sufficient supply to meet indicated needs into the 21st century.

Proved reserves in Alaska, where vast potential gas deposits are believed to exist, are currently reported at 5.2 trillion cubic feet. This amount does not include estimates for the Prudhoe Bay area because of non-availability of data the committee requires to make such estimates.

The gas industry has consistently urged Congress to strengthen exploration incentives. It is also in favor of retaining a quota system on oil imports, rather than adopting a tariff system which it believes would further discourage U.S. petroleum exploration and development. "Any decline in the search for oil would automatically reduce the search for gas," Mr. Heiney said. "Yet, as the reserves figures show, what the industry needs now more than anything else is more, not less, exploration."

The reserves committee also estimates that natural gas liquids reserves declined 455 million barrels to 8.1 billion barrels with production reaching a record 736 million barrels.

Canadian reserves, the Canadian Petroleum Association reported, climbed from 47.7 to 52.0 trillion cubic feet despite peak production of 1.6 trillion.

The five leading natural gas states experienced reserves declines as follows: Texas, down from 119.0 trillion to 112.2; Louisiana, from 88.0 to 85.1; Oklahoma, from 18.3 to 17.6; New Mexico, from 15.1 to 14.3; and Kansas, from 14.5 to 14.1.

Concurrent with the A.G.A. report on natural gas reserves, the American Petroleum Institute's annual report indicated a continuing decline in crude oil reserves.

"The oil experience," continued Mr. Heiney, "reminds us that this nation has an overall energy supply problem. In recent weeks several officials of the national administration have called attention to problems with electric power, coal, and oil. There isn't just a

gas shortage. There's an energy shortage. And, as I have indicated, there are compelling public interest reasons why the solution to our particular part of the energy shortage should have top priority."

Summary, natural gas reserves

(Millions of Cubic Feet—14.73 psia, at 60° F.)

Total proved reserves as of December 31, 1968.....	287,349,852
Extensions and revisions of previous estimate during 1969...	4,562,228
New reserves discovered in 1969...	3,812,776
Net changes in underground storage during 1969.....	107,169
Total proved reserves added and net changes in underground storage during 1969.....	8,482,173
Total proved reserves as of December 31, 1968, and additions during 1969...	295,432,025
Deduct production during 1969...	20,723,190
Total proved reserves of natural gas as of December 31, 1969.....	275,108,835
<i>Natural gas liquids reserves</i>	
(Thousands of Barrels of 42 U.S. Gallons)	
Total proved reserves as of December 31, 1968.....	8,598,108
Extensions and revisions of previous estimate during 1969...	213,007
New reserves discovered in 1969...	68,021
Total proved reserves added in 1969.....	281,028
Total proved reserves as of December 31, 1968, and new proved reserves added in 1969.....	8,870,136
Deduct production during 1969	735,962
Total proved reserves of natural gas liquids as of December 31, 1969....	8,143,174

MINORITY LEADER GERALD FORD CALLS FOR ACTION ON ENVIRONMENTAL LEGISLATION

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the excellent speech of the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) to the Water and Wastewater Equipment Manufacturers Association yesterday.

The minority leader has candidly reported that the four major administration water pollution bills are languishing in the House Public Works Committee. This is true in spite of the fact that the legislation is vital to a national attack on pollution.

The minority leader has also stated some hard facts about the economics of controlling pollution. He notes that the individual American is going to have to pay for controlling pollution whether it is through bond issues, increased taxes, or increased prices for consumer prod-

ucts. The basic issue of pollution control is, therefore, in the words of GERALD FORD:

The extent to which Americans are willing to pay for restoring our environment.

I commend this excellent statement to my colleagues in the House and I insert it in the RECORD following my remarks:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD BEFORE THE WATER AND WASTEWATER EQUIPMENT MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION AT THE SHERATON PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 24, 1970

We meet in exciting—and trying—times. These are times when momentous decisions must be made—decisions today which will determine the quality of our lives tomorrow. This is a time for realistic assessment of our problems—a time for a resolve to solve those problems as quickly and expertly as possible.

It is a time for positive action, for leadership, for creativity, and for boldness.

The challenge of our times is to confront the great problems and to employ the American genius needed to overcome them.

How are we to do this? There must be created in our country a new feeling—a two-way cooperation between government and the people, a working together of one with the other toward needed solutions.

Our federal government spends money in three basic areas: Defense, social welfare, and the environment.

During the last few years our expenditures in these three areas have gotten out of balance.

Now we are cutting defense expenditures. We are spending more on human resource needs. And we are moving toward vast new expenditures aimed at restoring our environment.

What we are witnessing today is the gradual self-destruction of life as we know it on our planet.

We have sent men to the moon but we have downgraded life on spaceship earth. Unless we spend the next few years putting a tremendous effort and a large slice of our resources into housekeeping—into cleaning up the air we breathe and the water we drink—then life on our planet will cease to exist as we know it today.

This isn't a job that government officials or nation's lawmakers can do by themselves. If the people aren't with us—if the people are not willing to pay the price—all is lost.

I personally believe that the Nation has been aroused. I believe that during the last third of this century—perhaps by 1980—we can bring nature back into balance and start dealing effectively with the problems of our environment.

The struggle begins with preservation of the natural resources and natural beauty of the land, and with the control of environmental pollution. It must extend to consideration of population control, the use of leisure, the pace and space of life.

There is reason to feel encouraged. We have a national commitment to a restoration of our environment.

On February 7, 1970, President Nixon proposed seven major bills designed to carry out pledges and recommendations he had set forth in his State of the Union and Environmental Messages to the Congress.

The House has already approved two of those bills—the Clean Air Act, which strengthened federal air pollution control programs, and the Resource Recovery Act, which authorizes a three-year program to recommend incentives and regulations for reducing the volume of wastes by encouraging the recycling or easy disposal of consumer products.

The parks and recreation legislation is still pending in the House Government Operations Committee, however, and no action has been taken on the four environmental bills

turned over to the House Public Works Committee.

The water pollution control legislation awaiting in the House Public Works Committee is vital to a massive national attack on pollution of our lakes and streams.

One of the bills would establish a \$10 billion federal-state-and-local program for the construction of waste treatment facilities over the next four years, with a reassessment of future needs in 1973.

Another would establish an Environmental Financing Authority to ensure that all municipalities needing treatment plants are able to finance local costs.

A third would authorize the Secretary of Interior to develop comprehensive water quality programs and would grant the authority for swift enforcement.

The fourth would authorize research, investigation, training and demonstration projects to improve State and interstate pollution control programs, with greater flexibility provided for the grant programs.

President Nixon has promised to "put modern waste-treatment plants in every place needed to make our waters clean again." He needs the help of Congress to keep that promise.

Today I have some doubts that any of the four water pollution control bills will be enacted into law this year. Probably the only action in the House Public Works Committee will be hearings on the two financing bills. Although I am informed prospects may be brightening in the House Committee on Public Works, I hope so.

Meantime the House—this very afternoon—is taking up a public works appropriation bill which includes \$1 billion in new funds for construction of water waste treatment plants, with a carryover of \$440 million from the current fiscal year.

Assuming House approval of the committee recommendations, about \$1.44 billion would be available for waste treatment construction grants to the states during the next fiscal year.

Up to \$200 million of the new funds could be used to reimburse states like my own state of Michigan which have moved ahead rapidly to attack water pollution and are hoping the Federal Government will catch up with its share of the costs.

As you probably know, Federal funds cover 30 to 55 per cent of the cost of state and municipal water treatment plants.

I am expecting an attempt on the House floor this afternoon to increase the appropriation for waste treatment plant construction from \$1 billion to \$1.25 billion, the full amount of the authorization.

The appropriation will be made under the Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966, which required states to establish standards for maintaining the quality of interstate and coastal waters. When approved by the Federal Government, the standards become laws that the Federal Government can enforce if the states fail to adhere to them.

The Administration enforcement bill fashions new Federal weapons to fight water pollution. It extends the Federal-State Water Quality Standards to include precise standards for all industrial and municipal sources and provides court action for violation of the standards. Fines for violation of the standards could run as high as \$10,000 a day.

The bill also extends pollution control authority to include all navigable waters, both interstate and intrastate, and provides operating grants of up to \$30 million by 1975 to state pollution control agencies.

We must have effective enforcement of our pollution control laws if our talk of pollution control is not to be just that—talk.

One of the most serious defects in our present system of water pollution control is the delay in taking an individual polluter to court. It now takes 18 months or longer to go through all the procedures involved before court action is possible. The hearing stage is at the root of the delaying action.

President Nixon would eliminate the hearing stage and take a case directly from an enforcement conference to the courts. I applaud this move.

I also favor the President's attempt to give enforcement more clout by empowering the courts to impose fines of up to \$10,000 a day for non-compliance with responsible water quality standards.

Citizens groups across the country are clamoring for action on environmental problems. I fail to understand how the Congress can in all conscience put off action on the President's water pollution control program until next year.

Concern has been building for some time about the environment. It is absolutely inexcusable that water pollution control legislation should be left on the shelf at a time when the problem is reaching crisis proportions.

The environment has become a major political issue—and properly so. I hope the conservationists who have been demanding action will take note as to just who is sitting on the Administration's much-needed water pollution control bills.

We know that the cost of adequate water pollution control will be astronomical. That is all the more reason why we should begin the cleanup job in earnest now—not next year, but now.

It is estimated that a really thorough job of cleaning the environment and protecting areas not yet damaged by man will be far more expensive than sending men to the moon.

A report issued by the General Accounting Office indicates that an expenditure of \$5.4 billion to reduce water pollution in the past 12 years has left the nation's rivers and lakes as badly polluted as they were prior to the expenditure of those billions. This would indicate that we are paying out billions in water pollution control costs just to keep the pollution of our lakes and streams from getting worse.

There is no question that Congress has been laggard in supplying sufficient funds to cover the Federal cost-share of the water pollution control effort.

Of the \$450 million authorized for 1968, Congress appropriated \$203 million; of a \$700 million authorization for 1969, \$214 million was appropriated; of an authorized \$1 billion for 1970, Congress appropriated \$800 million.

What is needed now is a massive program of municipal waste treatment plant construction and a sharply accelerated program of pollution abatement through the prosecution of individual polluters.

According to the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, bringing the nation's streams and lakes up to Federal standards would entail expenditures by 1973 of \$8 billion for sewage treatment plants, \$6 to \$7 billion for sanitary collection sewers, and \$2.6 to \$4.6 billion for facilities to treat industrial waste. These estimates do not include the cost of separating existing storm and sanitary sewer systems, or debt service and operating costs.

It is encouraging to note that industrial expenditures for pollution abatement have risen at a rate of 30 to 35 per cent in recent years.

Of course a major problem in industrial pollution is that pollution abatement adds to the cost of doing business and affects profits.

It should be emphasized at this point that industry's emissions of wastes into public waterways are twice the volume of domestic wastes, and in some areas are even greater. Yet the average American thinks of water pollution control almost entirely in connection with construction of sewage disposal plants.

The Congress is very much aware of industrial pollution of our lakes and streams and it is for that reason that the Federal

tax reform law allows for a five-year amortization of certain pollution control facilities.

The cost of controlling pollution is central to our environmental effort.

Let us be honest about it. The individual American is going to foot this huge bill no matter how we decide to assess the cost.

He will pay for it through bond issues and increased taxes, and he will pay for it in the increased price of consumer products.

How willing is he to pay for cleaning up our environment? That is the question that must be answered as we embark on this environmental mission which is more costly than sending men to the moon.

We can observe Earth Day ever year. We can listen to endless rhetoric about the very survival of mankind being at stake. But what is really at issue here is the extent to which Americans are willing to pay for restoring our environment.

We had better be willing to pay the price, whatever it may be. For unless we move without delay to halt the destruction of our land, our water, and our air, our own children may see the last traces of earth's beauty crushed beneath the weight of man's waste and ruin.

Our goal is clear: Cleaner water, cleaner air, cleaner countryside, cleaner cities, cleaner suburbs—in short, a cleaner America.

We had all better take our talents and our treasure and join with others in giving ourselves back America the beautiful.

This will only come about through the power of the government and the people working together—through the power of the heart and the mind, the power of conscience and intellect, and the power of personal responsibility.

This is the power that will clean our water and air. This is the power that will restore the America that our forefathers knew—America the Beautiful.

A NATURAL GAS SHORTAGE

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, in my continuing study of the serious implications of a natural gas shortage, I have come upon an excellent statement on the situation by Herbert D. Clay, president of the National Fuel Gas Co., to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement relates to the effect of imports, but it deals in the general situation as well and certainly indicates that positive governmental action is an immediate requirement if we are to avoid shutdowns of industry during the cold snaps next winter and thereafter.

The statement follows:

HEARINGS ON OIL IMPORT CONTROLS

Mr. Chairman, my name is Herbert D. Clay. I am President of the National Fuel Gas Company and Chairman of the Government Relations Committee of the American Gas Association. I am appearing today on behalf of A.G.A. and the National Fuel Gas Company. Both organizations are greatly concerned about the domestic natural gas supply situation and our ability to satisfy rapidly increasing consumer demands. We feel that any national policy on Oil Import Controls will materially affect that supply situation.

We have today offered for the record a more detailed statement of our position on Oil Import Controls. However, I would like to emphasize a few principal points in about a 10-minute summary.

A primary purpose of this brief oral state-

ment, Mr. Chairman, is to attempt to give this Subcommittee a concise, chronological account of the facts—especially those over the past year and one-half—which give rise to this growing concern, which in turn reaches its very peak today with the announcement of the proved gas reserves estimates for 1969.

First a word about those for whom I speak today.

National Fuel Gas Company is a Public Utility Holding Company, whose subsidiary companies operate properties in Northwestern Pennsylvania, Western New York, and a small section in Eastern Ohio. This system provides retail gas service to over 635,000 customers in 468 communities with an estimated population of 2,300,000. The business and industrial centers of Buffalo and Niagara Falls in New York State, and of Erie and Sharon in Pennsylvania, are key markets in the service area.

The American Gas Association is comprised of 345 member companies, including 254 gas distribution companies, 60 gas and electric distribution companies, 31 gas transmission companies and several thousand individual members. Over 41.5 million homes, businesses and industries in all 50 states are served with gas; the distribution companies in this Association serve 92% of these customers which include some 145,000,000 of our population.

Thus, I am speaking essentially for the distribution segment of the gas industry. While some distributors have corporate diversifications which are related to oil and gas production, these are few in number, and comprise a very small portion of their total operations. So I believe I am on sound ground in making the statement that A.G.A. members have no significant monetary axe to grind in this oil import issue—except the very vital one of adequate gas supply and the ability to continue to serve our consumers.

This was our position in testimony last year before the House Ways and Means Committee and Senate Finance Committee on petroleum industry tax incentives. It was reaffirmed in our statement filed with the Oil Import Task Force on July 14, 1969. It is our position here today.

But the matter of domestic natural gas supply is one of increasingly vital concern. It is a concern that did not develop overnight, but over an extended period of debate. Let me recount a few significant dates and points.

During the late 1950's and the 1960's, the question of a possible gas supply problem was argued vigorously. And during this period, the drilling and exploration trends of the domestic petroleum industry declined sharply. Wildcat drilling and geophysical activity, which are considered the most sensitive measure of exploration operations, dropped 40% and 56% respectively between 1956 and 1968; total wells drilled declined 43%, and the number of active rotary rigs was off 55%. There was also a drastic drop in exploratory wells completed as gas producers from 909 in 1959 to 429 in 1968, a decrease of 53%. A frequently discussed parameter of supply and demand, the reserves-to-production ratio, also drifted steadily downward from over 21 in 1956 to less than 15 in 1968.

Then on December 16, 1968, about a year and a half ago, the American Gas Association, through a letter from its then President W. Morton Jacobs to the Federal Power Commission, took what was admittedly an extraordinary step. As Commissioner John Carver pointed out in a speech last month on March 5, this was one of four major "turning points, or new direction dates" since passage of the Natural Gas Act of 1938.

The A.G.A. letter said distributors were having difficulty in contracting for increases in long-term gas supplies and recommended that the Federal Power Commission act to provide additional economic incentives for

exploration and development. This meant higher field prices which most distributors had in the past vigorously resisted. Mr. Carver noted that "its significance was recognized by the Commission. Until then, the distributor group had been aligned as an adversary of the producer group."

This was neither a timid nor a reckless step by A.G.A. There were many known and predictable ramifications. It was taken only after very careful consideration. In major public interest or government matters, no one likes to do an about face. But it was deemed necessary at that time, and events have supported that decision.

This "extraordinary step" was followed by the annual report of the A.G.A. reserves committee in April 1969 which, for the first time since reserves had been reported over the past 23 years, revealed a deficit. By deficit, I mean that the gross additions to proved reserves were less than gas produced—and by a very substantial 40%. Production in 1968 was 19.4 trillion cubic feet and only 13.8 trillion cubic feet of new reserves were added, a deficit of 5.6 trillion cubic feet.

This was a very significant development. Even though the reserves-to-production ratio was declining to what many thought were dangerously low levels, there were numerous and prominent voices in the gas industry which contended that there was no real cause for concern so long as new reserves added each year kept up with actual production. So in April 1969, we reached that point of "real cause for concern," because reserves added did not keep up. We found less than we produced—40% less.

Then in June 1969, 10 distributor executives, representing about 40% of the total meters served by the gas industry, met with the full Federal Power Commission at the Commission's invitation, and reaffirmed that they could experience actual—although isolated—shortages this past winter (1969-70) and real problems this coming winter.

These predictions of some shortages this winter were borne out. Certain gas companies in the heart of the industrial midwest curtailed their activities for new business and began to deny accounts which they had sought for years. One company had to shut down some major industrial plants for 6 days during the peak January cold spell—the first time that had ever happened. A north-central pipeline withdraw a major expansion proposal for lack of supply. Evidence of actual shortage was no longer theoretical or prospective. It was here!

As to the real problems of next winter—and in future years—I cite the 1969 estimates of the A.G.A. Gas Reserves Committee, which were released today. This release date is only coincidental with my appearance here, but I hope it will help me to illustrate the domestic gas industry's supply concern.

Production in 1969 was 20.7 trillion cubic feet. Additions to reserves were only 8.4 trillion cubic feet. This is the second consecutive annual deficit, and this time by a startling 12.3 trillion cubic feet, or 60%.

Suffice it to say, there is no doubt whatsoever that we have a serious domestic natural gas shortage. We think this is a problem capable of solution. But the most economic and the most expeditious solution is a timely drilling effort aimed at the vast domestic potential natural gas supplies. Estimates of this potential for the "lower 48 states," that is, excluding Alaska, range upward from 750 trillion cubic feet. This compares with present proved reserves of 275 trillion cubic feet. But this vitally needed domestic drilling effort will only be further set back if a change in oil import controls attracts capital away from the domestic scene and towards foreign supply areas.

We in the gas industry used to worry a lot about acknowledging our supply problems for fear that our competitors would take advantage and gain the marketing momentum

even after we had solved our problems. Now we find that our competitors seem to have equal or greater supply problems. Various government officials have commented on this recently.

There isn't just a gas shortage. There's an energy shortage. And there are impelling public interest reasons why the solution to our particular part of the energy shortage should have top priority.

In addition to the fact that gas is a convenient, dependable, and economical fuel, it offers a very positive contribution to the growing national concern about environment. Natural gas is clean burning. It doesn't create air or water pollution. As to aesthetics, gas facilities seldom offend the eye because the 890,000 mile pipeline network is almost entirely underground from wellhead to burner tip.

Natural gas is a most valuable domestic natural resource. In this era when environment and consumerism are national bywords, the discovery and development of natural gas should be encouraged, not discouraged. It is our position that the proposed tariff system on oil imports would only serve to discourage the badly needed development of gas reserves.

GOD SAVE THE GOOD OLD "DELTA QUEEN"

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the paddle-wheel boats which plied the Mississippi and other major rivers of this Nation played an important role in the opening of the West and the growth of our country.

In many ways they were also the center of life for the inhabitants of the river towns, providing entertainment and a tie with other parts of the land.

There remains in the United States only one overnight passenger paddle-wheel steamboat. She is the *Delta Queen* and regularly makes the trip up and down the Mississippi, affording the opportunity for a few lucky passengers to catch a glimpse of the beauty of America's past.

Her superstructure is of wooden construction, in the traditional fashion, but she will soon be forced off the river unless Congress acts swiftly, because the Safety at Sea Act requires steel. The provisions of this act should never have been applied to the *Delta Queen* in the first place. They were designed for ocean-going vessels.

I recently introduced a bill which would correct this legislative mistake by exempting the *Delta Queen* from this act and preserving her from extinction. I have been gratified by the support I have received in this effort. In Clinton, Iowa, for example, over 900 people signed a petition to save the *Delta Queen*.

I sincerely hope that this bill will receive speedy and affirmative action by the Congress so that the *Delta Queen* may continue to inspire future generations of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Davenport, Iowa, Times-Democrat vividly describes what the *Delta Queen* means to America.

The article follows:

GOD SAVE THE GOOD OLD DELTA QUEEN

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Unless Congress does something between now and Nov. 2, the *Delta Queen*, the last real packet on the Mississippi River system, gets the ax from Uncle Sam.

The reason is ridiculous. A government agency has decreed that the "safety-at-sea" regulations, which outlaw any ship carrying more than 50 overnight passengers if it is not built entirely out of steel, must apply to riverboats as well.

For four years the *Delta Queen* has been operating under a temporary congressional reprieve. The *Queen's* hull is steel. But its superstructure, in the tradition of riverboats, is wood. The noble curved staircase is mahogany trimmed with brass. The deck is hand-pegged ironwood. The 28-foot stern wheel is made of planking, and the cabins are paneled in oak.

The Green Line of Cincinnati, which sends the *Delta Queen* on cruises down the Ohio and Mississippi and up the Tennessee and Cumberland, has made a valiant effort to meet the government demands.

Only two shipyards even bid on plans for an all-steel, diesel-electric monstrosity. The estimated cost was \$10 million. Not many American river-lovers could afford the fares necessary to amortize such an investment.

The safety-at-sea regulations were designed to protect passengers hundreds of miles from land and hours from help. A riverboat runs between river banks. Sure, there's some fire danger in a wooden superstructure. There is also a little danger in stacking up a dozen 707s over O'Hare on a night when the birds are walking. There's some danger in walking the streets of Washington in daylight.

To knock off the *Delta Queen* because of a law designed for ocean liners would be like pulling down the Tower of London because it doesn't meet city fire escape regulations for public places.

No one would think of allowing passengers to hang on the outside of a New York City bus, but people hang all over San Francisco's wonderful cable cars. If we are going to keep any flavor in America, somewhere there must be an area of common sense.

The *Delta Queen*, as all river buffs know, was not born to the inland rivers at all. She started life in 1926 on the overnight Sacramento-San Francisco run. Still, she looks like a riverboat except to us purists who would prefer the pilot house farther aft behind twin smokestacks abreast. She has a calliope, so she's really a hybrid of the *Eclipse* and the *Cotton Blossom*.

The *Delta Queen* goes eight miles an hour. She would drive the jet set bats. In his "life on the Mississippi," Mark Twain claims that he served as pilot on the John J. Roe, a boat so slow that they changed watches three times in a five-mile stretch. When the boat finally sank, he swore it was five years before the owner heard of it.

Even the Robert E. Lee, in its record-breaking 1870 race with the *Natchez*, took three days, 18 hours and 14 minutes to run the 1,218 miles from New Orleans to St. Louis.

The river is not for speed, but for an experience unlike any other travel adventure. On a boat breasting a stiff current, go-go types glare at the banks and chew their nails. River-lovers are relaxed. Steamboat captain Fred Vay puts it this way:

"They exist on a continent of their own, secure and steadfast; the boat is stationary; the shores do the moving, advancing, sliding by, retreating. The mountains slide apart and close again. You will wonder as you step ashore, suitcase in hand, whether you are entering the world of reality or departing from it."

I never rode the *Delta Queen*, although I've been aboard her at Cincinnati and New Orleans. But once I helped pilot 600 feet

of gasoline barges from Louisville to Baton Rouge, and by the time the five days ended I was a mainline addict.

The Ohio and the Mississippi above Alton are a series of beautiful slack-water lakes divided by dams and locks. But the lower Mississippi is a fractious beast for which charts are useless—gnawing at Tennessee, building up Arkansas, eating islands, piling up reefs, cutting new chutes, leaving isolated oxbows.

Most of the time you float through utter wilderness, for the flood plain between the levees is chancy land, given over to cypress and cottonwood, mysterious pools and Spanish moss. Beyond the levees there may be cities and super roads and locomotive horns and people standing in line. The river hears only the call of the heron, the splash of the muskrat and the gurgle of brown waters around the snag.

We need these things.
God save the Delta Queen

PRINCE EDWARD ACADEMY GRADUATION EXERCISES

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on Friday night, June 5, I had the privilege of attending the graduation exercises of the seniors of the Prince Edward Academy at Farmville, Va. I am indeed proud of the academy and the wonderful work that it is doing in educating many of the young people of Prince Edward County and some of the young people in adjoining areas.

When we are informed by the news media of the criminals assaulting citizens on our streets with impunity, crowds blocking the thoroughfares with demonstrations and marches, mobs burning and looting in our cities, students disrupting education in schools, colleges, and universities, I fear for the future of our Nation but sitting there in the audience during the graduation exercises of the Prince Edward Academy, I realized that many, many of our young people are dedicated to America and its great heritage. Here were a group of students who desired an education, who worked to obtain an education, whose parents sacrificed that these children might receive an education, that these young boys and girls might be equipped to go out into the world as God-fearing, liberty-loving, loyal citizens of America equipped to measure up to their responsibilities, duties, and obligations as citizens of a great nation coming from an area whose people inherently believe in good government, in law and order and that the best governed are the least governed, that it never was intended that the Government should take care of the people but rather that the people should support the Government. These young men and women were graduating from one of the finest schools in the Commonwealth of Virginia, made possible by the work, determination, and sacrifice on the part of many, many people who under great hardship and handicaps developed an educational system from scratch and second to none in our area.

I commend the graduates and all those who had a part in making these graduation exercises possible.

Mr. Speaker, an intricate part of the graduation exercises was an outstanding address by one of the students, Fred Hutcheson Hanbury, senior class speaker and treasurer of his class. The address is well prepared. It points out some of the problems confronting our people today. It impressed me so that I would like to share that address with all the Members of the Congress and others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He is a young man who has done better than well in school pointing out to us the pitfalls and giving us some sound advice. I commend it to those who are interested in the young people of today and who are determined to make tomorrow a better place in which to live.

Mr. Speaker, the address of Fred Hutcheson Hanbury, who is a wonderful student and is to be commended for applying himself so well, is as follows:

Mr. Helms, Dr. Hargrove, Mr. Redd, Mr. Kindle, Faculty, Parents, Guests, and Fellow Classmates:

It seems strange that we should use the word "commencement" to designate the day on which we set aside the school work we have carried for so many happy years. "Completion" would seem to be a more appropriate term.

But that would not be life, for in this world, everything that marks an end, also marks a beginning. The end of a day is the commencement of another. The end of a task, the beginning of a new one. The tree blossoms, bears fruit, sheds its foliage, and immediately begins preparation for another crop.

So it is with our education. What we have learned at school, valuable as it is, is only the beginning. The end of our school work merely means the commencement of these experiences which will put to the test the principles we have learned.

Tonight, graduating classes all over the country are entering a world of student unrest and campus disorders, which are a major concern to all of us. With this in mind, some people tend to denounce the younger generation as the cause of it all. Others take the opposing viewpoint that the on-coming generation is far superior in education and in knowledge of current affairs than their parents were at that time.

The real question is the underlying cause of the campus troubles today. It appears that students have become the self-appointed destroyers. They are aware of injustice; they want action; and action without experience simply means destruction. Having learned to destroy, they feel that's all it takes. DESTROY! Two very popular answers to this question are over affluence and a permissive society. Even though we are speaking of a very small minority here, it is said that the youth of today are over indulged with benefits such as cars and allowances. The same applies to the permissive restrictions placed on them by parents which allow them total freedom in making their own decisions.

With this background picture of society, our Senior Class selected a very positive motto which it feels is indicative of its youth. "We believe in minds that think, hearts that love, and hands that work." Let us analyze each portion of this motto as it applies to our lives.

First, We Believe in minds that think. Whether or not we have derived all the benefits from our classes is a matter between us and our conscience. Up to this time, our work has been directed and made

as easy and beneficial as trained minds could make it. From now on we must rely more and more upon our own efforts. The good we derive from our high school work will depend entirely on us. The success we make of our careers will likewise be due to our own initiative.

We have seen minds like Von Braun, Roosevelt, Lincoln, Edison, and Jefferson make their contribution to this world. These original thinkers seem to have certain things in common. First, there is the desire and ability to create—to do something original—something no one has ever done before. Second, there is the quality of persistence, the urge to keep going until it is finished, regardless of surroundings, poverty, or health. Third, there is that dissatisfaction which seems to be standard equipment of these men. Regardless of how outstanding their work appears to the world, they themselves were never satisfied with it and were sure that if they had it to do over they could have done a better job. Thinking minds are the blueprint for action. As we are controlled and completely governed by our thoughts, far greater care should be given to what we put into our minds than to what we eat and wear.

We have millions who are affected with mental laziness—those who are satisfied. They are easy thinkers. When a raw thought is given to them, they find it much easier to agree than to question it. And this is dangerous, especially if the idea is a bad one.

In the final analysis, we alone are responsible for our thoughts. We alone decide upon the choice of thinking that completely controls our life. We decide whether our thoughts are to be constructive or destructive, or whether they will be translated into good or evil action.

The Edisons and Einsteins were the long range thinkers of yesterday. What we want from the 1970 graduating class: Some long range thinkers of today.

The second portion of our motto: We believe in hearts that love. Several years ago there was a very popular song entitled "What This World Needs Is Love". Included in its lyrics was the phrase "That's the only thing there is too little of." What we need as graduating seniors is love—love for country and fellowman. Why is it so unfashionable to choke up with tears as the flag goes by? Why is it so unfashionable to beam with pride as our nation achieves greatness? Why is it so unfashionable to pray for the safety of our astronauts and soldiers in Vietnam?

As 8th graders read Edward Hale's "The Man Without A Country". Philip Nolan was a hot-headed youth with a sharp tongue. He made a rash statement before a military court as he said, "Dam it. I wish I may never hear of the United States again. Dam the United States." His wish was carried out as he spent a lonely life on a vessel at sea. When he died, the Captain found a slip of paper on which was written the following, "He loved his country as no other man has loved it, but no man deserved less at her hand." Philip Nolan did not appreciate his country until it was taken from him. We, as the Class of 1970, must not be apathetic. We must be willing to fight and even die, and love it as those before us have done. If Americans don't wake up, they will soon discover their nation has been snatched from them. Then it will be too late to appreciate her.

Our world today is bound together by a system of communications. We can no longer ignore the fate of people half-way around the world nor can we live in an isolated state. In the story of the Good Samaritan we are told to be a neighbor to all mankind, regardless of religious beliefs, race, color or creed. As Seniors, we must accept the challenge to love our fellowmen. May we be like Lee who loved his Virginia, Churchill who loved his England, and Schweitzer who loved his Africa. Grant that we may put out of our

hearts all the hatred, prejudice, and selfishness, and make love the ruling motive of our lives.

The final portion of our motto: "We believe in hands that work." Man must work. But he can either work grudgingly, or he may work gratefully; he may work as a man, or he may work as a machine. There is no work so rude that he may not exalt it; no work so impassive that he may not breathe a soul into it; no work so dull that he may not enliven it.

Let's divide the people of the world into three classes: There are few who work and make things happen; There are many who watch things happen; and the vast majority who have no idea of what happens. We need more people who are willing to work to make things happen. Creative, inventive, original work is grueling hard work. It involves a persistence and a love of work with which few men are gifted, and is seldom accomplished except under pressure.

We frequently hear expressed the statement that pioneering days are over; that all the land and water have been discovered; all the wilderness explored, and all the great machines invented, however, our educational system is the result of all this work. It is like the foundation of a building which we fix ready for our use. We have only to accept it; to take advantage of the work of others over the centuries which have preceded us, building as high as we wish, and giving our structure what form we desire it to take.

In the true sense, we are still pioneers in a world yet filled with adventure and romance. As long as we have ambition and dreams, there will be pioneers in every field of endeavor. When such dreaming stops, civilization will cease to be. If we wish to be one of these pioneers, the surest way to attain that end is to accept the work already done by those who preceded us. Then we must continue to work. The better the foundation we lay now, the better will be the structure which we can build upon it. In speaking to the Class of 1970, we must be willing to work for our dreams and goals. There is no record of anybody ever being drowned in sweat.

With our motto: "We believe in minds that think, hearts that love, and hands that work," we are well equipped. The fact that we are receiving our diplomas tonight proved that we have intelligence, that we are concerned, that we know how to work, and that we are ambitious. These qualities should carry us far. This is best illustrated in the words of Robert Browning as he said, "A man's reach must exceed his grasp or what's a heaven for."

As we leave the school doors for the last time and commence to a larger life, may our hopes and dreams be realized to the fullest degree. In years to come, may our names reflect credit upon Prince Edward Academy which has been our home during the formative period of our life. Thank you.

PRIVACY AND THE AGE OF COMPUTERS

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the process of legislative reorganization, computer services will become increasingly important assets to the Congress. This is not only the space age, but we are also involved in "the computer age." The computer will provide fantastic benefits to mankind in increas-

ing the efficiency of man's work and in supplying him with ready and almost instant access to the accumulated knowledge of history.

Of course, the computer also poses a potential threat to our privacy without adequate controls of the use of such information.

This subject, which is both fascinating and important, is discussed in what I believe was an excellent speech by Robert P. Henderson, vice president and general manager of the Electronic Data Processing Division of Honeywell, Inc., on June 9 before a national symposium of the National Archives and Record Service—GSA—in Washington, D.C. His company, which is a national leader in the computer field, is located in Wellesley Hills, Mass., in my district. I am privileged to insert the speech in the RECORD.

It is thought provoking, and a major contribution to our understanding of the possibilities ahead in "the computer age." I recommend it strongly as important reading to my colleagues. The text follows:

RECORDKEEPING IN THE SPACE AGE (By Robert P. Henderson)

It is a great pleasure to be here with all of you today, and to have this opportunity to discuss some of the problems and opportunities that we share in this very vital area of "Recordkeeping in the Space Age."

Space age? Yes, we certainly have entered this most adventurous era in man's history. But I can't help feeling that an even more meaningful description of the time in which we now live is "The Computer Age."

I don't say that just because computers are my field and my overriding interest. I say it because I think that the computer already exerts—and will increasingly exert—a more compelling influence on the life of the average citizen than the exploration of space—as thrilling as that may be. In fact, it hardly needs saying that there would not be any space program without the technological advances which we loosely lump under the heading of "computers."

Precisely because the computer's potential effects on society are so important, it has generated a good deal of controversy.

On the one hand the computer is seen as the great servant of mankind. It has come along just when it is most needed to help solve many of the complex social and economic problems which threaten to overwhelm us today. It is a miraculous extension of man's intellect, with implications so broad that no one can even begin to predict its ultimate uses.

That's one view of the computer—but by no means the only one.

The man on the street, with only a vague comprehension of it as some sort of mechanical brain, may regard it as a threat to his job. Or he may see it as an impersonal compounding of errors that show up from time to time on various printed statements—an inhuman device designed to frustrate him by his inability to get past it to the very human person who is really responsible for the mistakes.

If that sort of view represented the only criticism of the computer, there wouldn't be too much for us to worry about. It is easy to demonstrate that computers create far more jobs than they eliminate. And the errors blamed on them are indeed chargeable to people who probably would have committed them even if the computer had never been invented.

There is criticism, however, of an entirely different sort that *does* worry me. It comes from some very learned and thoughtful people. They don't see the computer as a

monster, which it is not. They don't see it as the ultimate master of mankind, which it will never be. They see it, rather, as facilitating radical realignment of knowledge—and therefore of power. This they regard as a very dangerous possibility—and so do I: a new sort of computerized power politics. But I don't regard it as *inevitable*, so what I'd like to get across to you today are some personal observations about future computer developments in four areas:

First, the great benefits that lie ahead of us;

Second, the dangerous side effects that could threaten some of our prized individual freedoms;

Third, what can be done—and *must* be done—to avoid that sort of perversion of computer technology; and

Fourth, steps already being taken to insure that the computer always serves the individual and never the other way around.

In their potential benefit to society, computers today are ready to take off in a big way. Most of our ideas about them in the '60s need to be discarded or at least radically revised. Arthur Humphreys, managing director of International Computers, Limited, in England, has pointed out that we must stop thinking of computers merely as a way to *save money*. In their ability to perform far more demanding and complex assignments than they have ever been given, computers have become a means of *making money*—of creating new wealth.

In the past a great deal of effort has been directed toward making the most efficient use of computers *as they existed*. This was fine for miscellaneous back office applications, but now managers must think of developing computer systems that are specifically geared to *their needs* and the needs of the people who work for them. It is the decision-making process that should receive major attention. Some observers—including Mr. Humphreys—even foresee the old functions of programming passing from the picture.

How will this happen? We will see systems analysts working directly with individual line managers. By learning to understand managers' problems in the light of practical day-to-day business, the analysts can evolve appropriate solutions through the establishment and manipulation of data by computer.

Thus it will be people who best understand management's problems who see a data system through from conception to implementation. With this close user involvement, there will be little or no need for intervening technical or programming specialists.

Up to now the computer industry has had very limited success in persuading management to utilize computer-processed data in their decisionmaking. And I think much of management's resistance has been because they didn't know how to change the way they called for information. New management information systems will be more practical. They will conform to the reality of the human beings they are devised to serve. And the result will be an invaluable data base for an organization's operational and planning activities. In fact, I would hope to see it providing information on day-to-day operations to a point where managers feel unable to function efficiently without constant updating of the data base.

In this way the computer will become a true management innovation, giving executives the time for deeper and more astute consideration of their decisions. You might say it will even put them a bit on the spot—by relieving them of any excuses for not exercising the highest degree of creative thinking and good judgment. Flying by the seat of your pants will be out.

Another extremely significant development in the '70s will be the linking together of the isolated and independent computer systems of the last decade. Data and pro-

grams will begin to flow together in enormous national—and even international—data grids.

This becomes possible through two important advances in computer technology:

First, new time-sharing potential permits simultaneous on-line access to many users at remotely located terminals;

Second, mass memories are becoming available with a capacity for files of almost unlimited size.

One of the great benefits of these large new computer systems will be their ready access to many people in both a physical and intellectual way. Terminal devices through which people can communicate with the computer systems will enable them to converse with the data bank as easily and familiarly as with their human colleagues. In effect, each man will be able to use the computer as a means of building upon the work of others. Just as he will use data generated by the activities of others, he can generate his own data for their use.

The result can be an eventual pyramiding of man's knowledge and intellectual accomplishment that is staggering to consider. There are those who even foresee a time—we are no longer speaking of the '70s, of course—when all of the information available in the world can be stored and constantly updated in computer memory. From terminals in every large city in every country scholars and others could query the computer to search its memory on any subject—and thereby instantly find and receive the required information. Where a Harvard graduate student, for example, now enjoys the privileged position of working within that institution's great library stacks, that same capability—and even better—would become available to anyone who wanted it wherever he might be.

In a modest way, this sort of thing is already being done. The Library of Congress provides computerized bibliography service on its some 70 million books and documents. The Smithsonian Institution now keeps track of its multitude of exhibits and specimens by computer. Aspen Systems has the legal statutes of all 50 states computerized by subject matter and can provide immediate summaries for any jurisdiction.

Today a brilliant lawyer may diligently track down some remote case history that will favor his side in a trial. Tomorrow vast computerized legal files could produce such histories quickly and easily for all lawyers, freeing their time for other constructive activities. The result could not only help to clarify our laws and their interpretation. It could reduce the costs of cases and relieve our overtaxed court facilities by enabling them to dispense justice more rapidly and efficiently.

Another important area of our lives where computer data banks can benefit us is in the maintenance of our health. Every citizen's complete medical history can be recorded within a national data network. Wherever he may go, from coast to coast, this history will always be immediately available to any doctor or any hospital should he suffer an accident or illness. No more mistakes involving blood type or allergy to certain drugs or lack of information on past disabilities. And oceans of correspondence and paper work in triplicate will be eliminated from the burden carried by our overworked medical profession.

Doctors may also use data banks to assist them in making a patient diagnosis. In much the same way that lawyers could obtain help in plotting a case. Today if you take a complaint of illness to your doctor, he will make his diagnosis by running through his memory to search out similarity of symptoms. He may refer to certain books in his library or call in other consultants who can search through their memories and thereby assist him with their experience.

But suppose we have a vast computerized

file of case histories at your doctor's disposal. Within minutes the computer can search its memory against a given set of symptoms and list every possible diagnosis for the doctor's consideration. This is not to say that the computer will make the diagnosis. That will always remain a human function, but as an extension of the human memory, the computer can play an invaluable role.

Since I don't want to spend all of my time with you today in presenting the positive benefits available to us through rapidly advancing computer technology, I will mention only one more example—education.

Even the most gifted teacher cannot simultaneously satisfy the individual needs of each student in a class—particularly when the student population explosion gives us classes of from 30 to 100 or more. But consider a computerized instructional system which supplies each student with material controlled by a program specifically suited to his needs. Again we are not replacing people with computers. But we are giving the teacher the equivalent of dozens of personal assistants whose work with students can be monitored by the teacher and modified as he may deem necessary. At the same time the teacher would have more time to give direct help to students as required.

In considering all the benefits of a computerized society, we must remember that they depend primarily upon two developments:

vastly increasing the capacity, complexity and accessibility of computer systems;

and, storing within their memories not only an infinite amount of academic information, but also a great deal of highly personal information about us—the people who will be looking to these new systems for assistance.

For example, we obviously cannot solve a problem such as poverty without maintaining extensive records about the recipients of welfare programs, job training programs, educational programs. And only a computer can take records of such size and scope and help us reach coordinated decisions and conclusions.

As the same time, there is a natural human dislike of becoming a statistic—particularly when the statistic grows into a lengthy dossier providing more or less intimate details about one's person and one's daily living habits. And even more particularly when that dossier is secreted within a vast, impersonal, electronic information system to which any number of unknown persons may have access for any number of unknown reasons.

Privacy is one of our most precious human rights, and in today's crowded and disorderly environment, it may be one of the hardest to maintain. Long before the pressures of 1970, Louis Brandeis described privacy as "the right to be let alone, the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized man."

The computer does not in itself create any invasion of privacy. Its role is no more active in this respect than the old-fashioned filing cabinet. The threat to privacy posed by surveillance and record-keeping has been a fact of life for centuries.

The only new element introduced into this picture by the computer is fantastic efficiency. I believe that is what people really fear, and that is the problem that must be faced. For there is no way to halt computerization any more than the Luddites of 19th century England could halt the Industrial Revolution.

As Professor Robert Fano of MIT has said, "You can never stop these things. It is like trying to prevent a river from flowing to the sea. What you have to do is to build dams, to build waterworks, to control the flow."

It is toward building those dams and controlling that flow of information that I want to address the rest of my remarks. Because I feel very deeply that computer manufac-

turers are among those who must assume heavy responsibility in the matter, responsibility which needs to be defined and implemented.

We have too many examples around us today of how technology failed to look ahead at problems which it might accelerate, even if it did not really create them. Pollution of our environment is one, and now we must reckon with the human consequences of pollution of privacy.

The computer industry cannot solve the problem alone, but there is a great deal that it can do, both technically and ethically.

Technically we can build safeguards into system design. We can make it possible to limit those who are allowed to put information into a system. We can even have the machines check data against a given set of values and reject questionable information. In fact, all input could be classified as it is received, ranging from material of public record to top secret. Sensitive information then could be encoded during the input process.

Similarly, there can be ingenious safeguards in the delivery of information. The computer can require a password or answers to a series of questions before printing out. It could require several persons to be present, each possessing separate parts of a code. According to the password a person possessed, the computer could limit access to a specific type of information. It could have intelligence built in to detect any unusual pattern of access request—hesitation, for example. It could record each request so as to pinpoint blame later if information is misused. It could be constructed to read badges and other forms of physical identification—or even compare the user's voice to a "voice print" stored within it.

There are many more possible examples of technical security systems which I might describe—not to mention increasingly ingenious ones which may be developed in years to come. Yes, our machines can do a lot to protect the privacy of computerized records—particularly if you compare them to a flimsily locked filing cabinet or even a safe. But really determined men, unfortunately, can find ways to get around the best security systems. Practically speaking, we regard Fort Knox as inviolable. In an absolute sense, of course, it is not. The late author, Ian Fleming, even wrote a James Bond thriller, I recall, suggesting an imaginative means of attack.

So we must consider more than physical safeguards. Obviously the trustworthiness of the operating personnel is an important factor, and management should exercise sensitive control here. What goes into files is also a management decision, and perhaps the question needs to be asked more frequently, "Is this information really necessary?" Do employers, for example, really need to know all about the emotions, personal habits, attitudes and beliefs of their employees—or could they be satisfied to judge their work performance objectively?

The burden of answering questions from all sides is growing for the average man. All of us are leaving a longer and longer trail behind us of information gained by birth records, employment records, Social Security, Selective Service, police, hospitals, credit bureaus, Internal Revenue Service, the Census.

Credit cards establish in the checkless society where we eat and shop and how much we spend. In the cashless society to come, even the smallest transactions may be fed instantly into central computers to put every detail of our daily life on record. If you knock off work mid-afternoons to take in a movie or go out to the golf course, that tiny transgression may be irrefutably noted when your account card is processed at the box office or club house.

If we cannot stop this relentless flow of

information about ourselves into central files, we can do as Professor Fano suggests—build a dam here, a filtering system there to control it. For example, trivial information—such as that visit to the movie or the golf course—could be recorded on independent data systems which are periodically erased. A time limit on all personal data might be a good idea—so that a youthful indiscretion wouldn't haunt a man's records for the rest of his life.

Frankly I feel that we will need some new legislation in this area. Our old legal framework may not be adequate to defend our privacy against these new techniques of data collection and record-keeping.

Perhaps the most important new legal safeguard would provide a citizen with the ability to challenge in court the release of private data about him without his consent. *Without his consent.* Those are very meaningful words.

Professor Alan Westin, in his widely read book "Privacy and Freedom," has defined privacy as "the claim of individuals, groups or institutions to determine for themselves when, how, and to what extent information about them is communicated to others . . . (although he adds) The individual's desire for privacy is never absolute, since participation in society is an equally powerful desire."

Professor Westin's point is that circumstances may determine whether a man wants to share or withhold information about himself—even information which may be stored in some remote computer system. If he is to have any control, he must be aware that it is there and have the right to examine it and challenge it. He must be able to know who has access to the information and to what outside agents it may be released.

These are some of the things, I believe, that would have to be covered by new legislation. Such legislation might make personal information a property right, with all of the protections and guarantees of due process that our laws have devised for our property. This could involve criminal penalties for improper conduct in gathering, storing or releasing personal information.

In addition to new statutory laws, there is one other area which deserves our attention. You might call this "public education" in a very broad sense. This may sound strange, coming from a representative of the computer industry, but I believe that it is important to get the general public involved in thinking about and discussing the problems generated by computerized record-keeping.

The weight of public opinion can do a great deal toward influencing constructive public policies, voluntary ethical codes among users of computer systems, and standards of practice among businesses, government agencies, labor unions, universities, research projects and various other organizations.

Happily there are some strong, constructive forces already at work. The Russell Sage Foundation is funding several projects including an in-depth study on data banks and personal privacy by the National Academy of Sciences. Professor Westin is directing the project assisted by a distinguished group of advisers.

The Business Equipment Manufacturers Association has a new Committee on Matters of Privacy and Security which is actively seeking to find feasible solutions to the problems. For we are concerned and want to contribute positively to resolving these complex issues which can have such a profound effect on our personal freedom and the operation of our society. As members of the world's fastest growing industry, there is no reason why we cannot exert a strong influence on the ethical standards governing the use of our products.

Very simply, there are two directions in

which computerized and centralized information systems can take us. One would lead us to a rigid, automated bureaucracy with great knowledge and power but little regard for the human consequences of its program.

The other would enlist the power of computers in the service of individuals, enabling them to cope more successfully with the complexities of modern life and increasing the opportunities for successful fulfillment of their talents.

It is never enough just to invent something—the printing press, the automobile, television, or computers. It is how we use these products that counts. Technological advances must be adapted to serve people, and good intentions will not suffice.

It is the time ever comes when the misuse of computerized record-keeping leads man to fear being curious, daring, and willing to deviate from the norm in order to experiment, it would not be a case of the machine triumphing over man, as some people fear. It would be a case of man *becoming* the machine.

May I say again that the computer manufacturing industry feels a heavy responsibility in this regard. We believe that society has no choice but to use computer aids in relieving the tensions and solving the problems of our age. We are thankful that our products now have the capacity to help achieve these beneficial results. And we see no reason why personal privacy and human dignity should be sacrificed in the process. Thank you.

THIS HALLOWED GROUND

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an appreciation of our national heritage rightfully includes knowledge and respect for the contributions made to America by immigrants from abroad. Mr. Henry Archacki, noted historian, recently produced a story dealing with contributions of early Polish immigrants to this country. The article was carried in the *Guard*, the official weekly of the Polish National Union in Scranton, Pa.:

THIS HALLOWED GROUND

(By Henry Archacki)

Memorial Day gave most of us cause to remember those near and dear who have passed beyond the veil.

Our own thoughts went back to another May 30, 1884 when the life of one Paul Sobolewski ended in his one room habitat in Chicago.

In our day Paul Sobolewski is just another name. In the life and times of Sobolewski (1817-1884), the man himself was unique!

Born in Poland on June 16, 1817 Pawel Sobolewski was a delight to his parents. He was a precocious child. His intelligence and interest exceeded his years.

At age 14 young Pawel dropped out of school to join the Polish Uprising of 1831. By the time he was 17 Sobolewski had fought and was imprisoned for his part in the Insurrection. He became the youngest of the 234 Polish exiles shipped to America in 1834 by the Austrian government.

First in Philadelphia and later New York, the precocious Paul had mastered the English language and with his fellow exile, a talented engraver, Eustache Wyszynski, launched the first English-Polish periodical titled "Poland," which appeared in 1842. It was beautifully printed and illustrated and sold for fifty cents per issue.

FATHERED AMERICAN POLISH JOURNALISM

The "Poland" publication lasted through four issues and folded but in time history was to call 26-year-old Paul Sobolewski the Father of Polish American Journalism!

Sobolewski was to father other firsts: He translated "Jeszcze Polska Nie Zginieła" into English and put out the words and music in a handsome folio form . . . He authored the first Polish-English dictionary, the manuscript was lost on a ship that sank on its way to England where it was to be printed . . . As a poet he became intimate with Longfellow and Whittier . . . His feeling for Polish poetry was to prompt him into publishing the first volume of "Poets and Poetry of Poland" in English translation—a handsome 500 page edition. That effort came in the apex of his life when Sobolewski found himself in Chicago where he became mentor to the growing Polonia there. Here he fathered the first Polish theatre. Here he lived long enough to enjoy a reunion with some of his exiled compatriots when the first big Polish parade in America marked the 200th anniversary of Sobieski's victory over the Turks at Vienna. He wrote the program notes for that occasion.

Here too, Paul Sobolewski was to die on May 30, 1884—a proud Pole but as poor as a church mouse!

The precocious child had more than fulfilled his promise—but not in terms of monetary gain.

Under the circumstances a pauper's grave would have awaited the mortal remains of Paul Sobolewski. But one of the older Polish exiles, Edward Wilkoszewski, had bought in 1857 a plot of twelve graves in Graceland Cemetery in Chicago. He buried some of his children there and eventually sold the plot to Stanislaw Kociemski who buried a daughter, Florentyna Kociemska there April 29, 1878.

It was Stanislaw Kociemski who offered a last resting place for Paul Sobolewski. Before Kociemski was laid to rest in this plot, he was to carve out a name for himself as a civic leader.

STANISLAW KOCIEMSKI, SECOND PNA PRESIDENT

Stanislaw Kociemski came to Chicago in 1854. In 1866 he was one of the founders of "Gmina Polska." With the founding of the Polish National Alliance of North America, in 1880, Kociemski became its first cashier or treasurer. Two years later he was elected second president of the PNA succeeding Maximilian Kucera. Kociemski was reelected in 1883 and 1884 and once again in 1889, this time as Fifth PNA President.

These were the formative and crucial years of the Polish National Alliance and thanks to Kociemski's leadership the fledgling fraternal organization took root and grew into the greatest such Polish American institution in the country.

Stanislaw Kociemski died on February 15, 1904, and was buried next to the man who had served as his mentor, neighbor and inspiration in all things Polish—Paul Sobolewski.

The last burial in this Graceland Cemetery was that of Stefan Kociemski who died August 6, 1913. This Kociemski plot now housed nine adults and twelve children. Only a family friend, Antoni Drezmal, who died May 27, 1901, had a marker put up. Over the rest, the earth was to lay silent for a quarter century until the young historian, Edmund L. Kowalczyk, working as Mieczyslaw Haijan's assistant in the PRCU Museum and Archives, went out to Graceland Cemetery and then wrote a short article on his findings.

Another fifteen years was to pass before this hallowed ground came to the attention of the undersigned, who then was serving as National Chairman of the American Polish Civil War Centennial Committee. Paul Sobolewski

lewski, at 46, tried to volunteer for the Union Cause in Illinois but his age and a bad left eye prevented that. So he did the next best thing. Being a lecturer, he turned over the proceeds to Civil War widows and orphans. That seemed cause enough to render Sobolewski an APCWCC tribute.

AN UNMARKED GRAVE

This tribute became even more manifest when it was learned that Paul Sobolewski lay in an unmarked grave. Therefore the APCWCC asked its Mid-West Coordinator, Dr. Edward C. Rozanski, to raise a suitable headstone and have it unveiled with appropriate ceremony. Dr. Rozanski fulfilled this assignment with rare dedication.

The Paul Sobolewski Memorial Stone was unveiled on October 24, 1966 in an hour long ceremony distinguished by the representation of many military, fraternal and civic organizations—but in paying tribute to Paul Sobolewski, it was learned that Stanislaw Kociemski, Second and Fifth President of the Polish National Alliance also lay in this hallowed ground without visual recognition.

SEQUEL

This year, four years later, a sequel is about to take place.

Marking the 90th anniversary of the founding of the Polish National Alliance, it has been decreed by President Aloysius Mazewski and the PNA Board that an appropriate marker be erected over the grave of Stanislaw Kociemski and dedicated with proper ceremonies . . . Dr. Rozanski once again, heads the Committee.

Thus this hallowed ground which has lain fallow for so many years will now bloom with memorials to two of Polonia's finest sons:

Paul Sobolewski, 1817-84.

Stanislaw Kociemski, 1827-1904.

AFTER TROOP WITHDRAWAL—A REALISTIC APPRAISAL BY COMMANDANT CHAPMAN

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, this past Tuesday, June 23, 1970, I had the privilege of attending a luncheon at the National Press Club at which the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. Leonard F. Chapman, Jr., was the principal speaker.

General Chapman spoke very realistically of the situation that our country is faced with today in regard to Vietnam and our withdrawal of forces in that area and, specifically, where this leaves our great country and its inherent requirement and dependence on seapower. His comments related to the future situation that will face this country, rather than to the past or current situation.

I highly recommend that all concerned with the future defense posture of our country read the Commandant's speech and the subsequent questions and answers.

Mr. Speaker, I include General Chapman's speech, with questions and answers, including his introduction by Michael Hudoba, president of the National Press Club, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ADDRESS BY COMMANDANT CHAPMAN

Michael Hudoba, President of National Press Club: Ladies and gentlemen . . . our

guest speaker today is Chief of the world's best volunteer fire department . . . namely 281,301 United States Marines.

As such, he sits in council with other military chiefs as a trusted advisor . . . to a former Navy Lieutenant. And since all three of our most recent Commanders-in-Chief have been former Navy Lieutenants, one wonders what moral that draws for young officers in the Marine Corps and Navy.

As the Commander of 41,000 gallant young fighting Americans in South Vietnam, he brings to his position a special understanding and sympathy . . . having served with heroism in World War II, the Korean conflict and Viet Nam.

When not in the combat zones, he was known for his heroism in fighting computers and politicians in the Pentagon.

Our guest was born in Key West, Florida in 1913. In 1935, there was a single Marine Commission open for a University of Florida graduate . . . and our speaker successfully jumped at it. He is a distinguished product of the ROTC program.

He has always had a remarkable relationship with the press . . . for a general . . . and that may stem from the fact that his father was a newspaperman.

His convictions on the conflict in South Viet Nam are deep and personal. Two of his sons have served there, and one has been wounded there.

After a series of responsible positions with the Marine Corps, divided about equally between staff and combat, our speaker became the 24th Commandant of the Corps in January, 1968.

As Commandant, he has favored, among other things . . . cutting the Corps back to an elite all-volunteer force.

We note, General, that things are changing within the Corps. Not only is longer hair allowed . . . but a more liberal policy on marital status is now in force.

Our speaker met his wife, Emily, at his first duty station at Quantico. In those days . . . Marines were not permitted to marry during the first two years, and Lieutenants were not allowed to have wives. Since Lieutenant Chapman had to cool it a bit then, we shall no longer delay him on this occasion.

It is my privilege to present the Commandant of the United States Marine Corps . . . General Leonard F. Chapman, Jr.

General Chapman:

Well, distinguished guests, gentlemen, I want to thank you Mr. President for that introduction. I'm just glad you pronounced my name clearly because I wasn't sure I was the one you were talking about.

When I came into the Marine Corps 35 years ago, one of the first things I was told was that if the Marine Corps had wanted me to have a wife they'd have issued me one. But I find that has changed quite a bit. As a matter of fact, I seldom enter a hazardous situation without thinking about the support my wife has given me all these many years. Without her, I wouldn't be here today. As a matter of fact, she's in another room listening to what I say just to be sure!

Well after that laudatory introduction, Mr. Hudoba. I understand better what Will Rogers said quite a number of years ago after he had been introduced in a similar fashion. "I really appreciate those kind words," he said, "I'm just sorry that my parents weren't here to hear them because my father would have enjoyed them and my mother would have believed them."

But being here today before this distinguished audience, an audience which has the capacity to influence public opinion to a degree that's formidable and unparalleled, I can think of another statement that that Oklahoma Sage made many years ago when he was speaking to a group of horse breeders. "There aren't many people that know as much about horses as I do," he said, "It's

just my bad luck to have all of you here this afternoon."

And that's why I have here with me today the Marine I always want with me in every hazardous situation—a veteran of three wars, the wearer of many decorations for valor, the Sergeant Major of the Marine Corps, Sergeant Major Joseph Dalley. If I find a question I can't answer, I'm sure the Sergeant Major can.

And I want to take this opportunity, on a very serious note, however, to salute one of your own members. A fine Pulitzer Prize winning reporter, a member of the National Press Club, a gallant Marine, Jim Lucas, who at this time is fighting the last great battle. He's fighting for his life stricken with cancer.

I am sincerely grateful for this opportunity to be with you today—for the chance to be able to talk to you about some of the problems affecting American defense. You are expert observers of these problems; you have seen them grow and develop; you know their sources and their powers. And now, because you are expert observers, I think I can get right to the basics. And today, in 1970, these problems are basic only in their positions, not in their structures.

America's place in a new world; the contemporary American social thrust; communications between the American people and their armed forces; money and equipment; manpower and the draft; purpose and quality—all of these are problems that affect the present and future defense of this great country of ours. And, of course, there is the major overriding problem of American defense—indeed of American life itself—and that's the war in Indochina.

"The war in Indochina." The newness of that term is an incongruity in itself. The plain and simple truth is, that this conflict has been "the war in Indochina" since long before the American entrance. Ever since Hanoi began applying military pressure against the Republic of Vietnam, against Cambodia, and against Laos—first with auxiliary guerrilla forces, and finally with full-scale regular divisions—North Vietnam has been making war all through Indochina.

When the United States entered this war with ground forces in 1965, we committed ourselves to blocking the invasion of the Republic of Vietnam, and neutralizing Hanoi's grip on that country. We, and our allies, stepped into a war limiting ourselves to the area under attack. But only we were restricted by these limitations, not Hanoi. Hanoi's limits were simply set by the length of her reach, and Hanoi has made the very most of this freedom of movement.

This free movement has, for these many years, curved and stretched through the entire area of Indochina. How effective that freedom has been is evidenced in the massive number of troops and weapons that have been transported from the north through Laos and Cambodia, and employed at will against Americans and Vietnamese who were themselves limited to the bulls-eye of the Republic of Vietnam.

How limited Hanoi's war had been, can best be described perhaps by the Vietnamese and Americans who have managed to bring peace to regions within our limited area of operations, only to see that peace torn to shreds again and again by the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong forces pouring in at will, from their out-of-bounds sanctuaries. There have been some terrible examples of that recently, including a rise in assassinations. And I imagine that the captured Americans and Vietnamese who have been transported from the Republic of Vietnam to prison camps in Cambodia, Laos, and North Vietnam would also have some comments on the newness of the term "the war in Indochina."

Well, American participation in the war in Indochina is drawing to a close. Vietnamization is working, and it's working well in my opinion. And because we have been able to

destroy enemy supplies and bases in Cambodia, Vietnamization is going to work even better and faster in the next several months.

At the height of the American commitment in Vietnam, the Marine Corps was short by only one regiment of having three Marine divisions—with accompanying air, artillery, and logistics support—actually in Vietnam. Now since this past March, when the 26th Marine Regiment came home, we have been down to one Marine division, one Marine aircraft wing, and the normal supporting forces for those units, left in that country. And, in the months ahead, more Marines will come out as part of the President's continuing redeployment plan. Now, this is only a percentile picture of the overall American effort in Vietnamization. By order of our President, and in accordance with the wishes of the majority of the American people, we are departing Vietnam. And in accordance with the tenor of that command and those wishes, we are departing—not deserting.

But even after the last American has departed Vietnam, and this war has become a past issue, it's still going to remain a problem of American defense. It will remain a problem not because of its cause, its purpose, or its results—but because of its timing. Timing in that its duration has stretched far beyond the experience of other American conflicts.

For Americans are tired of war—and not just this war, but all war. Americans are tired of the preparations for war—and tired of the hardware and the posture such preparations impose. But that hardware and that posture is necessary for defense, too.

And yet it's no wonder we are weary. For 30 years, ever since 1940, we have had to work hard toward preparations for defense. For more than 12 of these 30 years, American fighting men have actually been engaged in combat. Because of this we are sincerely looking for new ways to establish a lasting peace. Some Americans are even to the point of considering the possibility of stacking all weapons, and simply announcing "we quit." Well that's a fresh approach in the 20th Century, and it might work. But what if it doesn't work? Where would the hope of a new America be, if quitting our defenses invited destruction?

For this is indeed a new world, totally different than the world of 1940-to-1960. And America is finding a new place in this new world. But I want to point out its very newness presents some new dangers.

Now, as we disengage from combat in Vietnam and look inward in our country, other nations are looking outward. Now, as we grow tired of our defensive machinery and begin a reduction in force, other countries are building up their military and their naval power. Well, if we are going to look inward, and seek a new level of defensive strength, we must look very carefully, and we must match that strength to the possible test that it may have to face.

So at this point, I'd like to cut away some of the rhetoric growing so abundantly in our national garden on this subject. Because behind that rhetoric is the single and simple purpose of American arms in the 1970's. And that purpose, quite simply, is the defense of the American people. I think that purpose is strong enough to stand without the aid of a great many adjectives. And I think that purpose is honest enough to survive the fashionable accusations of today. But as strong and as honest as the purpose of American defense may be, it must constantly seek its probable level of useful application in a real environment.

Well, our *real environment* is that of a giant island. Surrounded by the two largest oceans of this earth, and blessed with the best of warm water ports, we have traditionally looked to the sea for our security and for strength. In our past our environment provided us with the very real security of space and time. The sea presented a mass

of space to be overcome by any potential enemy, and that gave us time to prepare.

Because of friendly space and time, we were able to develop a doctrine of "wait it out." But now, that period of American defense has passed. Now, technology has compressed space and has rushed the clock. Space and time can no longer be counted as mainstays of American security.

But the sea, the great oceans are still there, and we still have the capability of using them as an ally. There are two very good reasons for this, I think.

First, a rough nuclear parity now exists between the two major powers of the world. It's a parity both in hardware and I think in human desire. We have made it crystal clear that it is not our policy to consider a first nuclear strike. And we sincerely hope, and we really don't believe, that any nation would be insane enough to unleash the destruction of mankind.

And that same rough parity secondly covers—to a lesser degree—the possibilities of a full confrontation of large armies and air forces in massive land war.

And this parity shall remain as long as we can maintain a sufficient defense against these threats.

So we are again back to our oceans, technically much narrower, but they're still there to serve us. But it isn't the lonely sea anymore; we find—in 1970—that after centuries of false starts, Russia has made her way into the oceans. Now, along with missiles, a first class army, and a powerful air force; Soviet Russia has become a sea power.

There is no doubt that Russia has developed her navy to the point that it dares challenge our position on the high seas. In April of this year, the Soviet Navy conducted a world-wide naval exercise involving more than 200 ships. And there are more. Sleek and fast new cruisers, destroyers, and large torpedo boats—all missile armed—have shown themselves in strong, bold formations in the Mediterranean, in the Indian Ocean, and even the sea historians love to call "an American lake"—the Caribbean. More than 350 Soviet submarines, nuclear as well as conventional, show themselves little, but they make their presence felt all over the world.

Among these new Soviet vessels are two rather unusual looking ships, the Moscow and the Leningrad—they're helicopter carriers. Obviously fitted out and operating as antisubmarine warfare ships, they each have a collateral purpose that I find particularly interesting. They are capable of putting ashore by helicopter, self contained Soviet Marine landing forces.

Yes, Russia does have Marines. Actually they are called Soviet Naval Infantry, and they have reemerged, after years of deactivation, as an elite force of 7 well-trained brigades. Cruising with Soviet ships, this force of naval infantry gives a new depth to Soviet foreign policy—a depth the world has already felt.

Transported in tank landing ships, much like our own LST's, the Soviet Naval Infantry battalions each number about 500 men. Equipped with amphibian tanks, and sea-going tracked amphibian personnel carriers, their presence with the fleet gives the Soviet Navy the ability to project its strength ashore. Their existence provides Russia with a force in readiness capable of establishing a beach head, and forcing entry onto any shore far beyond the land mass of Europe and Asia. This, backed up by powerful landing and air forces capable of exploiting an amphibious landing, adds a new dimension to the sea on our flanks.

And despite recent internal turmoil and confrontations with the Soviet Union, Communist China continues to grow in strength. Already possessing a nuclear capability and increasing missile power, Red China stepped into the space age two months ago when she launched her first space satellite. She too,

is blessed with good ports, and always looking for other means of world influence, and it's only a matter of time before she too looks seaward.

But, gentlemen, the sea is not primarily a place of war. It is, in its truest form, a means of commerce and of world trade, a highway. True seapower is not calculated only in the number of weapons that a nation can keep afloat. Seapower is strength at sea, and that strength is measured in the depth of control that a country is able to exercise over the use of deep water for its needs.

Right now the naval power of the United States and the naval power of the Soviet Union face each other in a contest of presence. But if the naval powers of our two countries struggle only in the ability to present themselves on the seas, then our merchant fleets have been struggling in the reality of world trade since the end of World War II. And in the process of that competition, the Soviet Union is not only gaining from her efforts—we are rapidly losing ground in a national let-down of our own efforts.

In 1960, just 10 years ago, the United States had about 3,000 commerce carrying ships actually plying the seas, as opposed to less than 900 Russian merchantmen. At the close of 1969, 10 years later, we had shrunk to 1,000 ships while the Soviet Union had increased her merchant marine to more than 1,600 cargo-carrying bottoms. But even more significant is the fact that in 1969 this country put 21 new ships to sea, while Russia added 89 to her merchant fleet.

The contest goes on. Now it is obvious the Soviet Union intends not only to maintain her lead over us, but finally to overwhelm us. In 1950, 42 per cent of all American trade was being carried in American ships. Last year, 20 years later, that figure slipped to a meager 6 per cent—6% of American trade carried in American ships. The new National Maritime Program initiated by the President is intended to reverse this trend.

But merchant shipping has more than just a partial relationship to this nation's security. It is the life-blood of defense to a country that is surrounded by deep water. If Japan or Germany could have stopped our logistics shipping in World War II, the final outcome of that conflict might well have been quite different. With this in mind, I think it significant that the Soviet Union has now surpassed our own merchant marine in the number of active, individual cargo-carrying vessels; and their naval arm poses a greater potential threat to our logistics shipping than we've ever faced before.

But the strength of the Soviet Union at sea doesn't stop with ships-of-war and merchantmen. Russian fishermen can be found on all the open seas of the world, serving not only the commerce of Russia, but its naval strength as well. As naval observation-reporting units, these trawlers gather and report invaluable information, ranging from foreign naval movements, to updated hydrographic and oceanographic facts.

Now, in that last field, the Soviets are even more active and determined. They have more oceanographic vessels and scientists working at sea, than any other nation of the world. At present, some 200 vessels and some 4,500 scientists and technicians are actively employed by Russia, as compared to 3,000 of our own.

And in looking at the overall picture of Soviet seapower, it is significant that her navy, merchant marine, her fishing fleet, and her oceanographic efforts—unlike ours—are not loosely related. Her seapower is integrated, mutually supporting, and is centrally controlled through state ownership.

So this is what we face as we again look to our oceans for a means of security, and as a highway. But our Navy-Marine Corps Team still surpasses any other in the world today, and as long as we keep our strength up to the test of the 1970's, the great oceans can

still serve this country. Now I'm not talking about a holding force merely prepared to buy time while we fill out our strength at home. That time has passed.

The Navy-Marine Corps Team of this new decade of the 1970's must be a complete force—a highly mobile line of outposts, capable of moving to any critical area instantly. The mobility and proven worth of carrier-based aviation, surface vessels, submarines, and Fleet Marine Forces can keep our oceans broad—and can keep a fight from our own shores.

But there is yet another area in which we must be careful in maintaining our defenses. It is an area no enemy has ever been able to penetrate, and yet, the danger is always present. I'm talking about *quality*—not quality in hardware, but quality in people.

Certainly we will continue to require top quality equipment, weapons, aircraft and ships. But they can only be as good as the men who will man them. For that is our real defense, the Americans who will serve this country in uniform.

If we are to eliminate the draft, cut defense spending, and still hope to meet the increasing demands of the security of this country, then every American who wears a uniform must count full measure. Each individual must offer quality service, professional ability—and most of all dedication.

Well, so far, in this war that no one wanted, we have received more than a full measure of all of these qualities from the American fighting man. Every service; Army, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard, Marines; has had more than a share of brave, complete effort by the Americans who have worn our uniform. And in spite of the discussions here at home, and in spite of a fashion that would seem to approve avoiding service—still they serve, and they serve so well.

Violence on the campuses of our universities, intimidation, and a general state of chaos have not stopped young graduates from seeking service as officers. And this isn't the conformity of "joining the team" of past wars. These young men have had to not only think out the dangers of their possible service, they have had to search deeply for a philosophical rationale. More have found it than not.

And the young man who enlists—or even accepts induction—is making a decision that does not meet with what is now known as "total peer approval." But still they come, they fight, they return home, and they quietly find their places in their country. And it is certainly *their* country. I believe they will be heard from in the years to come. I often think of a sign I saw by a Marine's fox-hole during the battle of Khe Sanh. He'd written it with pencil on a C ration carton, and it said:

"For those who have fought for them, life and freedom have a flavor that the protected never know."

But these young Americans are, after all, a part of the overall fabric of our American life. And the stresses and strains of contemporary American life are felt. If this country does not return the dignity of service to the serving, then our defenses will truly be endangered. Now I'm not suggesting a show of saccharine and theatrical emotion—I mean a mere sincere acceptance of service, a respect. It wouldn't take much, only the acceptance at face value of real heroism.

Thank you and now, may I answer your questions?

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

Question: General Chapman, a clarification. Someone asks, is it 7 Soviet Naval brigades or battalions?

Answer: Brigades—total force of about 10,000 men... but growing.

Question: In the light of world facts, do you think that our best practical policy in the interest of survival is an armed to

the teeth or crawling in our hole or something in between?

Answer: Well, obviously it's going to have to be something in between, I think we need adequate and sufficient strategic offensive and defensive forces. Then I think we have to have sufficient general purpose forces to control the seas and be able to protect our power wherever we need to go in the defense of this country. I don't think it's necessary to arm to the teeth. It is necessary, however, to maintain a balance of armed forces that are sufficient to deter. I think that's what we must do, and it's what we're in danger of not doing.

Question: President Nixon's gamble in Cambodia raised a howl in the U.S. Congress and Senate. Was the gamble worthwhile? Will we be out by June 30?

Answer: We will be out by June 30. The effort in Cambodia is the result of a very brave, a very courageous decision on the part of our Commander-in-Chief... that's number one. Secondly, there weren't any great military risks involved, but there were other kinds of risks. I think we've succeeded in doing a number of things, and we've done them well. First, we've destroyed the sanctuary concept that the North Vietnamese Army has relied on and that's a severe loss to him. He has used the sanctuary concept, the storehouse concept, for many years now and we've succeeded in disrupting his base area, his storehouse of weapons, equipment, rice, and supplies. We've torn up parts of his command and control, his training area. We've discovered some hospitals, and just in general, we've destroyed the sanctuary concept that he depended on to wage war within the Republic of Vietnam.

Second, we've preempted his rainy season plans. He no doubt had plans all set and the stores and the men ready to implement those plans. We've disrupted them.

Thirdly, I think it's clear that there's been a tremendous lift in the morale, the spirit, of the Army of the Republic of Vietnam. They, for a long time, have had to fight inside their own country and now for the first time they're invading the enemy's sanctuaries. The results are that their morale and their spirit are very good and, conversely, there's been a loss of morale and a loss of face on the part of the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong.

We've diverted the NVA effort. Instead of being able to operate from their sanctuaries, they now have to put a tremendous effort into rebuilding them, attempting to rebuild the supplies and stocks that they've lost.

And they've lost quite a number of men in this process.

All in all I would say Cambodia can be best described by one word. It's a word that I almost hesitate to use because it's going out of fashion, and it's even frowned on these days, and that word is a very simple one: *victory*.

Question: Sir, you say the war in Indochina is drawing to a close. When will it end?

Answer: It could end tomorrow if the North Vietnamese would go home where they belong and stay there. But short of that, I, of course, don't know. Of course, the plans are all very carefully worked out for winding the war down as the level of violence permits and as Vietnamization improves, which it's doing steadily. As I've said, I think we're winning. I think we are going to be successful. I'm confident of it. I can't put any exact date on it, but I'm very optimistic and confident of the final results. I think it really hangs on the perseverance and the will of the American people, whether or not we have the courage to stick it out in this country and see it through. We're going to accomplish what we went over there to do and I want to point out, gentlemen, that it's going to be a tremendous achievement, an unprecedented achievement in world history. We

have gone across many thousands of miles of ocean and for unselfish reasons attempted to assist a small country in establishing itself, in creating a viable and enduring structure, and developing an armed force that can defend itself against outside aggression. And if that occurs, and I think it will, then those who've taken part in it, those who supported it, are going to be able to feel very proud in the years to come.

Question: General Chapman, do you believe the South Vietnamese Marines and Army are good enough to take over fighting the war now?

Answer: Well they're fighting a good part of that war already. The 1st ARVN Division is alone, almost alone, up below the DMZ where the 3rd Marine Division used to be. It's a first class fighting outfit. Some of the Vietnamese Marines are fighting heavily in IV Corps and in Cambodia. And they are fighting very well. There's nothing wrong with the individual RVN soldier. He's just like a soldier anywhere. He fights well, if he's got good leaders, and he doesn't fight so well if he doesn't. The question is leadership and it's leadership they're developing and they're developing it well. Certainly they can fight. They are fighting now and they will continue to fight. Some of their units are not up to the standards of the others, but as I said, their efforts in Cambodia have provided a tremendous uplift to their morale, and I think we'll see a faster improvement in the months to come. I have a high regard for the fighting quality of the well-trained, well led, South Vietnamese units. In the days and years to come, they're going to be some of the best.

Question: Sir, the original purpose of the U.S. Marine Corps was a limited one. Today, in Indochina, the Marines have been used as a strike force. Do you favor this new use? Do you hope the original concept will return?

Answer: Well, the mission of the U.S. Marine Corps is laid down by law. The first, of course, is to provide landing forces for amphibious assault. That's our primary mission and there are two or three intermediate missions. Then we finally get down to the last one which says the Corps will perform such other duties as the President may direct. Believe me, that one's kept us pretty busy over the years. We've learned that if we organize, train and equip for our primary mission for the amphibious assault, one of the most difficult operations there is—using modern techniques of the main assault by air, by helicopter—if we can do that, then we can do almost anything else. All the other things we might be called on to do are what you might call lesser included functions. If we're organized, trained and equipped for that and then if we're ready—and readiness is our watchword—we have everything we want. We want to be fully ready at all times and under all circumstances. We stress readiness, readiness of our supplies, our equipment, our training, of our troop units in all respects, and above all we stress readiness as a state of mind. An eagerness to go, a desire to go, the opposite of the plank owner idea. If we're properly organized, trained and equipped and if we're ready, then when the crisis comes, we're going to get into the fight. I don't think there's any doubt about that. History proves that. When the real crunch comes, anybody that's ready is going to get called on. It doesn't make much difference what the plans or the missions say. We think our principle role is to provide a small, elite and highly professional force. We want to be lean, and frugal and hard. We want to be completely combat ready, and we want to be a fighting force. And we have no doubt if that's what we are, that we'll perform a real service for the American people.

Question: Last week the Vice-President compared the Cambodian operation with General MacArthur's landing of the Marines at Inchon. Are there other similar Ma-

rine operations that should be attributed to the Army?

Answer: Well, I'll just make the one comparison that the landing at Inchon and the attacks on the sanctuaries in Cambodia can both be described as the same one word I used previously—Victory. And I'm not at all worried about who gets the credit for it. I'm just glad we've accomplished it.

Question: How soon after the U.S. leaves Vietnam do you think that Red China or Russia will take over the Far East politically and economically?

Answer: Well, I'm afraid I don't know the answer to that question. They've got plenty of internal problems, of course, but they've got tremendous potential. I'm sure they'll try to use it. I'm sure they think in long range terms as is characteristic of oriental philosophies. When it may be, of course, I don't know. I'll just repeat what I've previously said—I think we've got to keep our powder dry.

Question: Does the American Press help to frustrate the military and political objectives in Southeast Asia when it headlines the activities of dissident groups?

Answer: Well I don't think the Soldiers, Marines, Sailors, Coast Guardsmen, and Airmen in Vietnam pay much attention to the described activities of the dissenters back here. They're really too busy. The overwhelming majority of them believe in what they're doing, in my opinion, and they're anxious to get on with it and bring it to a successful conclusion. I think it bothers them more when they come back home. But I don't believe it bothers them very much over in Vietnam.

Question: Does General Chapman consider the verdict in the case of the Marine convicted for murder justified by the evidence or is it unjustified by a soldier's obligation to obey orders.

Answer: I'm sure that refers to the court martial that was just completed in Danang and another one just started involving four or five young Marines who are under allegations of various kinds of murder with respect to Vietnamese villagers—women and children. It would be very improper, in fact it's prohibited by law, for me to make any comment whatever on those judicial proceedings because there's the possibility of command influence. So I don't think I care to comment on that. I'll just say that it's a very very difficult situation in which we place our young soldiers and Marines over there. On the one hand, they must fight the enemy and on the other, they must take care not to harm the friendly people that we're over there to protect. In many cases it poses a real dilemma for them and in many cases we have suffered wounded and even killed Marines because they waited that last minute to try to be sure that they were enemy rather than friendly and got hurt in the process. I think they deserve a lot of respect. We put a tremendous effort into training them to meet this problem when they go over there. We've improved our training over the years and today all of our instructors are Vietnam veterans. I think we give them the best possible training. I think those young men deserve a tremendous amount of respect and support from the American people for this very difficult war we've been fighting.

Question: Sir, do you think that the Marine Corps can remain an all volunteer force? Are you still able to maintain your standards for recruitment?

Answer: The answer to both those questions is yes. I'm confident we can stay an all volunteer force. We took our last draftees in February of this year, and we're not going to take any more. The ones that we did take during the course of this war were taken in order to maintain an even recruit input each month of the year and to achieve the peak buildup that we went through during the first year of the war. Let me say, by the way, there's nothing wrong with those draftees.

They're some of the best Marines we've ever had. And many of them have shipped over in the regular Marine Corps. As to the future, with the smaller Marine Corps that I advocate—and I'm the foremost advocate of a smaller Corps—I don't have any doubt we can get the necessary number of high quality young men to volunteer for the Corps. We may have more difficulty with our reserves and with our officer procurement in the all volunteer force concept, but I'm sure we can make it with the young enlisted men.

Now as to standards, what's happened in the last four or five months since we've been back on the zero Marine draft is pretty good evidence. Other than the mental group fours that we're required to take, we're getting 75% four-year enlistments and they're all top mental groups. We're very proud of these young men.

Question: As the regular forces decline numerically, will increased reliance be placed on reserve forces, particularly the Marine Corps Reserve? Would you comment on the Marine relationship to the reserve Marine? Is there honestly a commitment to a one Marine concept, active and reserve?

Answer: Absolutely. I can't think of anything we are more deeply committed to than that. We organize, train and equip our reserve division and our reserve wing identically with our regular division and wings. They have exactly the same hardware, the same T/O's and T/E's, the only exception is that they don't have all the modern first line aircraft that our regular wings have. But they're getting that. Furthermore, we handle reserve matters in Headquarters Marine Corps in exactly the same way we handle regular matters. I guess the most recent example of that is the fact that we ordered one of our reserve major generals on active duty to take over as Director of Reserve for the summer months. That, of course, is Charlie Ducheln who is here with us today. We believe in it very much, and I'm confident that any Marine reserve will tell you that we truly practice it.

Now as to the need for reserves. It seems quite clear that we're going to need military reserves, more ready reserves, truly ready reserves, more so in the future than we have in the past. We are cutting down on our regular active forces, but the threat is not decreasing. As I tried to make clear in my original remarks, we don't have the time anymore. What we're going to need are active reserve forces that are truly ready, and I can assure you that our Reserve Division/Wing team is ready. If there's a need for it, we're capable of bringing it on active duty and putting it into combat in a short period of time. If an emergency comes, I'm confident that it's going to look just as good as any regular Marine outfit we've ever seen. In fact we're very proud of our reserve.

Question: Many American colleges and universities are abolishing ROTC. Are you opposed, and what is the value of the ROTC to the United States.

Answer: Well, I think the value is pretty obvious. That's where the other services, particularly the Army, get the bulk of their officers. In fact, that's where the Marine Corps got their present Commandant, and I hope that's some sign of the value of the ROTC. Most of our general officers today are graduates of the ROTC. As to the decline in the number of ROTC units, that's more than offset by the creation of new ones. We're about to activate a new unit at the Citadel in Charleston, South Carolina, this coming fall. It'll be one of the Naval ROTC units, but it will be primarily Marine oriented and we'll have a Marine as the professor of Naval Science and Tactics there. There's a strange thing to me about this move to evict the ROTC and that is that the very people who propose it are the ones who advocate an all volunteer armed force. At the same time they attempt to prevent recruiting of volunteers on the college campuses which is es-

sential if we're to have high quality young men to lead our platoons, batteries and companies in combat. And that's what we must have. We've got to have discipline. We've got to have a high order of it because of the many problems which face our young uniformed members of the services. I can't stress that idea of discipline too much, either. I just want to point out that the greatest danger to a democracy is an undisciplined military. I think everyone ought to remember that.

Question: Does the Corps now have a greater disciplinary problem than at any other time in your experience? Do you advocate stronger measures to maintain discipline?

Answer: Well, I think the measures are adequate. We're employing the laws, the rules, and the regulations strictly, and I think they're perfectly adequate. They have not changed very much over the last several years, many years in the case of our fundamental concepts of discipline. We haven't changed anything with regard to our recruit training or anything in regard to the training and the discipline we require Marines to display after they leave boot camp. I don't think we have any great problem. Any problem we do have is primarily due to the tremendous turbulence and turmoil that's going on in the Marine Corps. I don't believe most people realize how heavily the Marine Corps has been committed or how big it's become. We often think of World War II as the era of the biggest Marine Corps. At peak strength it was nearly half a million and about 600,000 Americans wore the Marine Corps green in World War II. In the Vietnam War 700,000 already have worn the Marine Corps green and it's not over yet. So it's a very big war for us, and further it's the longest we've ever fought, and finally it's our heaviest commitment. We've had a third of the Marine Corps overseas, in combat and in deployed status, one Marine out of three, for about four years now. The turbulence and the turmoil has just been tremendous. But we're getting back to a smaller size now. The commitment's now diminishing and we're going to return in all respects to those very high standards that we've been proud of in the past. So, if there is any change I think that's the reason. I think that under these circumstances and with this heavy commitment, the Marine Corps has done a good job for the country in this war.

Question: We know of no Commandant who has presided so cheerfully and willingly over a contraction in the size of the Marine Corps. Does that mean that you are secretly a dove?

Answer: Well, I don't think I'm a dove, in fact, I'm sure of it. I just want to get away from a very large Marine Corps. It is no larger than it had to be to carry the load we've been carrying, but I want to get back as quick as we can to a small, hard, lean Marine Corps, all volunteer, elite, completely ready and a fighting outfit. I don't know of any Marine that doesn't support me wholeheartedly in that objective.

Question: Sir, The United States has been sued for one million dollars in a Baltimore federal court under the Federal Tort Claims Act for the alleged negligence of the Marine Corps for prematurely releasing one John Lawson from a Naval mental hospital in Philadelphia. How many more cases of that type are there presently pending?

Answer: Well, I wasn't aware of that. I get sued frequently, and I've got an office full of lawyers who are charged with keeping track of the suits that I'm defending myself against that I don't even know about. I really don't know the answer to your question. To my knowledge, there are no other of that type that are currently pending.

President of National Press Club: General Chapman, before asking the final question and on behalf of the National Press

Club, it's my privilege to present a certificate of appreciation for your service to the Press Corps and commemorating your visit with us.

General Chapman: Thank you, Mr. President.

President of National Press Club: I regret that it doesn't have the Marine colors, scarlet and gold, but here's a press club necktie. And now for the final question:

Question: Do you think that Beetle Bailey will ever make sergeant?

Answer: I'd like to call on the Sergeant Major of the Marine Corps to answer that question. . . . Sergeant Major. Sergeant Major Dalley says he doesn't think so. Gentlemen, it's been my pleasure to be here.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE TRADE POLICY

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, a refreshing new approach to U.S. foreign trade policy was suggested by Dr. N. R. Danielian, president of the International Economic Policy Association, in recent testimony before the Ways and Means Committee. He cites the concern of the International Economic Policy Association for the continuing deficit in the U.S. balance of payments, and the steady downward trend of our trade surplus, and the U.S. share of world trade. In seeking solutions to this crucial problem, Dr. Danielian rejects the old approach of the United States delivering first in reduction of trade barriers and calls for us to use every resource in our bargaining for reciprocal action.

Because of the great importance of this subject to our economic well-being, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues and the Nation the initiatives that Dr. Danielian recommends we take in the foreign trade area. I insert at this point in the RECORD an extract of the testimony containing Dr. Danielian's specific recommendations:

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE TRADE POLICY

I would like to touch briefly upon four areas for U.S. future trade policy which are of paramount importance. If the United States is to maintain its economic position in the world, we will sooner or later have to address ourselves to these items.

1. Establishment of a Council on International Economic Policy: For some time now, I have advocated the establishment of a Council on International Economic Policy. Just as we now have a Domestic Council, an Urban Affairs Council, an Environmental Council, and a Council of Economic Advisors which mainly deals with U.S. internal economic problems, we should also have a Council on International Economic Policy.

The Council would advise the President and the Congress on all aspects of U.S. international economic and financial relations. It would develop programs and strategies for achieving economic objectives in the external relations of the United States. It would have final responsibility, subject to the approval of the President, in defining the content of the negotiating posture with other trading blocs. The Department of State, of course, would still carry on international negotiations, within the guidelines and programs defined by the Council, as approved by the President.

2. Foreign Economic Budget: One of the first tasks of this Council should be to submit to the Congress an annual foreign exchange budget for the United States. We often hear the argument that since U.S. exports of goods and services are about 6 percent of GNP, any imbalance in our international payments is of little significance. This, Gentlemen, is an erroneous assumption.

The proper comparison is not between our foreign exchange earnings and GNP, but between what we earn abroad and what we spend abroad. For more than a decade, the United States has continuously run high balance of payments deficits. This means that many of the things we do abroad are done with money borrowed abroad. To bring our payments in balance we must either earn more or spend less, and within this context, it is vitally important that we plan for the future by means of a proposed foreign exchange budget. We should include all estimated foreign exchange earnings and all estimated foreign exchange costs, and the Council on International Economic Policy should develop programs for bringing them into balance. In this way the United States will be able to determine its priorities given the foreign exchange available, without continual increases in U.S. liquid liabilities abroad.

3. Bilateral negotiations between major blocs: In the economic relations with other countries, including our trade relationships, the United States should strive for bilateral negotiations between major blocs: The European Economic Community (EEC), the European Free Trade Association (EFTA), the British Commonwealth, Japan, the Latin American Free Trade Area (LAFTA), and the Central American Common Market (CACM).

The significance of trading blocs is that, for trade negotiating purposes, the concept to nation-state has lost its importance. In its most vital aspect, the unconditional-most-favored-nation principle, GATT is being violated by the expansion of these blocs. And the national treatment principle is being constantly modified in all parts of the world. If practical results are to be achieved, negotiations must be on a bilateral basis between these blocs.

4. Negotiations should include all pending economic and financial issues: In any negotiations that the United States undertakes with major trading blocs, we should include all pending economic and financial issues such as trade, mutual security expenditures, foreign aid, investments, balance of payments adjustments, freedom to travel, landing rights, etc. To limit any negotiations with trading blocs to a commodity-by-commodity or factor-by-factor approach, will only lead to future readjustments.

5. Reciprocity as a condition of most-favored-nation treatment: In any bloc negotiations we should strive for reciprocity as a condition of most favored nation (MFN) treatment. This reciprocity should cover not only trade but also mutual security costs, national treatment of investments, freedom of movement of travelers, sharing of foreign aid, fair and equal treatment of travelers and industrial property rights.

If I were to make one single recommendation, it would be this: Recognize the existence of trading blocs, make the most favored nation treatment conditional on reciprocity, and broaden the concept of reciprocity to include sharing of foreign aid and security costs, national treatment of investments and taxation, mutual protection of industrial property rights and the fulfillment of obligations undertaken by Treaties of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation.

A moment's thought about the implications of this, Mr. Chairman will persuade that with this kind of policy approved by legislation, many of the issues which other countries refuse to negotiate will soon become negotiable.

HARMFUL EFFECTS OF HERBICIDES

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, in February and again in March, I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD articles by Thomas Whiteside on the use of 2,4,5-T and other chemical herbicides, both in the United States and in Vietnam. The June 20, 1970, New Yorker carries a third article by Mr. Whiteside concerning the sale of 2,4,5-T, the ineffectualness of the Department of Agriculture in prohibiting its use, and the potential health menace that it presents.

In addition, Whiteside discusses the possible harmful effects of other herbicides now available, such as 2,4-D. Because these chemicals could have potentially disastrous effects on the environment and on our food supply, their proper use should concern us all. Therefore, I would like to bring Mr. Whiteside's latest piece to the attention of my colleagues:

DEPARTMENT OF AMPLIFICATION,

New York, N.Y., June 7, 1970.

The Editors,

The New Yorker.

DEAR SIR: In the issues of February 7th and March 14th of this year, I presented in *The New Yorker* some of the mounting evidence regarding the dangerous teratogenic, or fetus-deforming, effects of the herbicide 2,4,5-T, which has been used in huge amounts over the past decade as a defoliant in Vietnam and as a weed killer here at home. What seemed particularly alarming, as I reported, was the seemingly unavoidable presence in 2,4,5-T of a highly toxic and teratogenic contaminant belonging to a group known commonly as dioxins. I also pointed out the reluctance of the government, despite its apparent awareness of the dangers, to eliminate or drastically restrict the use of this herbicide.

On April 15th, the Surgeon General of the United States, Dr. Jesse L. Steinseld, appeared before a Senate subcommittee, headed by Senator Philip A. Hart, of Michigan, that was investigating the safety of 2,4,5-T and announced, on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a number of measures that were being taken to limit the use of 2,4,5-T in this country. These measures included the immediate suspension of the Department of Agriculture's registrations of liquid formulations of 2,4,5-T used around the home and of all formulations used for killing vegetation around lakes, ponds, and irrigation ditches. The Surgeon General also announced that the Department of Agriculture was about to cancel its registrations of non-liquid formulations of 2,4,5-T for use around the home and on food crops, including corn, barley, oats, rice, rye, apples, and blueberries. On the same day, Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard announced the immediate suspension of the use of 2,4,5-T in Vietnam.

Against a background of evidence accumulated since 1966 that 2,4,5-T, or material with which is it ordinarily contaminated to some degree, exerts a fetus-deforming effect on the offspring of experimental animals, and a background, too, of extraordinary reluctance on the part of government agencies, including the office of President Nixon's own Science Adviser, Dr. Lee DuBridge, to inform the public in a forthright manner about the potential hazards of 2,4,5-T to human health, the statement by the Surgeon General appeared to signal clear and unequivocal action

at last against the widespread use of 2,4,5-T. Federal law requires that all pesticides and herbicides be registered with the Department of Agriculture before they can be marketed in interstate commerce, and the conclusion that citizens could reasonably be expected to draw from the Surgeon General's statement was that cancellation and suspension of these registrations had put an immediate stop to the sale and use of 2,4,5-T here.

That conclusion, I regret to say, is not justified. The word "cancellation," which has such an air of finality about it, and which seems to signify drastic action, is really one of the weaker words in the federal-regulatory lexicon—far weaker than the word "suspension," which the Department of Agriculture has applied to its action on the registrations of liquid formulations of 2,4,5-T used around the home and around lakes, ponds, and irrigation ditches. To illustrate one of the powerful distinctions implicit in this upsidetown bureaucratic language, when the Department of Agriculture suspends the registration of a product for certain uses, the suspension takes force immediately, and under federal law shipments of the product in interstate commerce must stop; in effect, the flow of the product from manufacturer to ultimate user is immediately pinched off at a point reasonably close to the source of supply.

When the Department of Agriculture cancels the registration of a product for certain uses, however, the movement of the product in interstate commerce is brought to no such automatic halt. A company given a cancellation order is told that after thirty days it can no longer ship its product across state lines, but the company has the right to appeal the order, and if it does appeal, this action has the effect of staying the order. During the lengthy process of appeal, the company can continue to produce, ship, and sell the cancelled product. A company whose product's registration is suspended has no such recourse.

Approximately six weeks after the Surgeon General's announcement concerning 2,4,5-T, I stopped at several garden stores in the New York area. I found that a number of 2,4,5-T formulations—weed killers, poison-ivy sprays, and lawn food—were still on sale. Since the Surgeon General had cited as one of the primary reasons for federal actions against 2,4,5-T the government's wish to afford "maximum protection to women in the child-bearing years" by preventing them from being exposed to the herbicide, this state of affairs startled me, particularly since May and June are the months of maximum use of herbicides.

The disturbing fact is that the Department of Agriculture has no power to compel manufacturers to recall from retail stores products whose registration for certain uses the Department has either cancelled or suspended. There is no federal law against a retailer's selling such a product or against a customer's buying it. The law does provide that stocks of it can be seized by Department of Agriculture inspectors. However, the number of retail establishments selling herbicidal formulations for home use runs into the scores of thousands, whereas the number of retail-store inspectors employed by the Department of Agriculture, I recently discovered, is exactly thirty-two.

On a practical level, then, the power of the Department of Agriculture to prevent the retail sale of such products is almost nonexistent. Furthermore, not only is it legal under federal law for a homeowner to buy a product whose registration for certain uses has been officially cancelled or suspended but it is legal for him to use it, and use it in any way he pleases. Without breaking any federal law, he can dump concentrations of 2,4,5-T on his lawn in such a way that some of it enters his or his neighbors' water supplies.

Similarly, a farmer can continue to use 2,4,5-T on his crops without breaking any federal law even though that use has been the subject of a Department of Agriculture cancellation order. The only risk he faces is that of seizure by Food and Drug Administration inspectors of any of his crops shipped in interstate commerce that are found to have detectable amounts of 2,4,5-T residue on them. The risk isn't a very great one, since these inspections take place at retail outlets—supermarkets, and so on—where F.D.A. inspectors collect samples of foodstuffs and send them back to the F.D.A. for analysis, which takes time. The bureaucratic machinery is creaky, and if any detectable residue of 2,4,5-T is found on the food stuff—say blueberries that the farmer has sprayed with 2,4,5-T—the chances are that by the time the Department is ready to seize the stock of blueberries in the store (which, after all, is probably only one of many stores to which berries from this batch have been shipped) the blueberries have been bought and eaten. In any event, only the blueberries can be found guilty—not the farmer or the shipper. And the farmer can go right on using 2,4,5-T as he pleases, because the cancellation powers and suspension powers of the Department of Agriculture apply not to the basic chemical compound of 2,4,5-T as such but only to the formally registered uses for which it is intended.

In effect, this means that there is federal control only over the wording of labels on the cans, bottles, or drums of these chemicals. It is true that the Department has asked manufacturers of 2,4,5-T products whose registration for certain uses have been cancelled or suspended to recall the products from retailers, but this will have to be done strictly on a voluntary basis if it is done at all. Even if it actually is done, and the products are back in the manufacturers' hands, the recall does not mean that the 2,4,5-T will be destroyed.

For the most part, it means merely that the 2,4,5-T formulation will be relabelled, with the cancelled uses deleted, and sold over again in the same form, and even in the same containers. And since the label on the container has no binding force on the purchaser, there is no guarantee at all that 2,4,5-T will not continue to be applied in ways that the public might reasonably suppose to have been stopped dead by the government.

Further examination reveals that the measures against the use of 2,4,5-T that appear to be so sweeping actually apply to about ten per cent of the total amount of 2,4,5-T used in this country—that is, only to 2,4,5-T used around homes, gardens, and aquatic areas and on food crops. And since 2,4,5-T products are still being sold freely in garden-supply stores, I estimate that so far the cancellation and suspension orders have affected no more than two or three per cent of the total amount.

About ninety per cent, in any case, is used for the control of woody plants in such areas as rangeland and pastureland and along railroad and electric-line rights-of-way. These uses remain unaffected by the new federal orders because the Departments of Agriculture, H.E.W., and the Interior agreed that in such areas, many of which are remote from dense population, 2,4,5-T does not constitute an imminent hazard to women of child-bearing age.

I believe that this conclusion deserves reexamination. As studies with experimental animals have shown, 2,4,5-T is a fetus-deforming agent both in its relatively pure form, which has so far been formulated only under laboratory-test conditions, and in the form in which it is ordinarily sold to users. Because certain factors are apparently impossible to eliminate in its production, the latter form is a contaminated one, the contaminants being present in amounts that have up to now been considered tolerable. The name

of the principal contaminant in 2,4,5-T is symmetrical 2,3,6,7-tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin, and it has been found to be both extremely toxic and, in certain tests on living creatures, teratogenic. In tests on chick embryos, this form of dioxin, in a pure state, has the capacity to deform embryos at levels of a trillionth of a gram per kilogram of the egg—a level only one-millionth as great as that required to achieve a comparable effect in chick-embryo experiments with the notorious teratogen thalidomide.

And in tests involving a mixture of dioxins in which the symmetrical tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin predominated, conducted by the Food and Drug Administration on pregnant hamsters, a dosage of 9.1 millionths of a gram per day (for five days) per kilogram of the mother's body weight produced an incidence of eighty-two per cent mortality and eighty-two per cent abnormality among live offspring.

Dioxins are also known to have untoward effects on human beings. In factories where 2,4,5-T is produced, the dioxin appears as a contaminant in an intermediate stage of the manufacturing process, and some of it remains in the finished product. In 1964, workers in a Midland, Michigan, factory of the Dow Chemical Company, one of the largest producers of 2,4,5-T, contracted an illness through exposure to the dioxin contaminant. The symptoms of this illness were described as follows by Dr. Julius E. Johnson, a vice-president of Dow Chemical and its director of research and development, in testimony he gave in mid-April before the Senate subcommittee investigating 2,4,5-T:

"The most sensitive toxic reaction observed in humans to this impurity [the tetra dioxin] was manifested by a condition known as chloracne, a skin disorder mostly prevalent on the face, neck and back. It is similar in appearance to severe acne often suffered by teenagers."

The way Dr. Johnson described chloracne before the Senate subcommittee, it does not sound like a very serious condition. However, the way he described it before the subcommittee is not quite the way Dr. Benjamin Holder, the director of the medical department at Dow's Midland Division, had described it two months earlier during a meeting with government chemists. According to a memorandum originating in one of the regulatory agencies involved, Dr. Holder said that about sixty people had contracted the disease at the Dow plant, and that its onset had been slow—four to six weeks. The memorandum continued:

"Early symptoms [according to Dr. Holder] include fatigue, lassitude and depression, and early signs include the appearance of comedones on the face and body . . . and weight loss. . . . Severe exposure results in effects involving internal organs and nervous system disorder (polyneuritis) Dr. Holder discussed the examination and treatment of exposed workers. He said that six months were required for marked recovery to begin and complete recovery required up to several years."

According to a paper published in a German scientific journal a year before the Dow people made these observations, the symptoms of chloracne associated with the intermediate stage of manufacture of 2,4,5-T include mental depression, reduced power of recall and concentration, disturbed sleep, irritability, reduced libido, and impotence. And another scientific paper, so far unpublished, on an outbreak of chloracne that occurred in another 2,4,5-T factory (not a Dow factory) in the United States, describes the continued existence of serious mental disturbance among affected workers some six years afterward.

The reason I emphasize the presence and the extremely hazardous nature of the dioxin contaminant in 2,4,5-T is that while the Dow people claim that 2,4,5-T is readily

decomposable in soil and by the action of sunlight after it has been applied, neither they nor anyone else has ever shown that the dioxin contaminant, as distinct from a theoretically pure 2,4,5-T, is biologically degradable; that is, that it does not persist in the environment or accumulate in animal tissue.

On the contrary, the characteristics of dioxine-related chloracne poisoning, far from resembling those of the transient acne of teen-agers, include effects that are surely indicative of a serious toxic influence that is stubbornly persistent in the human body and its central nervous system. And, according to Dr. Jacqueline Verrett, of the Food and Drug Administration (Dr. Verrett's chick-embryo studies contributed to the discovery that the cyclamates widely used as sugar substitutes were carcinogenic substances), studies of the effects of dioxins on chicks and small mammals indicate that dioxin may very well accumulate in animal tissue more or less as DDT does—the difference being that dioxin is infinitely more toxic.

In the absence of positive proof that dioxin is not persistent and cumulative, the continued virtually unrestricted spraying of 2,4,5-T on pastureland and rangeland seems to me to constitute a serious potential hazard to human health. In spite of manufacturers' claims, there appears to be no evidence that the dioxin contaminant does not persist in the sprayed area long after the 2,4,5-T itself has broken down.

The amounts of dioxin that would thus remain would, admittedly, be very small in relation to the amount of 2,4,5-T originally laid down—the Dow people, for example, claim that the dioxin content of their 2,4,5-T is less than one part per million—but the potency of dioxin is so extreme that a serious question arises whether traces of dioxin remain on sprayed pastureland and may be ingested by beef cattle, dairy cows, and sheep, with the result that dioxin builds up in the tissues of these livestock and enters the human food chain through meat or milk.

The relentlessness of the cumulative process involving DDT and other pesticides is well known by now, when human milk contains more DDT than federal law permits in cow's milk crossing state lines, and when virtually every sample of drinking water tested throughout the country by the Environmental Control Administration has contained traces of pesticide. The only precaution recommended by the Department of Agriculture against possible contamination of dairy cattle feeding on pastureland sprayed with 2,4,5-T is that the land not be grazed for seven days after a spraying.

Since the Department's own calculations of the persistence of 2,4,5-T—calculations that take no account whatever of the persistence of the dioxin contaminant—are that 2,4,5-T takes about five months to break down in soil, these precautionary measures as they relate to grass growing from the soil or water holes on its surface hardly seem adequate for the ultimate protection of the public against a herbicide that has been demonstrated to be a serious potential health hazard even in a laboratory-purified form. As for precautions against the ingestion of dioxin, there simply aren't any, because as far as federal regulations are concerned dioxin does not exist. In the case of grazing beef cattle, the Department of Agriculture does not recommend withholding the land from use for as much as a day after a 2,4,5-T spraying.

In Texas alone, more than a million acres of rangeland and pastureland are being sprayed with 2,4,5-T this year; probably at least a quarter of a million head of cattle will graze on that sprayed land; and the cattle will produce something like a hundred and fifty million pounds of meat that will be sold to Americans as edible—all in the absence of a solitary meaningful restriction

imposed by the federal government on either the spraying or the grazing, and also in the absence of a solitary scientific study, either by industry or by any government agency, concerning the stability, the persistence, and the cumulative capacity of the dioxin contaminant in the bodies of living creatures.

Next year, the total area sprayed with 2,4,5-T throughout the country may well be greatly increased rather than decreased. The use of herbicides in this country has been increasing at a considerably greater rate than that of pesticides, and it is only because military priorities for defoliation programs in Vietnam cut the available supply of 2,4,5-T quite drastically that this country has been spared the much more extensive use of 2,4,5-T on rangeland and pasture land. In Vietnam, a total of about forty million pounds of 2,4,5-T has been dropped on the countryside. The suspension, under public pressure, of the use of 2,4,5-T there will probably bring about the release in the coming year of huge amounts of it in the domestic market, and a logical target of chemical-company salesmen for disposal of the surplus would be the cattle industry and the United States Forest Service.

Also, to my knowledge, no proper investigation has ever been made of the possibility that, quite aside from the dioxin already present in 2,4,5-T sprayed on vegetation, further amounts of dioxin may be created, and released into the environment, through the breakdown process of 2,4,5-T as it is affected by sunlight and by heat. Heat strong enough to create new dioxin can occur under conditions that are not highly unusual. Brush that has been killed, whether by 2,4,5-T or other means, is certainly a fire hazard, especially in a hot, dry climate, such as that of Texas, where so much 2,4,5-T spraying is going on, and a brush fire over a large sprayed area containing 2,4,5-T residues could conceivably generate considerable quantities of dioxin and release it into the atmosphere.

It seems most likely that the hazards of pollution of the environment by dioxins extend far beyond the use of 2,4,5-T. This herbicide is only one of many products derived from polychlorinated phenolic compounds that contain dioxins or are the precursors of dioxins. These products range from pesticides to deodorants. It appears that when any chlorophenol is heated sufficiently it can be converted into a dioxin. This fact raises questions about the release of dioxins into the environment merely through the burning of many commonly used products. For example, one of the polychlorinated phenolic compounds, pentachlorophenol, is widely used as a fungicide and as an antibacterial preparation. It is used in preserving wood and in controlling slime in the manufacture of paper. In 1968, more than twenty-seven million pounds of pentachlorophenol and its salts were used in the United States to preserve wood.

Since the fate of most timber is to be burned sooner or later, and since it is reported that when five grams of pentachlorophenol is heated at a temperature of three hundred degrees for twelve hours it is capable of generating one and a half grams of octachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin, the possibility that considerable amounts of dioxin will be released into the atmosphere from wood treated with this preservative presents a potential health hazard of very alarming dimensions. The same thing may be said of the burning of paper that has been treated with pentachlorophenol.

Aside from any hazard created by burning, the extreme toxicity of pentachlorophenol was discussed some years ago in an article in the *British Medical Journal* on some sawmill workers in Borneo who handled wet timbers that had been freshly treated with a solution of sodium pentachlorophenate, a salt of pentachlorophenol. The people in-

involved, who are described in a Monsanto Chemical Company manual on pentachlorophenol as "nine undernourished, scantily clothed native workers," were not wearing protective garments—a circumstance that the Monsanto manual calls a "complete violation of safety precautions for handling Penta [a Monsanto trade name] materials." They died as a result of handling the timbers.

Pentachlorophenol is used in a wide variety of products, including paints and shampoos. It is put in laundry starches as a preservative, and it has been used in other laundry products. The extreme hazards posed by the injudicious use of this chemical, which is buried in so many consumer products, can be perceived in a scientific paper that appeared in the *Journal of Pediatrics* last August, entitled "Pentachlorophenol Poisoning in a Nursery for Newborn Infants."

The paper describes the cases of nine infants between six and fourteen days old who were all born in a small hospital for unmarried mothers in St. Louis and who were all admitted to St. Louis Children's Hospital with a severe form of an unusual and undiagnosed illness marked by excessive sweating, increased heart rate, respiratory difficulty, and enlargement of the liver. Two of the infants died shortly after being admitted to Children's Hospital; the rest were given blood transfusions and other treatment and survived. The cause of the poisoning was traced to an antimicrobial laundry neutralizer that had been used in excessive amounts in the laundry of the hospital where the children were born.

The neutralizer contained sodium pentachlorophenate, and traces of pentachlorophenol that remained in diapers and other clothing after laundering had penetrated the skins of the infants and entered their systems. The insidious nature of pentachlorophenol can be illustrated further by the fact that after the use of the rinse was discontinued, traces of pentachlorophenol continued to be found in the blood of newborn children and of expectant mothers. It turned out that although the infants were no longer directly exposed to pentachlorophenol, the mothers-to-be had continued to use linens that had been rinsed with it. There is speculation that the pentachlorophenol traces in the linens used by the expectant mothers became absorbed into their systems and crossed the placental barrier into the systems of the unborn babies.

Such facts led me to become curious about other commonly used products that contain polychlorinated phenolic compounds. One of these is the household disinfectant Lysol, which contains a chlorophenol compound. Another polychlorinated phenolic compound that is widely used is hexachlorophene. The basic material for hexachlorophene originates in 2,4,5-trichlorophenol, which is also the precursor of 2,4,5-T in the manufacture of the herbicide. Hexachlorophene is very widely used as an antibacterial agent, and is an ingredient of toilet soaps, of skin lotions for babies, and of cleaning powders used for washing diapers and infants' laundry. It is used in deodorant creams and sprays, and it is a principal active ingredient of pHisoHex, a soothing antibacterial agent for the skin that is universally used in hospitals and widely used in homes. (In hospitals, it is used in scrubbing up before surgery.)

A relatively small number of people appear to be sensitive to such hexachlorophene preparations when they are applied to the skin, but the undoubted benefits of the preparations are generally considered to far outweigh this known disadvantage. Manufacturers of soap claim that hexachlorophene does not readily penetrate the natural barrier of the human skin.

However, it may be another matter when hexachlorophene preparations are used where the natural skin barrier has been broken down. In 1965, at the Shriners' Burns Insti-

tute, a hospital in Galveston, affiliated with the University of Texas, that is devoted to the treatment of severe burns, nine children had their wounds cleansed with a three-percent solution of hexachlorophene in detergent in preparation for skin grafts. Six of the children soon developed generalized convulsions. To determine the cause of the convulsions, a study was subsequently made in which hexachlorophene was sprinkled into skin incisions in rats. All the rats died.

More recently, Dr. Verrett has made studies of the effects of hexachlorophene on chick embryos, and her observations concerning one of her experiments have led her to conclude that hexachlorophene is so toxic that when it is injected into the embryos in a concentration of half a milligram per kilogram of egg it kills sixty per cent of the embryos. In another study, in which hexachlorophene was injected into the eggs at this same concentration, Dr. Verrett found signs of teratogenicity—including a significant incidence of cleft palate, eye and beak defects, and an incidence of leg deformations and edemas, or body-fluid swellings—similar to the teratogenic effects she had found in comparable chick embryo studies of 2,4,5-T, of the dioxin contaminant, and of 2,4,5-trichlorophenol.

Hexachlorophene has been manufactured for commercial purposes for about thirty years, and last year between two and three million pounds was produced in this country; much larger quantities are expected to be available in 1970, again because of the suspension of the use of 2,4,5-T in Vietnam. The Food and Drug Administration places no restrictions on the use of hexachlorophene in such consumer products as toilet soap and deodorants.

Yet, as far as I can determine, not one single series of formal tests has ever been completed either by any corporation or by any government agency to determine whether this chemical is teratogenic, whether it causes mutations or whether it produces cancer in experimental animals. Regardless of this lack of data, the Department of Agriculture permits the use of hexachlorophene in certain pesticides used on farm produce. It is sprayed on certain fruits and vegetables to cut down bacterial action that might encourage spoilage. Its use is permitted in quite high concentrations in water drunk by livestock, as a means of preventing liver flukes in cattle. If it is effective against liver flukes in cattle, it presumably penetrates to the liver, and since beef and calf's liver wind up on the dinner table, one wonders about other ways in which hexachlorophene might possibly be ingested by humans.

One route might be through drinking water. With the huge amounts of hexachlorophene used in soaps and such consumer products, regardless of whether, as soap manufacturers claim, very little of the hexachlorophene is absorbed into the human body through the skin, the hexachlorophene that remains outside the skin is for the most part drained away in waste water. Since much waste water in this country is reused, after treatment, as drinking water, it seems reasonable to question whether traces of hexachlorophene are indigestible by human beings in this way.

Both the ubiquity of polychlorinated phenolic compounds in the environment and their apparent ability to accumulate in the systems of living creatures are suggested by the contamination caused by a group of polychlorinated phenolic compounds known as polychlorinated biphenyls, or, more commonly, PCBs. These materials, which are known to be highly toxic, and are potential sources of dioxins in themselves, are used for a wide variety of purposes. They are used in rubber products and insulating materials, in paper coatings, in brake linings, in asphalt tiles and other asphalt compounds, in paints

and varnishes, in inks for high-speed presses, in waxes, and also in pesticides. In this country, PCBs are manufactured by the Monsanto Chemical Company under the trade name Aroclors. According to a recent article by Dr. Robert Risebrough, of the Institute of Marine Resources of the University of California at Berkeley, in the magazine *Environment*, PCBs have been found in North American peregrine falcons in amounts as great as 1,980 parts per million parts of body fat, and, in Sweden, in the fat of the white-tailed eagle in the amount of 17,000 parts per million. Traces of PCBs have been discovered in fish in Lake Michigan, and it may therefore be assumed that PCBs have found their way into the human food chain. In tests of samples of mothers' milk from Los Angeles and Berkeley that were analyzed late in 1968 by Dr. James Anderson, of Colorado College, every sample tested contained traces of PCBs.

Of the polychlorinated phenolic herbicides used in the United States, the most widely used is 2,4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid, or 2,4-D. In 1968, approximately fifty-seven million pounds of 2,4-D was used in this country, in compounds that ranged from agricultural sprays to lawn foods and preparations for removing dandelions. As far as the Department of Agriculture is concerned, 2,4-D may be sprayed on virtually any crop or area—with minor restrictions as to intervals before harvesting, and so on. Last year, probably fifty-seven million acres of agricultural land was sprayed with it, and probably more than a million pounds of it was used on turf alone.

Over the past ten years, close to half a billion pounds of 2,4-D has been laid down on vegetation in this country, and today every garden store is full of compounds containing it; about a hundred and seventy-five companies produce 2,4-D preparations, and the chemical appears in somewhere between five hundred and eight hundred products currently in use. In spite of the Department of Agriculture's almost completely permissive attitude toward the use of 2,4-D, this herbicide has never been proved to be non-hazardous to public health. Last year, 2,4-D was characterized in a report by the Bionetics Research Laboratories, in Bethesda, Maryland—the original discoverer of the teratogenic qualities of 2,4,5-T—as "potentially dangerous" and "needing further study."

Recently, a screening study conducted by Dr. Verrett on the effects of purified 2,4-D on chick embryos showed the 2,4-D to have teratogenic effects. And preliminary observations in a study, also made within the F.D.A., of the effects of commercially produced 2,4-D given orally at high dosage levels to pregnant hamsters are said to show an incidence of birth abnormalities, including skeletal abnormalities, higher than that in studies of the effects of purified 2,4,5-T given to pregnant hamsters at comparable dosage levels. But the Department of Agriculture has made no move either to warn the public of these ominous findings or to restrict 2,4-D's registered uses.

The potential hazards of 2,4,5-T and 2,4-D were further underlined this spring by a report concerning the fate of a herd of six hundred reindeer on government rangeland near Lulea, in northern Sweden, which had been sprayed last July with a mixture of one part 2,4,5-T and two parts 2,4-D at the rate of a little less than two pounds per acre. A few weeks after the animals had eaten large amounts of sprayed foliage, a hundred of them died and another hundred and fifty disappeared—the presumption being that many of the missing ones also succumbed. Among the surviving animals, forty females had miscarriages.

Analysis of the reindeer carcasses by the National Swedish Veterinary Institute showed significant residues of 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T in

their kidneys and livers. In view of this report, the almost complete lack of restrictions by our Department of Agriculture on the use of 2,4,5-T and 2,4-D on rangeland and pastureland seems particularly disturbing.

The acute effects on human beings of high dosages of PCBs are evident from a series of outbreaks of poisoning, traced to cooking oil extracted from rice hulls, that occurred two years ago in western Japan, in which at least ten thousand people were affected. The outbreaks involved both an abnormal incidence of miscarriages and stillbirths among women in the affected population and abnormally dark skin pigmentation in infants.

The victims of the poisoning showed the classic symptoms of chloracne, and in several very serious cases they also showed symptoms of jaundice and other liver damage. Polychlorinated phenolic compounds are known to be used in Japan as herbicides on paddy fields, and the causative agent of the poisoning was identified as a PCB. Yet our Department of Agriculture permits the use of PCBs as additives in between thirty and forty registered pesticide products and has taken no action to protect the public against the dangers of these additives.

It seems to me clear from all this that the whole family of polychlorinated phenolic compounds is one that, scientifically speaking, consistently produces very bad news. In spite of this, the federal agencies charged with regulating the use of such substances to protect public health have taken virtually no effective steps either to investigate the harmful potential of these compounds or to protect the public from such possible harm. The Department of Agriculture, which has jurisdiction over the pesticidal and other non-drug uses of all sterilizing, disinfecting, germicidal, and antibacterial chemicals sold in this country—and most of the polychlorinated phenols are in one or more of these categories—has not, during all the years in which it has permitted the use of these substances, completed one laboratory study of dioxin contamination or of dioxin generation by any polychlorinated phenol.

After almost a quarter of a century during which the Department has authorized the virtually unrestricted use of a herbicidal agent as powerful as 2,4,5-T, and in the face of well-established facts about the alarming teratogenicity both of 2,4,5-T and of its dioxin contaminant, none of the scientists employed by the Department have completed a single working experiment on the prevalence and generation of dioxins. Although they have gone so far as to draw up a list of seventeen polychlorinated phenolic compounds that they believe should be studied, they do not know, at the time this is written, even how many formulations of these compounds are on the market, what quantities of them are being sold, and what uses they are being put to.

I became aware of this when, before writing this letter, I called the Pesticides Regulation Division of the Department of Agriculture and asked for a list of registered products containing polychlorinated phenolic compounds. According to the assistant director of the Pesticides Regulation Division, the Department has no such list and no list of formulators in whose names the products have been registered, nor has it a list of the uses to which the compounds in interstate commerce are being put. No one had ever before asked for such a list, he said, and the only way the Department could compile one for me would be by making a manual search through files containing some fifty thousand pesticidal-product registrations—which would, of course, be very expensive and complicated.

Clearly, in the polychlorinated phenolic compounds, we are confronted with substances in our environment that, even though we may be exposed to any of them in almost undetectable quantities, cumulatively

and collectively pose frightening potential hazards to public health and involve the serious question of possible effects on the unborn. Considering the striking contrast between the urgency of the problems and the apparent inability of federal regulatory agencies to take prompt action to protect the public against these hazards, it seems to me that a drastic change in methods is essential. The existing pattern of inertia is attributable to a complex set of circumstances that includes inadequate statutory authority to deal with potentially hazardous products on the necessary environmental scale—all the way from their creation in factories, through their movement in interstate commerce, to their use and their eventual disposal or decomposition. A second factor is the very inadequate funding by Congress of the regulatory agencies. The Food and Drug Administration, for example, is supposed properly to regulate various activities of businesses that gross some three hundred billion dollars a year on an annual departmental budget of sixty million dollars, while the Department of Agriculture, as I have pointed out, has those thirty-two retail-store inspectors to cover the whole country. These conditions account, in part, for the passive attitude that agencies often take toward the industries they are supposed to regulate.

Once a product has been registered as acceptable for use in interstate commerce, it tends to acquire such status that if subsequent questions arise about its safety, the burden of proof concerning this is really placed upon the federal regulatory agency rather than on the producer of the product. Since the agency too often does not have adequate facilities, money, or manpower to offer such proof, general foot-dragging or tired surrender to industry pressure by the agency people is naturally encouraged.

It seems to me grossly improper that doubts raised about the safety of complex chemical substances put out by large companies for extensive public use should be so often resolved by federal regulatory agencies in favor of the welfare of these companies rather than of the welfare of the public. It does appear to me that in the case of the present uses of 2,4,5-T, 2,4-D, and other polychlorinated phenolic herbicide or pesticide compounds, such doubts can best be resolved by simply imposing a full suspension of all uses of these chemicals until it has been shown, as clearly as science can demonstrate through the necessary chemical, biological, and environmental testing, that the employment of these substances or their contaminants or breakdown products will not be hazardous to public health.

Sincerely,

THOMAS WHITESIDE.

THE KREMLIN'S MIDEAST GAMBLE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, after my private trip to the Middle East in February, I reported to the President that our Government should supply the military hardware which Israel requested to maintain a balance of power in that troubled area of the world.

In the same report, I noted that the Soviet Union had been intensifying its efforts to dominate the Middle East.

More recently, I have again urged the President to sell jets to Israel by joining with my colleagues in writing the President on two separate occasions.

If any further evidence is needed of Soviet aims in the Middle East, I would suggest that the following in-depth article from the June 1 issue of Newsweek be carefully read.

The article follows:

THE KREMLIN'S MIDEAST GAMBLE

To the untrained eye, it looked like a bleak and blasted landscape, shattered by countless bursts of artillery shells and bombs. But to experienced Israeli intelligence officers back in Tel Aviv, the withered terrain told an electrifying story. Scattered along a 60-mile stretch of the Suez Canal's badly battered west bank ran a string of 40 heavily reinforced concrete bunkers covered with thick layers of dirt. All the telltale signs were there. And last week the Israelis disclosed that they were sure the bunkers were core sites for the emplacement of highly advanced Russian SAM-3 surface-to-air missiles—weapons so sophisticated that all-Soviet crews are required to fire them. If the Israelis were right, the Soviet Union was engaged in its boldest geopolitical gamble since former Premier Nikita Khrushchev tried to smuggle Soviet missiles into Cuba eight years ago.

Indeed, reports out of Egypt seemed to confirm that, with Washington embroiled in another war at the other end of the world, Moscow was moving rapidly toward a bold new commitment of its own men and matériel in the highly volatile Middle East. As Soviet pilots, ground troops and equipment flowed into Egypt (following story), Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban flew to Washington to express his government's alarm over the mounting Soviet buildup and to renew its request for more American arms. And even while Eban was making his plea events back home seemed to underscore the gravity of escalating tensions. In Israel itself, twelve people were killed and 20 wounded—most of them children under the age of 10—when Arab guerillas launched a point-blank-range bazooka attack on a school bus 100 yards from the Lebanese border. In retaliation, Israeli artillery shelled four Lebanese villages, killing twenty and injuring 40. Meanwhile, in artillery duels along the canal, seven Israeli soldiers died in a single day—and the endless chain of killing and retaliation seemed as far from being broken as ever.

On the contrary, the trend of events suggested that Soviet airmen and soldiers might soon be joining the toll. For the Israelis have made it clear that they intend to engage Russian-flown MIG's and to knock out any SAM-3 system along or near the canal—Soviet crews or no (page 40). Precisely where that kind of confrontation might lead is anybody's guess, though for the moment Washington did not seem to be publicly exercised over the risk of being sucked into a direct confrontation with Moscow in the Mideast. "We have decided to play it cool," remarked one senior State Department official last week. "The U.S. obviously will have to reaffirm its position in the area, but we will do so in measured fashion." Such words were cold comfort for Eban, who left the U.S. amid conflicting reports as to whether any part of his request for 25 additional F-4 Phantom jets and 100 A-4 Skyhawks would actually be met. But having rushed precipitously into one volatile situation in Cambodia, Washington seemed ill-inclined to jump headlong into another quite so soon.

VACUUM

That was something Moscow seemed to understand only too well. For with the U.S. preoccupied in Indochina and Britain withdrawing from its colonial domains in the Persian Gulf, the Russians slipped almost naturally into the Middle East vacuum—the least risky area in the world, from Moscow's viewpoint, for the expansion of Soviet influence. And more than anything else, the

Arab-Israeli conflict paved the way. Only fifteen years ago, the Russians counted few friends in the area outside of Israel. Today, Soviet troops and technicians have become the mainstay of several Arab regimes. This is particularly true of Egypt, the largest and most powerful of the Arab states and the one in which Soviet investment has been greatest. But Syria, Iraq, Yemen and South Yemen also lean heavily on Soviet economic and military largess, and even Jordan's conservative monarchy is reportedly being tempted by Soviet offers of anti-aircraft and long-range artillery weapons.

All this pleases the Arabs, of course, but what do the Soviets gain? There are a number of experts who believe they gain very little in a positive sense and that their real motivation is the negative one of reducing Western influence in an area that abuts their own backyard. The Russians have traditionally had an interest in reaching the Mediterranean, obtaining warm-water outlets and in extending their influence over Turkic and Arabic lands. But with a surplus of their own to sell, the Soviets can hardly be interested in Middle East oil—except to the extent of depriving Western Europe of its source. Nor are they bent on an ideological campaign designed to convert the Islamic world to the glories of Communism—not when every Arab nation they aid has outlawed the Communist Party and clapped its leaders in jail. The most obvious strategic prize of interest to the Russians would be control over the Suez Canal, a waterway increasingly important to their growing Indian Ocean and Mediterranean fleets and their efforts to turn NATO's southern flank. In that sense, any Soviet move up to the canal's west bank could be interpreted as a step toward the waterway's eventual recovery and reopening, possibly under Soviet domination.

CHALLENGE

Whatever the motivation, Russia's sudden emergence as an active participant in the Arab-Israeli conflict poses a hard challenge to U.S. policy. As one official remarked last week: "This is a coup of great magnitude. Moscow has now firmly established its position in the Mediterranean and the Red Sea." On that score, in fact, both Israel and the U.S. seemed in agreement. Their differences, as Abba Eban pointed out, lay in what the response should be. Israel's inclination was to act, if only through a new agreement under which the U.S. would undertake to supply Israel with the arms it seeks. Washington favored caution. "I will accept the proposition that the Egyptians are digging along the canal for some purpose, and that they may be pouring concrete," said one official. "But I think we can wait to see whether they install SAM missiles."

The fact is that the Soviet challenge comes at a time of reassessment and uncertainty in Washington. Only a few weeks before, the Administration had acted swiftly and decisively in ordering a U.S. ground invasion of Cambodia. American officials had underscored the global implications of that decision and specifically its implications for the Middle East, where the introduction of Soviet pilots into Egypt was cited as a factor arguing for an American show of strength. But the events at Kent State and the widespread domestic protest that followed drained the Administration's decision of its intended global impact—if anything, weakening the image of resolve that Washington had sought to project. And far from calling a halt to their military buildup in Egypt, the Russians responded by speeding its pace.

CAUTION

In Washington, however, the atmosphere of certainty and toughness that had prevailed on Cambodia gave way to one of bureaucratic caution on the Middle East. The Soviets, it was argued, were behaving with relative restraint in Southeast Asia and were

still pursuing strategic arms limitation talks in Vienna without polemics; therefore, the U.S. should give them the chance to stop short of a dangerous confrontation along the Suez Canal. Thus, instead of making a swift, demonstrative gesture on the Middle East, the Administration put its policy reassessment through the bureaucratic system—the same system so notably bypassed in the decision-making process on Cambodia. But whether, in this case, there was time for the slow machinery of government to come up with an appropriate response was open to serious question. For by now the Soviets had drastically altered the strategic equation in the Mideast, and any further sign of hesitation on the part of the U.S. might embolden them to push their luck to the brink of the Suez Canal.

The issue would perhaps be academic now were it not for indications that the U.S. Government, which always opposed the raids, now tends to see the Soviet move as merely a defensive reaction on behalf of its main client state in the Middle East. As one American diplomat put it to me: "So long as the Russians stay within the delta, they have not really escalated the conflict." And the Israelis themselves insist that they can live with the present level of Soviet participation. "The Soviets may have solved Egypt's problem in the Nile Delta," one senior Israeli staff officer told me recently, "but it has no impact on the essential thing: our position along the canal."

The big question is, what is the next step? The Russians could stay where they are and say to the Egyptians: "We are protecting your heartland. And if you do not attack the Israelis along the canal, they will not attack you there either." In other words, they could work to establish an undeclared cease-fire, and then—within that framework—threaten to regenerate the crisis unless the U.S. brought massive pressure to bear on Israel to withdraw voluntarily from the canal.

WITHDRAWAL

But that Soviet approach is unlikely. For the Egyptians cannot afford to permit the Israelis to sit peacefully along the canal in hopes of an eventual withdrawal. They fear that Israel's de facto presence would become de jure. And so, most Israelis fear that the Russians may try to expand their military role into the canal area in the hopes of pressuring Israel into a withdrawal. "The Russian move has set a precedent for them," explains one Israeli military man. "It is too serious for just a stopgap operation, an operation limited merely to the Nile Delta. It does not in fact further the objective the Russians share with the Egyptians—which is to achieve our withdrawal from the canal."

There is then a strong likelihood that the Russians will try to extend their air-defense system to the canal area as an umbrella beneath which the Egyptians can intensify their war of attrition. If successful, Egyptian artillery might be able to inflict an unacceptable number of casualties on the Israelis and thus force a withdrawal. The Russians might even provide the air cover for an Egyptian beachhead across the canal. Or, they might simply threaten this, and hope that the U.S.—tired of crisis—will prevail on the Israelis to withdraw.

ESSENTIAL

One way or the other, a withdrawal from the canal—barring a peace settlement—would be a considerable victory for the Egyptians. And it is one that the Israelis are determined to deny them. "For us, it is essential to hold the canal," says one Israeli strategist. And I am convinced that the Israelis will, without question, fight the Russians if they try to move to the canal zone. In terms of existing Soviet and Egyptian strength along the canal, the Israelis are convinced that they could win a limited conflict in the area. "It would not be simple for the Russians to come

in with large masses of aircraft," explains one Israeli. "There is not much room for these to maneuver over the canal. And how good, we wonder, are the Russian pilots anyway?"

The Israelis still hope, of course, that the Russians will not risk a potentially humiliating encounter at the canal. And should the U.S. grant Israel the planes it needs and take a firm stand against further Soviet intrusions into the Middle East, the Israelis are convinced that Moscow will tread carefully. But one way or the other, the Israelis are determined to stand their ground. As Moshe Dayan has said: "We would not be another Czechoslovakia . . . We would be a fighting Finland."

RED STAR OVER THE NILE

The old coin-fed telescopes atop the concrete-latticed Tower of Cairo provide a commanding view of the countryside surrounding Egypt's ancient capital. And nowadays for an extra 5 plasters, a solicitous attendant will train one of the instruments on what he thinks you are looking for—not the pyramids at Giza but the Soviet surface-to-air missile installations that have sprouted on the Mokattam Hills to the east of the city and beyond the pyramids to the west. Any closer look can be dangerous. On a recent drive past the pyramids into the desert, my car came to an abrupt halt a mile and a half from a missile compound when the crack of a warning shot echoed across the sand. Through my field glasses I could see the "squat eye" radar making its several revolutions a second and the eight tips of the 19-foot SAM-3 missiles protruding from the site's twin launchers.

In Alexandria, SAM-3 watching is much easier. A room at the Windsor or Cecil Hotel, a meal at Abu Kheir's seafood restaurant or a swim in the Mediterranean—all provide close-up views of the military paraphernalia that is changing the strategic equation in the Arab-Israeli conflict. To be sure, few Egyptians know what a SAM-3 is. And fewer still know what it can do. But everyone seems to believe that the days when Israel enjoyed virtual impunity to strike by air deep into Egypt's heartland are gone forever. Even the Israelis, who have refrained from any raid into the Nile Delta since April 13, seem to be seconding the view. "What happens if the Israelis resume their deep penetration raids?" a Western ambassador asked an Egyptian general at a recent diplomatic reception in Cairo. "Let them come," the general answered. "We would welcome such an attack. You'll see."

The Egyptians have every reason to feel cocky. If Israel decides to resume its raids into the Nile Delta, it will have to tangle with the elaborate new Soviet air defenses that are rapidly abuilding. That means Soviet airmen piloting advanced MIG-21 jet fighters in the air and Soviet missilemen manning sophisticated SAM-3s on the ground. Few doubt that Israel could do it if Jerusalem decided. As one foreign military observer in Cairo puts it: "Israeli pilots could even teach the Russians a thing or two." But for Israeli strategists, this begs the real question: has Russia's new air-defense system deprived Israel of its ability to launch a pre-emptive strike if the Egyptian Army should, sometime in the future, mass for a major offensive across the canal?

The answer is that such a strike, increasingly difficult for Israel to pull off since the six-day war because of growing Egyptian awareness of the need for plane dispersal and fortified shelters, would be prohibitive today and may become well-nigh impossible before the year is out. Russia's first 22 SAM-3 sites are already in place near Alexandria, Baltim, Cairo, the Aswan dam and Cairo West, the current hub of the Soviet military buildup that includes a big airport and the headquarters of the recently arrived Soviet air defense division.

SITES

But that is just the beginning. An additional 23 sites are now under construction, and another seventeen installations projected, including some near the Suez Canal, for a total of 62. By the time this network is completed (target date: Sept. 1), the Russians plan to have 480 new surface-to-air missiles in place, manned by some 15,000 Soviet military personnel. Including the 3,000 military advisers and 2,500 civilians who were already there before the SAM-3 buildup began, more than 20,000 Russians should be in Egypt by the end of the year, and one well-connected military attaché in Cairo puts the figure as high as 28,000.

Moscow, in short, is beginning to run the show. In theory, the Egyptians continue to be responsible for their own airspace. In practice, however, a Russian general and his Soviet staff will now make all the decisions, and Soviet personnel will do most of the firing. Russians will decide, for example, how an intruder is to be engaged—whether by Egyptian or Russian-flown MIG-21 interceptors, or by Egyptian-manned SAM-2s, or by Russian-manned SAM-3s, or by Russian or Egyptian-fired 100-mm. anti-aircraft guns (which will soon ring every key military site in Egypt). On the ground and in the air, the Russians operate and defend their own installations. They have deployed machine-gun nests and sown mines against an Israeli ground attack. They have taken over early-warning radar, including some installations close to the canal. And to cap it all, they have set up their own communications system, which keeps U.S. listening posts on Cyprus working around the clock.

Evidently, the Soviets have decided that even with thorough training Egyptians are not capable of operating the highly complex gadgetry of a modern air defense network. "An Egyptian university graduate would require two years of training in the Soviet Union before he could fit into the system," explains one Russian. "And there isn't time." In a sense, of course, the old Egyptian-manned SAM-2 system chalked up a creditable record of kills—though only one of them turned out to be an Israeli intruder. The rest of the bag reportedly consisted of two Soviet-supplied Egyptian troop transports, one Egyptian MIG-19, one small Egyptian reconnaissance plane and an Ethiopian Airlines Dakota flown by a French crew. Left unsaid, also, is the fear that anything turned over to the Egyptians runs the risk of winding up in Israeli hands. Such was the case last year with the Israeli capture of an entire SAM-2 radar installation and its four Soviet advisers in the bargain. (They were later released through the Rumanian Embassy in Jerusalem.) All in all, during Israeli attacks on SAM-2 sites last year, the Russians are said to have lost twelve advisers killed and 29 wounded.

Having invested heavily in SAM-3s manned by their own crews, the Soviets apparently also concluded that they could not provide an effective air defense screen without their own interceptors responding to Russian controllers on the ground. Soviet Ambassador to Egypt Sergei Vinogradov (who has been dubbed by his diplomatic colleagues "the High Commissioner") was once adamantly opposed to such missions because of the attendant risk of escalation.

SIEVE

Vinogradov reportedly won his case with the Kremlin. But when the Soviet military heard the Israelis were putting most of their pilots through a crash training course designed to penetrate or circumvent the SAM-3s (by flying at Mach-1 speeds as low as 200 feet at night), they argued that without their own interceptors the SAM-3s could go the way of the SAM-2s—making the air-defense system more of a sieve than a screen. So Vinogradov was reversed.

And Soviet pilots poured in. Before the SAM-3 influx there were 80 Soviet airmen in Egypt, principally instructors and crews for the TU-16 bombers that fly surveillance missions out of Cairo West over the U.S. Sixth Fleet. In recent weeks three new squadrons of MIG-21s have arrived, accompanied by 90 pilots (roughly, two pilots per plane as opposed to the Egyptian ratio of two planes per qualified pilot). The Russians have already taken over five of the 28 air bases formerly shared with Egyptians. And some Western experts estimate that for a truly effective defense of the Nile Delta the Soviets will need ten MIG squadrons, or 150 planes and 300 pilots, and exclusive use of fifteen airfields. Many are betting that eventually the Russian commitment will reach that level.

MISSIONS

Many also bet that the rising commitment will bring a rising temptation to broaden the ground rules of the fighting. As of the moment, Moscow and Cairo have agreed that Soviet pilots should confine their defensive missions behind a line 30 miles west of the Suez Canal. The message to Israel is clear: don't tangle with our interior defenses and we won't cross the line. But no Western military expert believes this sort of arrangement can hold up very long. "It doesn't make sense," said one observer with vast combat experience. "For an effective air defense you must go forward. They will need air patrols to meet the enemy, and it's a safe bet that the Soviet military agitating in Moscow for such authority right now." Said another expert: "If I were the Soviet general in charge of air defense, I would want to neutralize the four forwardmost Israeli airfields in the Sinai—much as the Israelis neutralized SAM-2 sites last year."

In fact, the Russians appear to be training for just such a contingency. TU-16 bombers have been spotted firing air-to-ground missiles in the desert in upper Egypt. At a "standoff" range of 50 miles, the TU-16s could fly just west of the canal and fire at Israeli planes taxiing for take-off from forward Sinai bases. In addition, some 75 MIG-21s, originally designed as defensive interceptors, have been given an offensive capability—bigger bomb and rocket loads, extra fuel tanks, longer combat radius.

"If Israel persists in attacking Egypt she will have to be taught a lesson," a high Soviet official told me. "And that lesson can only be a dose of the same medicine. It won't be long before the Egyptians are capable of bombing targets in Israel the way Israel bombs targets in Egypt. Then, hopefully, Israel will at last realize that this war must be stopped and the occupied territories evacuated." What would happen, I asked, if the Israelis shot down Soviet pilots? "We are a major power—a superpower as you Americans call us—and superpowers do not like to be humiliated," he replied. "In that respect, we are no different from the United States. If Israel wishes to escalate, we can also escalate."

There is no question that the Russians mean business, as even the Egyptians are finding out. When the Soviets discovered that Israeli reconnaissance planes had been sneaking through Egyptian radar on the tail of civilian passenger flights, they ordered a detour of all incoming traffic through Matruh, 300 miles northwest of Cairo on the Mediterranean coast. When they found, to their further exasperation, that the detour was falling to deter Israel's long-range Phantoms, which still showed up on radar scanners as part of the blip of civilian airliners, they asked the Egyptians to drastically reduce all civilian flights. Cairo demurred, arguing that it could not afford to lose contact with the outside world.

TRACT

The Russians have also taken over a vast tract between Matruh and the Libyan border,

putting a Soviet general in command. Russian dredgers are deepening the harbor at Matruh. And the Soviet Deputy Defense Minister and naval chief of staff have put the arm on Nasser to persuade Libya's Col. Muammar Kaddafi to give the Soviets naval facilities at Tobruk and an air base at El Adem—both recently evacuated by the British. Encouraged by the French to resist, Kaddafi is said to be equivocating. He told Nasser during an all-night session in Cairo that he didn't get rid of the Americans and the British to turn his country over to the Russians.

Such qualms are shared by many educated Egyptians, as well. Says a Cairo journalist: "How we will ever get rid of [the Russians] is a question we ask each other all the time." In fact, there are various signs that the Soviet presence in Egypt is getting to be a little too close for political comfort. In a classic balancing act, Nasser recently revamped his Cabinet, moving several well-known anti-communists into important positions. And the Egyptian President's long-waged campaign against internal Communists still shows no sign of slackening.

STAKE

Even so, the Soviets have made their intentions clear: they will not let the Egyptians go down to defeat again, even if they have to run the country themselves to prevent it. Why has Moscow moved as far and as fast as it has? Most veteran diplomats in Cairo feel the Soviets had no choice. After fifteen years of heavy investment, they could not afford to see Nasser's regime go down the drain—a distinct possibility had Israel's deep penetration raids into Egypt's heartland gone on unabated. Further humiliation in Egypt could also have had dire consequences for the men in the Kremlin—the same men who kicked out Nikita Khrushchev, in part for the humiliation Russia suffered in the Cuban missile showdown in 1962. To put it bluntly, Egypt has now become as important to Moscow as Czechoslovakia was in 1968, and the Russians are determined to keep their stake alive.

Most observers agree that the next move is up to Israel. A direct confrontation with the Soviets has always been Defense Minister Moshe Dayan's most chilling nightmare. The only reason he hesitated about the Golan attack at the end of the six-day war was because of the number of Soviet advisers reported to be with Syrian troops on the heights. But how much longer can the confrontation be avoided? Israel can slow down the new Soviet commitment, but it cannot turn that commitment back. If Israel resumes the attack on Egypt's heartland, the Russians will be drawn promptly into the fighting. But to leave the Nile Delta alone can only mean, from the Israeli viewpoint, that Egyptian preparations for a major new offensive will move ahead with impunity. Suddenly, the long-promised Arab counter-attack has shifted from the realm of fantasy to the realm of a distinct possibility.

IN ISRAEL: CRUEL DEATHS, GRAVE DOUBTS

What stung the average Israeli most painfully last week was not the threatening Russian presence in Egypt but events closer to home. Only two weeks ago, the Israeli Army launched a massive search-and-destroy operation into southern Lebanon in an attempt to disrupt a string of guerrilla bases there. But then, after the presumably successful Israeli foray, the guerrillas struck back—and in a particularly ruthless way. Their target was an Israeli school bus that ran each day along a country road near the Lebanese border. Hiding in a clump of bushes, the Arabs waited until the bus was only 20 yards away, then fired four bazooka shells directly into the passing vehicle. By the time rescue crews arrived, eight Israeli schoolchildren, three

teachers and the bus driver lay dead in the bloody wreckage.

At the funeral service for the children, Deputy Premier Yigal Allon warned: "The arm of Israel's army is very long, and its blows are heavy, and those responsible for this crime will pay for it." In a sense, the bus incident symbolized Israel's central frustration. For although the Jewish state has demonstrated time and again its stunning tactical ingenuity (as in the recent raid into Lebanon), its over-all strategy of bludgeoning the Arabs into passivity has proved a complete failure. Now, as a result of the major Soviet buildup in Egypt, Israel is faced with the chilling prospect that even its tactical superiority may eventually be challenged along the Suez Canal. From Jerusalem, Newsweek correspondent Michael Elkins reports on the Israeli dilemma:

Few Israeli officials would agree—and none publicly—that the Israeli deep-penetration raids earlier this year into the Nile Delta heartland provoked, or even contributed to, the Russian decision to escalate their military involvement in Egypt. But that view is held by many foreign observers and—privately—by some prominent Israelis. And it was all too apparent that Foreign Minister Abba Eban himself was none too happy with the raids. Publicly, he supported them as a necessary response to Gamal Abdel Nasser's war of attrition. But in Cabinet meetings he proposed to his fellow ministers that the raids be stopped in exchange for an Egyptian agreement—even a tacit one—to reinstate the ceasefire along the canal. It may have been unlikely that Nasser would have agreed, but in any event Eban's associates voted him down.

REMOVING THE TAX EXEMPTIONS OF UNIVERSITIES

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I find no pleasure in having to include the following letter in the Record. This letter concerns actions of the Internal Revenue Service that I find appalling and reprehensible. The IRS has made known that it is considering removing the tax exemptions of universities which allow students to participate in campaigns this fall. The ramifications of this are profound. My letter of protest to Commissioner Thrower of the IRS outlines some of the detrimental effects that the IRS decision to terminate tax exemptions would have.

The foundation of our country is embedded in our educational system and our building blocks of the future are dependent on this foundation. Such threats by the IRS are appalling and could cause unparalleled harm.

The implied threat of the IRS to remove tax exemptions would force the universities into a corner. The universities either would be faced with the prospect of having to close—no university could operate for long without the tax exemption—or would be compelled to prohibit students from campaigning. Neither prospect is acceptable. The latter would be disastrous because academic freedom would be curtailed.

If the IRS is trying to politically blackmail the universities, it is essential that

public attention be called to this. This veiled threat must be exposed, and the IRS must state its intentions immediately to the public.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 25, 1970.

Mr. RANDOLPH W. THROWER
Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER: I understand that the Internal Revenue Service is considering the possibility of lifting tax exemptions for Universities that allow students two weeks this fall to campaign. I am writing to express my distaste for such political intimidation. As we know, Universities receive their tax-exempt status because they are educational institutions. Since the Universities as institutions have not committed themselves politically, the Universities in no way suggest a threat to the educational atmosphere. Furthermore, the students are not taking time "off" instead, they are sacrificing one week of summer vacation and one week of Christmas vacation to provide two weeks of their own time to campaign. Moreover, campaigning is an educational experience recommended for years in political science courses. I have often found that students gain more practical experience by participating in such programs than they would by studying the machinery of government in school.

The IRS has known of the possibility for nearly two months that Universities were considering making changes in the academic calendar to provide a period of two weeks for students to campaign. If the IRS were contemplating a decision to remove the tax exemption for Universities which allow students to campaign on their own time, the IRS should have been considerate enough to notify the Universities immediately. By waiting to make its decision public, the IRS has created abhorrent problems for Universities. The Universities have already made final changes in their academic calendar, and some students have made commitments to campaign. It would have been fair to the Universities had the IRS made its decision known prior to any plans contemplated by the Universities and students with respect to campaigning.

The IRS, by refusing to make known its position, has put a sword of Damocles over the heads of college administrators and students. If the IRS had waived this tax exemption status one or two months ago, the Universities would have had the benefit of a judicial decision on the legality of such a removal. Moreover, the students would have rulings on two issues—arrangements to use college facilities and using their own time to campaign. If the action contemplated by the IRS is a veiled threat to keep students in school instead of campaigning, I would consider it deplorable.

It is ironic and inconsistent for students to be encouraged, on one hand, to participate in politics and are told that established political institutions can be used as vehicles for positive change, while students are told, on the other hand, that Universities may lose their tax-exempt status because students are campaigning to effectuate change through established channels within the political system. Congress has striven hard to instill trust in the students of today by passing the 18 year old vote. By waiving the tax exemption of Universities, the IRS would do much to dismantle the faith and confidence we have attempted, and I think successfully, to establish.

With every good wish,
Sincerely,

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

WHAT IS TREASON?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Black Panthers, in urging a Revolutionary People's Constitutional Convention to write what they call a new constitution, continue to serve as dupes of a few white left wingers who are attempting to create a public image that they are moderate middle-of-the-roaders.

What is treason? Consider the use of a national monument in our Nation's Capital, by a little band of mercenary secessionists, to denounce our people and our Government and scream:

For the salvation, liberation, and freedom of our people, we will not hesitate to either kill or die!

Mr. Speaker, I ask that a news account entitled "A White Party for Black Panthers," a clipping concerning Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, and the "Message to America," by the Black Panther Party, follow my remarks:

[From the Washington Post, June 18, 1970]

A WHITE PARTY FOR BLACK PANTHERS

(By Sally Quinn and Hollie West)

Dr. and Mrs. Fern Wood Mitchell last night gave the first known white-sponsored benefit cocktail party in Washington for the Black Panther Defense Fund.

The middle-aged chemist and his wife threw the party at their spacious red brick house at 3834 Fulton St. NW.

Although this was the first known party for Black Panthers in Washington, there have been several parties for the Panthers in other cities, particularly New York.

Last January, conductor Leonard Bernstein and his wife, Felicia, threw a party to raise money for the Panthers Defense Fund at their Fifth Avenue apartment. 100 socialites, artists, musicians and members of the jet set flocked to the Bernsteins to hear the Panthers speak, munch roquefort morsels, and drop thousands of dollars into the hat for the Defense Fund.

The party was reported in the papers and the Bernsteins were besieged with mail. The party also prompted New York Magazine to devote an entire June issue to an article by writer Tom Wolfe exploring the phenomena he labeled "Radical Chic."

The Mitchells' party had few parallels with the Bernsteins' party. It was for the Panthers and it was hosted by middle-class and middle-aged whites. But the whites at the Mitchells' party were not the wealthy, Beautiful-People types that graced the Bernsteins'. They were instead, people for whom commitment to a cause is a more serious business. Some were dedicated members of SANE. Some had worked in the civil rights movement. None was wealthy.

The printed invitations to the party were sent out to more than a hundred friends. On the cover was a grimacing black man with a raised arm, clinched first and a broken chain on his wrist. The invitation promised the appearance of Panthers David Hilliard, chief of staff; Big Man, minister of information, and Jim Williams and Willie Dawkins, members of the Washington Panthers.

"This is not Lennie's," and hostess Mrs. Mitchell, referring to the Bernstein party. "We're not serving roquefort morsels tonight." The Panthers are worried for the

sake of their brothers who are in jail, and so are we. This is not a social event—it's a way to raise some bread."

The medium-height Mrs. Mitchell wore a beige robe with a native hand woven sash over one shoulder and sandals. Her gray hair was professionally coiffed.

Mrs. Mitchell was active in the peace group SANE (National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy) several years ago.

She said: "We are early fiftish people. We're sincere. My husband is a native of Alabama. That means he ain't no radical. When the news came that Pearl Harbor had been bombed, he was one of the first to volunteer. That's the kind of man he is. We came to this kind of thing through the peace movement. It sounds pretty peculiar—a guy working for a large company and doing this kind of thing. I grew up in Washington. My parents read the Reader's Digest. I have impeccable credentials. I'm a straight lady, you know what I mean. I take baths."

Mitchell, a tall distinguished gentleman with long gray and curly sideburns, works for the W. R. Grace and Co. in Clarksville, Md. He declined to disclose the nature of his work.

"We used to work for SANE, but now that's like kicking a dead horse."

At midday yesterday, the hostess, Mrs. Mitchell, had no objections to having the fund-raiser covered by the press. Indeed, invitations had gone out to several members of the press. But the benefit organizer and former 1966-67 chairman of SANE, Mrs. Gabrielle Edgcomb, had second thoughts and suggested the Panthers be consulted. Panther Charles Bronson, contacted by phone at the National Committee to Combat Fascism, indicated that there should be no coverage.

The party, which was to be from 6 to 8 p.m., drew only about 20 to 30 guests, modestly dressed, and the only sign of wealth was a glass jar full of dollar bill contributions on the bar, which was manned by a white bartender. Pots of fern, which the Fern Wood Mitchells grow, hung from the ceiling in the dining room where the bar was set up.

They included one of the Chicago Seven, Rennie Davis, and his brother Dick and Milton Kotler, a fellow at the Institute for Policy Studies.

Rashid Aalloway, formerly with the Sierre Leone foreign service and cousin of John J. Akar, the Ambassador to the U.S. from the Sierre Leone; Austin Scott, reporter with the Associated Press, and Fred Gale, former disc jockey with radio station WWDC. They all wore conventional dress and ties. The women were in long Indian prints or simple minis.

At 7:45 p.m. several Panthers arrived, including Willie Dawkins, and deputy minister of information and editor of the Black Panther newspaper, Big Man.

Many Panthers from all over the country are converging on Washington for a mass rally that will take place Friday at Lincoln Temple Congregational Church.

Willie Dawkins, in a white knit T-shirt and striped trousers, accompanied by an unidentified Panther in a blue body shirt, black vest and trousers spoke to the press.

"We don't welcome you," he said. "We don't consider this event newsworthy. There has been a news blackout on the Panthers and the press are only the ideological lackeys for the man. I certainly share this view with Dr. Mitchell.

"You (the press) have made your own shoe and you're going to wear it.

"Why do you come here to the mother country to talk to us. Why don't you go down there to where our oppression really is. You are more concerned with where our resources come from. Why don't you write about our brothers down on death row."

With that, Willie Dawkins made an indignant exit.

"I'm so sorry," said Dr. Mitchell, "They really are very serious. But they're the only bridge we've got, you understand. They're our only means of communication. They're the only goddam blacks who are doing something."

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) State-Times, May 8, 1970]

HOOPER ATTACKS BLACK PANTHERS (By William Barton)

WASHINGTON.—FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover says law enforcement agencies were not to blame for confrontations between the Black Panther party and police.

Testimony released today by a House appropriations subcommittee quoted Hoover as saying police in several cities have been "wrongly accused of harassment by many well intentioned but uninformed voices echoing outright lies generated" by the Panthers.

"A free society is in trouble when blatant propaganda so overshadows the truth that the rule of law is jeopardized," Hoover said in his testimony March 5.

Although Hoover strongly defended police in each instance, a special federal investigation is still under way in connection with the fatal shootings of two Black Panthers last December by Chicago police.

But Hoover attributed Panther-police clashes in both Chicago and Los Angeles to the militant black organization's "intense hatred of and vindictive hysteria against local police."

He described the Panthers as a "black extremist organization" consisting mostly of "hoodlum-type revolutionaries," who stockpile weapons, espouse Marxist-Leninist doctrines and terrorize black communities.

While condemning the Panthers, Hoover also attacked "prominent individuals" who, he said, have made "substantial contributions" to legal defense funds for party members accused of crimes.

SPECIFICALLY NAMED

Specifically, he named composer-conductor Leonard Bernstein, film director Otto Preminger, black entertainer Dick Gregory and the wives of orchestra leader Peter Duchin and film director Sidney Lumet.

"Let us clear away the rhetoric and confusion purposely generated to shroud the Black Panther issue and get it back into proper perspective," Hoover said.

MESSAGE TO AMERICA

(Delivered on the 107th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation at Washington, D.C., Capitol of Babylon, World Racism, and Imperialism June 19, 1970, by the Black Panther Party)

As oppressed people held captive within the confines of the Fascist-Imperialist United States of America, we Black Americans take a dim view of the position that we, as a people, find ourselves in at the beginning of the 7th decade of the Twentieth Century.

We find ourselves in a very dangerous world-situation. White America has always adhered to a very racist attitude in its policy towards people who have color. This has been true in the past and it is true today. We see very clearly that whereas White America has escalated its policy of repression and containment of Black people inside the United States itself, on a world scale, the United States is playing the leading role in organizing the White race against the people of the world who have a color. Resolving contradictions between White Protestants and White Catholics, between White Christians and White Jews, between White Capitalists and White Communists, between White Eastern Europeans and White Western Europeans, between White Archo-Colonialists and White Neo-Colonialists, wherever we look, the picture is one and the same.

White racist America, which domestically has adopted the policy of open fascism in order to put down the uprisings of oppressed people of color and those few Whites who take a stand against the grizzly reality of the Babylonian scene, this same White racist America has projected its domestic racist perspective onto the international scene and has organized world imperialism along racist lines. Within the domestic confines of the United States of America, we see clearly that a well-planned, calculated Fascist Genocidal Conspiracy is being implemented against our people.

Black people within the domestic confines of the U.S.A. have reached another cross road. This is a time for the most serious decisions that we, as a people, have ever been called upon to make. The decisions that we make in our time, the actions that we take or fail to take, will determine whether we, as a people, will survive or fall victims to genocidal extermination at the hands of the Fascist Majority which the Nixon clique are rapidly mobilizing into a beastly vigilante weapon to be unleashed against us.

THE U.S.A. MONSTER

The United States of America is a barbaric organization controlled and operated by avaricious, sadistic, blood-thirsty thieves. The United States of America is the Number One exploiter and oppressor of the peoples of the whole world. The inhuman capitalistic system which defines the core of reality of the U.S.A., is the root of the evil that has polluted the very fabric of existence within the U.S.A. Exploitation of man by man; the rule of man over man instead of the rule of the laws of Human Rights and Justice; savage wars of aggression, mass murder, genocide, and shameless slaughter of the people of the world; impudent, arrogant White Racism; and a naked, brazen attempt to perpetuate White Supremacy on a world scale—these are a few of the unsavory characteristics of the U.S.A. Monster with which we have to deal.

We did not ask for this situation. We did not create it. And we do not prefer it but we must deal with it.

THE EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION

Today, June 19th, is the anniversary of the issuance by President Abraham Lincoln of The Emancipation Proclamation during the Civil War, officially dated January 1, 1863. The end result of the Emancipation Proclamation was supposed to be the freedom and liberation of Black people from the cruel shackles of chattel slavery. And yet, 100 and 7 years later, today, Black people still are not free. Where is that freedom supposedly granted to our people by the Emancipation Proclamation and guaranteed to us by the Constitution of the United States?

Is it in the many "Civil Rights Bills" that have been passed to try to hide the irrelevance of the Constitution for Black People?

Is it in the blood-shed and lives lost by Black People when America brings "Law and Order" to the ghetto in the same fashion and by those same forces that export "Freedom and Democracy" to Korea, to Vietnam, to Africa, Asia, and Latin America?

Is it the right to "political activity" when the U.S.A. attempts to legally murder Bobby Seale, Chairman of the Black Panther Party, for his political beliefs?

Where was that right when brother Malcolm was murdered, when Martin Luther King was gunned down?

Where is Freedom when a peoples right to "Freedom of Speech" is denied to the point of murder? When attempts at "Freedom of the Press" brings bombings and lynchings?

Where is Freedom when the right to "peacefully assemble" brings on massacres? Where is our right to "keep and bear arms" when Black People are attacked by the Racist Gestapo of America? Where is "religious freedom" when places of worship become the

scene of shoot-ins and bomb-ins? Where is the right to vote "regardless of race or color" when murder takes place at the voting polls? Are we free when we are not even secure from being savagely murdered in our sleep by policemen who stand blatantly before the world but yet go unpunished? Is that ". . . equal protection of the laws"? The empty promise of the Constitution to "establish Justice" lies exposed to the world by the reality of Black Peoples' existence. For 400 years now, Black people have suffered an unbroken chain of abuse at the hands of White America. For 400 years we have been treated as America's footstool. This fact is so clear that it requires no argumentation.

THE CONSTITUTION

The Constitution of the U.S.A. does not and never has protected our people or guaranteed to us those lofty ideals enshrined within it. When the Constitution was first adopted we were held as slaves. We were held in slavery under the Constitution. We have suffered every form of indignity and imposition under the Constitution, from economic exploitation, political subjugation, to physical extermination.

We need no further evidence that there is something wrong with the Constitution of the United States of America. We have had our Human Rights denied and violated perpetually under this Constitution—for hundreds of years. As a people, we have received neither the Equal Protection of the Laws nor Due Process of Law. Where Human Rights are being daily violated there is denial of Due Process of Law and there is no Equal Protection of the Law. The Constitution of the United States does not guarantee and protect our Economic Rights, or our Political Rights, nor our Social Rights. It does not even guarantee and protect our most basic Human Right, the right to live!

IMPLEMENTING POINT NO. 10 OF THE BLACK PANTHER PARTY PLATFORM AND PROGRAM

Point No. 10 of the Black Panther Party's Platform and Program addresses itself to the question of the National Destiny of Black people. We feel that, in practical terms, it is time for Black people as a whole to address their attention to the question of our National Destiny.

Black people can no longer either respect the U.S. Constitution, look to it with hope, or live under it. The Constitution is the social contract that binds the American people together into a sovereign nation and defines authority and the distribution of power, rights, and privileges. By showing the Constitution aside, rendering it null and void, in order to carry out fascist oppression and repression of Black people, the fascists have, by that very fact, destroyed even the false foundations of authority in this society. We live in a lawless society where racist pigs have usurped the Legislative, Judicial, and Executive branches of government and perverted them towards the prosperity of their private interests. We repudiate, most emphatically, all documents, Laws, Conventions, and Practices that allow this sorry state of affairs to exist—including the Constitution of the United States.

For us, the case is absolutely clear: Black people have no future within the present structure of power and authority in the United States under the present Constitution. For us, also, the alternatives are absolutely clear: the present structure of power and authority in the United States must be radically changed or we, as a people, must extricate ourselves from entanglement with the United States.

If we are to remain a part of the United States, then we must have a new Constitution that will strictly guarantee our Human Rights to Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness, which is promised but not delivered by the present Constitution. We shall not accept one iota less than this, our full,

unblemished Human Rights. If this is not to be, if we cannot make a new arrangement within the United States, then we have no alternative but to declare ourselves free and independent of the United States. If it is our national destiny to follow the latter course, then we must declare ourselves into self-governing machinery, and seek the recognition of the freedom-loving nations of the world.

The Black Panther Party fully realizes that the two roads upon to us as set forth above involve monumental undertakings. But we are trapped in a monstrous situation that requires a monumental solution. And no task, however great, is too much to deal with when the very welfare, survival, and national destiny of our people are at stake. Having already struggled up from the dismal depths of chattel slavery, no obstacles can be too high for us to surmount in order to liberate our people and take back the freedom and security that was taken away from us and denied us for so long.

CALL FOR A REVOLUTIONARY PEOPLE'S
CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

The hour is late and the situation is desperate. As a nation, America is now in the middle of the greatest crisis in its history. The Black Panther Party believes that the American people are capable of rising to the task which history has laid before the nation. We believe that the American people are capable of rejecting the fascist solution to the national crisis which the fascist Nixon clique, the George Wallaces', Lester Mad-doxes', Ronald Reagans', Spiro Agnews', etc. hold out to the people.

We therefore, call for a revolutionary people's constitutional convention, to be convened by the American people, to write a new Constitution that will guarantee and deliver to every American citizen the inviolable human right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness!

We call upon the American people to rise up, repudiate, and restrain the forces of fascism that are now rampant in the land and which are the only real obstacles standing between us and a rational resolution of the national crisis.

We believe that Black people are not the only group within America that stands in need of a new Constitution. Other oppressed ethnic groups, the youth of America, women, young men who are slaughtered as cannon fodder in mad, avaricious wars of aggression, our neglected elderly people all have an interest in a new Constitution that will guarantee us a society in which Human Rights are supreme and Justice is assured to every man, woman, and child within its jurisdiction. For it is only through this means that America, as a nation, can live together in peace with our brothers and sisters the world over. Only through this means can the present character of America, the purveyor of exploitation, misery, death, and wanton destruction all over the planet earth, be changed.

WARNING TO AMERICA

We are from 25 to 30 million strong, and we are armed. And we are conscious of our situation. And we are determined to change it. And we are unafraid. Because we have our guarantee. If the American people, as a whole, do not rise up, reverse the present course of this nation, which, if unchecked, holds out only fascist repression and genocide for Black people, then we, Black people, will be forced to respond with a form of War of Salvation that in the chaos of carrying it out and the attempt to repress it, will gut this country and utterly destroy it. Before we accept Genocide, we will inflict Total Destruction upon Babylon.

It had best be understood, now, that the power we rely upon ultimately, as our only guarantee against Genocide at the hands of the Fascist Majority, is our strategic ability to lay this country in ruins, from the

bottom to the top. If forced to resort to this guarantee, we will not hesitate to do so.

For the salvation, liberation, and freedom of our people, we will not hesitate to either kill or die!

All power to the people.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON SAYS
WE MUST DO MORE FOR VET-
ERANS, THEIR WIDOWS AND
DEPENDENTS

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, there must have been 10,000 speeches delivered on Memorial Day, 1970. No doubt some of them were great speeches. But one which many who heard believed most thought-provoking, was delivered by our colleague from California, the Honorable GLENN M. ANDERSON.

Speaking at the Nisei Veterans' Memorial Hall in Gardena, Calif., at the memorial services sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post No. 1961, Congressman ANDERSON stressed the need for doing more for the disabled veterans, veterans' widows, and their dependent children. In pointing out the dire need in which many disabled veterans, war widows and dependents find themselves, he said, "We can and must do better."

Underscoring the need to intensify our quest for peace, Congressman ANDERSON, told his primarily Nisei audience, "We should see our highest glory, not so much in battles won as in wars prevented."

Because I know my colleagues and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be as impressed as I was by the thoughts as expressed by Congressman ANDERSON. I submit his address for inclusion in the RECORD:

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN
GLENN M. ANDERSON

It is a real pleasure for Mrs. Anderson and me to be here with you on the occasion of Memorial Day. I am honored to have been invited to speak with you.

It is on this day that we stop, reflect, and pay tribute to the courage, endurance, and patriotism of those brave Americans to whom we owe the most—those who have made the supreme sacrifice and whose names are written indelibly upon every battle monument.

On the solemn occasion of Memorial Day, some may argue that Spring—such a pleasant time of year—is not an appropriate time for honoring our war dead.

I cannot accept that view. In observing Memorial Day on the finest day of the year, we are even more aware of the fruits of life which we as American citizens enjoy and which we continue to enjoy only because in every period of our history there have been young men willing to make the sacrifice in defense of our country and our way of life.

On this day, we are, of course, reminded of the battles fought. Without the valor of our American soldiers and regiments, many of these wars might yet be in full progress. Such regiments as the 442nd Regimental Combat Team—formed in early 1943 and composed mainly of Japanese-Americans from detention camps in the West—proved that the blood of all citizens, regardless of their race, color, creed, or national origin runs red. This unit, which was credited by General MacArthur with saving millions of

American casualties in action against the enemy, won acclaim as the most decorated unit in American history for its size and length of service. It also won fame as "the Purple Heart regiment," for its troops suffered more than 300% casualties in terms of its initial complement of troops.

But when our battles are over and when the conflicts are concluded, we are reminded on this day that the American people—so given to peace—are a people who have, when aroused, a power of resistance sufficient to meet any need, however great. Shake them rudely, or menace their freedom and put them in fear, and there is no confronting them.

Nor can we fall, on this Memorial Day, to be reminded of our own individual service—such as it was, and of our sons and comrades—whose honorable discharges were given them by a bullet in battle or fever in jungles; whose bones lie in shallow graves on the plains of Antietam, on the craggy slopes of Midway, in the mountains of Korea, on the bluffs of Normandy, and in the steaming jungles of Pleiku. It is for their memory that we have resolved to honor them each Memorial Day—to salute them martially with the roll of drums and thunder of cannons—so that our fallen comrades are remembered, and will never be forgotten—and that we will never forget what they did.

I come today, not to glorify war—for as our own General Sherman said: "You want to know what war is? War is Hell."

Anyone who has seen war would agree. True, war sometimes develops noble and heroic qualities in individuals or a people. But war is Hell for all that it destructs—for all that it wastes.

We should see our highest glory, not so much in battles won as in wars prevented. By seeking to influence mankind—not by heavy artillery and nuclear weapons—but by good example and wise counsel. In doing this, other nations will instinctively turn to us as their mutual friend and preserver of peace.

In short, our manifest destiny rests upon peace—peace with honor. It is the noblest aspiration of Americans who love their country. It is for this cause that our sons and comrades have given themselves in battle.

The goal of peace, and the achievements of our country are also the truest monuments and highest tributes we can pay the memory of those fallen heroes who have served our nation so well. For their contribution toward saving our republic, and their great deeds and duty, so nobly completed, will never cease to be prized by a grateful country.

There comes to mind on this Memorial Day, the words of Abraham Lincoln: "Let us strive on to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and orphan."

Lincoln was reminding us that it was not enough that we should merely remember those who died in our behalf. We have an additional obligation. While we have little power to repay our war dead directly, we can and should honor them by making certain that we have adequately provided for their families and for their comrades who survive.

We have taken some steps in paying this debt—but we must realize that much remains to be done. Present medical care is not adequate; Present levels of pensions and compensation are not sufficient; educational assistance benefits are not at a level to cover the cost of education.

MEDICAL CARE

Our Veterans deserve medical care of the finest quality. I don't have to tell you that our Veterans hospitals are under funded and thus, they are short changing our servicemen; That a lack of funds results in a lack of trained personnel, a lack of facilities, and a lack of adequate treatment due to over crowded condition. Therefore, I would say—

on this Memorial Day that we rededicate ourselves in Their Memory to do much better.

Approximately 3.1 million veterans are receiving either a pension or compensation from the Veterans Administration. 80% also receive Social Security benefits. With the combined benefits of Social Security, Veterans Administration pensions, and all other outside income, about 1/2 of our eligible veterans—veterans who are totally disabled and have no dependents, are living on less than \$200 a month. We can and must do better.

A veteran's widow, who is receiving a pension on the basis of need, is in even worse financial condition. Half of the eligible widows of veterans (those with no dependents) are living on a scanty \$135 a month budget, and those with one dependent are living on less than \$150 a month.

In memory of those—to whom we are paying tribute today—we can and must do better.

I know you are aware that in order to compete in today's job market, a Veteran needs an education, a skill and a trade. We are obligated to encourage our returning servicemen to resume their schooling—we are obligated to encourage returning Veterans to seek the best education and training he can attain.

And yet—Statistics tell us that 23% of our enlisted separetees, from Military Service in 1969 were High School Drop Outs.

And only 6.1% of these eligible High School Drop Outs have taken advantage of our Educational Program. That is less than one in 16. Obviously, in the area of Veteran education we can and must do better.

And so, on this lovely day in Spring—when we stop to reflect and pay tribute to those who have made the supreme sacrifice, we should remind ourselves—that in addition to paying our respect to their memory—we ourselves—have certain responsibilities, certain obligations that we owe them.

We must honor them not only for their individual acts of courage and patriotism—we must honor them for their dreams—dreams of peace, dreams of justice, dreams of brotherhood—dreams yet unfulfilled.

REAFFIRM THE TRUTH

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as plans develop for the great Fourth of July commemoration here in Washington many Members look forward to returning home to participate in our national Independence Day festivities. The emphasis will be placed on legitimate reflection on our national heritage and reaffirmation of our confidence in our national destiny.

An editorial emphasizing this very point was carried in the Southwest Messenger Press of Cook County, Ill., Thursday, May 28 commenting on the Flag Day commemorations but the commentary so effectively would cover the Fourth of July commemorations as well that I place it in the RECORD at this point and compliment the publisher, Walter Lysen, on the impressiveness of the article:

REAFFIRM THE FAITH

Serious observers are questioning the durability of the American system. One of these is columnist Stewart Alsop who commented recently that, "A good many normally sensible people . . . are beginning to ask themselves whether the American system might not come apart one of these days, rather like Oliver Wendell Holmes' wonder one-hoss shay. The one-hoss shay, it will be recalled,

'was built in such a logical way, it ran a hundred years to a day.' But it 'went to pieces all at once—all at once, and nothing first, just as bubbles do when they burst.'" Mr. Alsop concludes that the odds are high that the American system will surmount present difficulties as it has other difficulties in the past.

These reflections of a leading and highly competent viewer of the contemporary scene should make everyone pause and search for little ways in which to exhibit a reaffirmation of faith in the U.S. An obvious opportunity will present itself on June 14 during the nationwide observance of Flag Day. It was on June 14, 1777 that the United States' Flag was adopted. For nearly 200 years, it has been a symbol of freedom and justice. On countless occasions, it has rallied the patriotic and unified the nation in the vast crucible of human existence where only the fittest can survive. The right to fly the American Flag before our homes and places of businesses is a high honor at anytime—and doubly so on the Anniversary of the birth of the Flag.

MEDICAL CARE FOR VETERANS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I am a member, has been delving deeply into the shortages of manpower and services in our Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Remedial legislation is being drafted and the committee hopes to be able to act on this matter shortly.

I have pointed out previously the shortage of registered nurses and other professional persons.

These conditions cannot be allowed to continue. We must act to see that our VA hospitals are adequately staffed so that our deserving veterans can be assured of medical attention second to none.

Mr. Speaker, Miss Mildred Spencer, capable and award-winning medical writer for the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News has written an excellent five-part series on caring for the veteran at the VA hospital in my home city of Buffalo.

Following are her articles:

PERSONNEL ARE SCARCE IN BUFFALO VA HOSPITAL; FACILITIES AMONG BEST

(By Mildred Spencer)

The walls are all an off-white and there are no draperies to offset their dull sameness. Some are dingy and in need of repairing.

But the rooms are clean. There are television sets in many and reclining lounge chairs in those set aside for heart patients.

There are no porterhouse steaks or lobsters on the menu, but food is plentiful, well-balanced and tasty. No one goes hungry. And there are special diets for patients whose physicians order them.

There are vacancies on the medical staff. Physiatrists (specialists in rehabilitation medicine) and psychiatrists are needed—but they are in short supply everywhere.

And patients know that the physicians who care for them are specialists in their fields, either qualified by their specialty boards or eligible for such qualification in most cases.

The likelihood is great that they are also members of the teaching faculty of the State University of Buffalo Medical School. The

services of other members of the faculty are readily available when consultation is needed.

TOO FEW NURSES

More serious is the shortage of registered nurses. There are too few of them to give the patients much more than the routine attention their conditions demand. But they give what they can—and there are 700 volunteers to help out with the TLC (tender loving care) that patients need and want.

It looks worse than it is sometimes. A visitor seeing two oldsters eating their lunch in a busy corridor near the nurses' station asks why they are there. Why not a dining room or, if that is not feasible, why not their own rooms?

A nurse explains that they need watching—that they may forget to eat or wander off somewhere. "And besides," she adds, "the busy atmosphere of the hall is stimulating to them. Here they can watch what is going on, enjoy an occasional word from a nurse or another patient. They aren't just lying in their beds staring at the ceiling."

NATIONAL ATTENTION

Patients have the advantage of the latest and best in diagnostic and treatment procedures, ranging from open-heart surgery to the fitting of artificial limbs.

A cobalt unit is being installed for the treatment of cancer patients.

The implanted heart pacemaker was developed here, and here a hyperbaric chamber was first used for the experimental treatment of senility—a program that has attracted nationwide attention.

This, then, is the Buffalo Veterans Hospital—one of 166 throughout the United States, a network whose financial needs have attracted considerable attention in Congress and nationally-circulated news media in recent months.

"MORE GOOD THAN BAD"

Eugene E. Speer Jr., named director last year, admits that Buffalo, like other hospitals, has its problems, principally in attracting qualified personnel.

"We get complaints, yes," he says, "but we get more compliments. I read or listen to them all—and there are more of the good than the bad."

The complaints are concerned mainly with failure to get into the hospital and with the shortage of nurses.

The compliments come from those who enter seriously ill or injured and believe, as one young veteran told The Buffalo Evening News, "without this hospital I wouldn't be here today."

BUFFALO'S VA HOSPITAL FACES NEW CHALLENGES AS TIME BRINGS CHANGE

The 961-bed Buffalo Veterans Hospital will be 20 years old in January.

It was built as part of a post-World War II effort by the VA to upgrade its hospitals from domiciliary to active patient-care institutions, from dumping grounds for those who had nowhere else to go to teaching-research-treatment hospitals that would be the equivalent of others in the communities where they were located.

To make what Donald E. Johnson, administrator of veterans affairs, calls the "best and most sophisticated medical care" available to veterans, the VA determined that as many of its hospitals as possible must become affiliated with medical schools.

For this reason the new hospital was built on the grounds of the Grover Cleveland Golf Course, across from the site of the new University of Buffalo Medical School.

An agreement was reached with the school that all physicians named full-time heads of service would have the approval of the school, and serve on its faculty, and that the services of other faculty members would be available, on a fee-for-service basis, for patient treatment and consultation.

TEN VETERANS FROM 1898

Today the Buffalo hospital, like the 165 others in the system, has a full three-year accreditation from the Joint Commission on Hospital Accreditation.

That is the body that inspects and approves—or disapproves—all hospitals on the basis of their physical plant, staffing and patient care, and is composed of Medical and Hospital Associations, College of Physicians and College of Surgeons.

Although the Buffalo hospital still has 10 veterans of the Spanish-American War, including a nurse who will be 99 in July, and although one patient has been there since 1953, it is no longer primarily a domiciliary institution.

ADVANTAGE FOR WOMEN

Its patients this week also included 213 veterans of World War I, 368 of World War II, 46 of the Korean conflict, 57 of Vietnam and 24 others, including veterans of peacetime service and men on active duty who became ill on leave or are about to be discharged.

Eighteen are women—and the National Organization for Women will be happy to know that in the Veterans Hospital, at least, it pays to be a woman. If you are, the chances are that you will be assigned to your own private room with bath. At most you will go into a four-bed women's ward.

Men, on the other hand, are assigned rooms on the basis of the seriousness of their illness—and when they improve are moved on to a larger room, eventually one of the 16-bed wards separated by a curtain into two eight-bed units.

STRICT ADMISSIONS

This past year the hospital gave 290,000 days of inpatient care, 69 per cent to veterans whose illness was non-service connected. Of 32,000 outpatient visits, 15,000 were non-service connected.

Contrary to popular belief, not every veteran can be admitted to a veterans' hospital for whatever ails him.

A veteran with a disability that is service-connected is assured of both inpatient and outpatient treatment for that disability.

But if his disability is non-service connected, he must meet certain strict criteria for treatment.

In the first place, physicians on the hospital staff must agree with him, or his family physician, that treatment is necessary.

STEPS OUTLINED

Take a patient whose family physician says that he needs a gall bladder operation. He goes to the hospital and a physician there examines him.

If he, too, feels that surgery is called for, he orders the necessary further laboratory tests, which are done on an outpatient basis.

A hospital representative then sits down with the veteran and explains to him what the surgery and requisite hospitalization will probably cost in a community hospital. He questions him about his insurance coverage and other assets.

If the veteran attests that he cannot afford the surgery elsewhere, and is willing to sign a paper to that effect, the hospital will admit him and the operation will be done there.

CAN'T CHOOSE DOCTOR

The patient has no choice of physician. He must accept whoever is assigned to that service at the time his operation is scheduled.

After discharge, the veteran comes back to the hospital on an outpatient basis for follow-up care, if needed—but only for the procedure for which he was hospitalized.

Until a few years ago, outpatient care was not provided for non-service connected disabilities. Its availability today has been helpful in reducing the length of stay for many hospitalized patients.

LENGTH OF STAY AT VA HOSPITAL DROPS, BUT OCCUPANCY RISES

The average length of stay in the Buffalo Veterans Hospital is 23 days for surgical patients. And 30 days for medical patients in comparison with an average of 9.5 days in other local hospitals.

But figures can be misleading. The length of stay is obtained by dividing the total number of days of care rendered to patients who either die or are discharged by the number of such patients.

In the average acute-disease hospital, few patients stay longer than two to three weeks. Some stay only two or three days.

But in the Veterans Hospital, the death of a single patient who has been hospitalized for ten years—more than 36,500 days—or the discharge of a patient who has been treated for tuberculosis or psychiatric reasons for a year or more—can send the average length of stay skyrocketing. And there are many such cases.

Then, too, Director Eugene E. Speer Jr. points out, physicians may discover, after admitting a veteran for treatment of one condition—say an acute gall bladder—that he also has badly infected teeth.

A community hospital would discharge him after his gall bladder surgery to seek dental treatment elsewhere. The Veterans Hospital may keep him until the teeth have been removed and dentures fitted.

And there may be a necessary lapse between the time one procedure is finished and the other can be started.

Yet despite these considerations, the average stay is going down. It dropped three days for surgery and four for medicine in the past year.

One reason is the availability of outpatient care before and after surgery for non-service-connected disabilities. Previously a patient would have been admitted to the hospital at the time of diagnosis and kept until no further after-care was necessary.

Another reason is the removal of the budgetary club once employed by the federal government to control costs. Hospitals were asked to estimate their occupancy for the year and their budgets were predicated on those estimates. If occupancy dropped below the estimated figure, funds were withheld.

This fact led to such stratagems as keeping patients in the hospital over Christmas, even though they were well enough to go home, rather than let hospital occupancy drop to a level that would cost the hospital part of its budgetary allotment.

Today the hospital needs employ no subterfuge to keep occupancy up. It was 89.3 per cent during the last fiscal year, and is now running about 84.6%—but because of shorter stays the numbers of patients treated has increased from 8368 to 8500.

The trend to shorter stays and more patients means more acutely-ill patients. And such patients require more care from a hospital that is already shortstaffed.

A SHORTAGE OF PERSONNEL, ESPECIALLY NURSES, PLAGUES VA HOSPITAL

The Buffalo Veterans Hospital has only 1.37 employes per patient.

Other hospitals in the community average 2.41 and those which like the Veterans, are affiliated with the State University of Buffalo Medical School, more than 3 per patient.

Other veterans hospitals throughout the country average 1.5—slightly more than the Buffalo institution.

Hospital Director Eugene E. Speer Jr. attributes Buffalo's plight to three factors—a tight budget, shortages of professional personnel and the unwillingness of such personnel to "devote their lives" to institutional work.

Shortages are particularly acute in two medical fields—physiatry (rehabilitation medicine) and psychiatry.

NOT ON VA TIME

Physiatry, a specialty of particular concern to the Veterans Administration, recently lost its chief to the central administration in Washington. The hospital has been unable to find anyone to take his place.

The position of chief of psychiatry has been vacant for some time, and the department is operating under an acting chief.

Top salaries for physicians in the hospital range from \$19,555 to \$29,752, considerably less than most men could make in private practice, though they represent a big jump over the top of \$12,800 paid in 1953.

Full-time physicians are allowed to supplement their income by outside practice or teaching—but they cannot do it in time paid for by the VA.

Other institutions, including universities, are often more lenient in their interpretations of "full-time." They may allow physicians to see patients on a consultant basis, for example, during the hours they are supposedly devoting to institutional work.

WELL-QUALIFIED

The physicians on the Buffalo Veterans Hospital staff are generally well-qualified.

There are 39 "full-time equivalents," a category that includes both physicians who work full-time and part-time. (Two part-time physicians, for instance, would count as one full-time equivalent.)

Twenty-six of the 39 have been certified by their specialty boards. Most of the others, Dr. William J. Ford, chief of staff, points out, have had extra training and are eligible to take board-qualifying examinations.

NURSING SHORTAGES

The hospital also has a roster of 141 attendants and consultants—members of the Medical School faculty who are available for patient care or consultation on a fee-for-service basis.

And it has 38 resident physicians and six dental residents who care for patients as part of their training to attain specialty status.

But it is in nursing that the greatest problems exist.

The hospital, whose ceiling for registered nurses is 177, has been able to fill only 140 positions. To meet its nursing needs, it has increased the number of licensed practical nurses to 55 and nursing assistants, who have had 13 weeks of intensive training in basic nursing, to 185, for a total of 240, or three over a ceiling of 237 for these two categories.

The ceiling for RNs will go up to 180 on July 1. Nineteen will be joining the staff in coming weeks, mostly students from the UB and D'Youville Schools of Nursing who obtained part of their training at the hospital and are now graduating. Others have been obtained as a result of an intensified recruitment drive.

CLERKS HIRED

To reduce the demands on nurses and give them more time for bedside care, the hospital has hired clerks to take over desk duties and to service the central supply. The dietetics department serves trays and the hospital pharmacy issues ward supplies—tasks once carried out by nursing personnel.

Salaries and the benefits at the Veterans Hospital aren't bad. RN salaries range from \$8266 to \$15,478, depending on experience and education. Licensed practical nurses get \$5212 to \$8510 and nursing assistants \$4621 to \$7608. Registered nurses get 30 days of vacation beginning the first year, the other range from 2½ to five weeks, depending on the time they have been employed. They have group hospitalization, partially paid for, and a Civil Service retirement program.

HEAVY TURNOVER RATE

But the turnover in registered nurses has increased from 30 percent in 1965 to 36.7 percent during the last fiscal year, and that for nursing assistants from 24.4 percent to 33.7 percent.

Working conditions—some the result of

the shortage, some attributable to VA policies—are blamed.

A nurse cannot choose to work days only. If she could, Mrs. Rose Kennedy, chief of nursing service points out, the day shift would be over-staffed and there would be almost no one on nights or evenings.

So a nurse who wishes to work days is required to work three or every six work weeks either nights or evenings, at her choice, in order to be assured of three weeks on days. If she chooses nights or evenings in the first place, she need not rotate.

NO OVERTIME

Because of the shortage, nurses may be called to work ten days out of a two-week pay period without a day off. Sometimes they are asked to work a double shift. Under VA rules they cannot be given overtime pay but must accept compensatory time off.

Rep. Thaddeus J. Dulski, Buffalo Democrat who is a member of the House Veteran Affairs Committee, is supporting a bill to require pay differentials of 15 to 30 percent for nurses who work evenings, nights, weekends and holidays and make it possible for hospitals to pay for overtime.

Such a policy, he estimates, would cost the Buffalo Veterans Hospital nearly \$200,000 more a year.

Director Eugene E. Speer Jr. believes that it would be a major step towards solving some, if not all, of the hospital's staffing problems.

VA PATIENT-CARE COST WELL UNDER OTHER HOSPITAL RATES

The average cost of caring for a patient for one day in the Buffalo Veterans Hospital is less than one-half the cost in other Buffalo area general hospitals—\$37.54 including physicians' services.

At Meyer Memorial Hospital, where such services are also computed as part of the over-all cost, the average ranges from \$96.08 in psychiatry to \$91.74 in the general hospital to \$53.06 in the tuberculosis wing.

Other large Buffalo hospitals, where patients pay their physicians separately, also have higher costs per patient day. Buffalo General's, as of Dec. 1, were \$73.64; Sisters' \$65.62; Deaconess' \$61.52 and Millard Fillmore's \$57.49.

The difference is largely accounted for by the staffing pattern. Veterans Hospital employs only 1.37 persons per patient as compared with an average of 2.4 in the other hospitals.

Staff salaries are a major part of any hospital's budget—ranging from 66 to 80 per cent. The higher figure is reached at Veterans, which has funds for few luxuries such as window draperies or carpeting, and buys many of its supplies and much of its food at reduced prices through a central purchasing system for all veterans hospitals.

BUDGET AT HIGHEST

Donald E. Johnson, the administrator of veterans affairs, has pointed out that the basic VA medical care budget for the current fiscal year is the highest in all VA history.

The budget for the Buffalo hospital has risen from \$13 million last year to \$15 million this year and will be approximately \$16 million next year.

But the increase is being more than eaten up by higher salaries and increases in the cost-of-living that are wreaking havoc with home budgets. Salaries and wages alone increased \$335,000 last year, \$874,000 this year, and will increase an estimated \$500,000 next year.

If hospital programs are to be improved and more personnel added, greater budgetary increases are going to be necessary.

Meanwhile, the hospital's new director, Eugene E. Speer, Jr., is doing all that he can to work within present limitations.

FIRE HAZARD

He has assigned ten men to paint walls that have grown dingy. New, brighter light-

ing is being installed. He hopes within the year to have fireproof draperies installed in patient rooms and activity areas. A major deterrent to the use of draperies in the past has been the fire hazard, since many veterans are heavy smokers.

The 30-bed psychiatric ward has been closed down for lack of staff and—to some degree—reduced demand. To compensate, the hospital has opened a psychiatric day center, as yet unfunded. Here patients come by day to work with psychologists, social workers and volunteers, returning at night to their homes.

The hospital has recently been named a prosthetic center to make and fit artificial limbs for other veterans' hospitals throughout the area under a special funding program. It is also an open heart center for such area hospitals.

A new cobalt facility will provide the latest and best in cancer radiation therapy to veterans, and new diagnostic X-ray equipment will speed and improve the accuracy of diagnostic procedures.

NURSING HOMES

A 17-bed intensive care unit is being constructed on the second floor for general medical and surgical as well as coronary patients.

Mr. Speer would like to see some loosening of the government's ceiling of \$16.50 per day which the hospital can pay to place veterans in nursing homes in the community. Most such homes which meet government standards, he points out, have a daily rate of \$20 or more a day and are unwilling to take veterans for less.

The hospital has its own nursing home unit of 36 beds, but many other long-term patients, he feels, would benefit from placement in a nursing home environment.

"We have our problems," he admits, "but we're doing our best to solve them. Our veteran patients get the very best care that we are capable of giving them with our limitations—and those limitations are gradually being overcome."

"Come back next year and I think you will be surprised and impressed with what has been accomplished."

A BOOMING TECHNOLOGY—A BETTER ENVIRONMENT—CAN WE HAVE BOTH?

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following thoughtful and extremely articulate article on the environment written by Morris Tanenbaum, a Western Electric general manager in engineering, who has been with the Bell System since 1952. The article appears in the May/June 1970 issue of the Bell Telephone magazine and comments at length on the need to reassess our priorities in our search for means to reestablish a quality environment:

A BOOMING TECHNOLOGY—A BETTER ENVIRONMENT—CAN WE HAVE BOTH?

(By Morris Tanenbaum)

Although, from a pedantic point of view, technological innovation began in the Stone Age, it is only in the past few hundred years that man has developed the ability to use technology to make major changes in his environment, and only in the last century that this control has gained global proportions.

Today there is little question that many of the dominant physical characteristics of

the modern world are the direct result of technology. Thus, technological innovation is a major determinant of man's environment, and I use the term environment in its broadest sense, reflecting not only the physical sphere but the social, political and economic as well.

In addition, today the quality of our environment is a matter of increasing attention and concern in the public's mind. And, as the realization grows that technology is the dominant tool in man's ability to change his environment, public attention focuses on technology and the technologist in a manner which is new and unfamiliar in its intensity and direction.

This new attention creates new problems for the generators and managers of technological innovation. It produces fundamental changes in the boundary conditions which have guided innovation in the past. It creates new criteria against which innovation is judged. And these new criteria are different in fundamental ways.

Technological innovation is the novel application of physical knowledge and technique to make premeditated changes in the physical aspects of the environment.

By any measure, technological innovation in this sense has been one of man's most important and successful social inventions. Over the centuries we have developed a complex system of institutions and methodologies for probing and understanding physical phenomena, for developing this understanding into useful artifacts and systems, and for evolving social, political and economic methods for distributing and applying the products of technological innovation to major sections of society. Indeed, our systems for producing technological innovation are one of the principal successes of western civilization.

There are many measures of this success. The pervasiveness of technology throughout our everyday life is objective evidence of how successful technological innovation has been in gaining society's acceptance. In addition, an opinion survey of the willingness of individuals to forego past or future fruits of technology would show that relinquishing past benefits is essentially unthinkable and that the average person's future expectations are even greater than the benefits which he experiences today.

Even the most jaundiced critic of technological abuses and excesses would be unwilling to forego technology's contributions altogether. Those most concerned about the population explosion would be very reluctant to give up modern medical care. Those most concerned about water pollution would be loath to trade today's crop yields for ancient agricultural methods, or surrender the water closet for the privy. Those most concerned about the automobile's part in air pollution would be unhappy to return to the horse and buggy days.

However, the fact that we can identify major problems such as the population explosion and water and air pollution, suggests that all is not well with man's use of technological innovation—that there are technological abuses and excesses that are matters of growing concern in an increasing number of minds.

Man's ability to affect his environment has grown to the point where he can produce massive changes on a global scale. And in some cases the changes could be irreversibly damaging. Nuclear war is an obvious example, but there are more subtle possibilities of great concern. For example, a straightforward prediction of our power requirements for the 1980s indicates that with present technological trends about 25 per cent of the total surface water in the United States will pass through the cooling coils of our power generating plants. Without sufficient knowledge and foresight this could produce a significant change in the steady state temperature of our surface waters, with effects

on biology and climate which are not readily predictable.

These hazards are not confined to political boundaries. As we increase the chemical and thermal pollution burdens of the atmosphere and the oceans, the problems become of international concern. We are reaching the point today when we must carefully think through the broader and longer-range consequences of our actions to change the environment in which we live, so as to assure that the changes which we produce are, indeed, the changes that we desire for the future.

Of course, one solution to the problems of the misapplication of technology is to decide that we've had sufficient technological change and to halt or substantially retard future technological innovation. To my mind—this is a completely unacceptable alternative.

Many of our present social and environmental problems such as under-employment, air and water pollution, can be corrected with the help of technology. Indeed, much of the basic knowledge and technology required is now available. What is lacking is the economic and political means to stimulate its further development and application.

If we wish to continue to solve mankind's problems, I predict there will be an increasing pace of technological advance in our future. However, it is also increasingly clear that this advance must be made with more care and forethought than in the past.

There are those who despair of our ability to guide technology. It is not uncommon to hear warnings that man has been enslaved by his technical creations and that he has lost the power to control his technological Frankenstein. These fears can be placed in perspective by remembering that although technology has created unprecedented power, the technology itself is only a tool. Sir Peter Medawar expressed this clearly in his Presidential address to the British Association for the Advancement of Science. He said, "There is, of course, a sense in which science and technology can be arraigned for devising new instruments of world warfare, but there is another and more important sense in which it is the height of folly to blame the weapon for the crime. I think it is more accurate to say that in the management of our affairs we have too often been bad workmen and like all bad workmen we blame our tools."

Obviously, technology in itself does not possess the ethical qualities of "good" or "bad." It is only in man's application of technology that these qualities arise. Determining how technology will be used has its technical aspects. However, it also has its economic, political and moral aspects. Thus, the decisions which guide innovation must reflect the viewpoints of many segments of society. The technologist and the entrepreneur play a critical role, but they cannot function alone in today's technology-dominated world.

The pace and complexity of our national growth call for modifications in the ways in which we establish standards and set priorities to guide the systems which generate technological innovation. Technology has become too important for us to ignore and its future growth too essential for us to deny the most careful and considered judgments.

Of course, these matters have not been ignored. In certain major areas, such as defense and space technologies, there has been essentially complete control by our society's chosen instrument of public interest, the Federal government. In other areas such as foods, drugs, communications, power and transportation, special public agencies have been established which seek to assure that the public interest is dominant in technological evolution and application.

However, as technology becomes more pervasive, conflicts in priorities arise. Because

of practical limits in our economic and technological resources; emphasis on one area such as defense denies emphasis in other areas such as housing and transportation. Because our natural resources such as water are limited, pollution by agricultural chemicals interacts with urban pollution, industrial pollution and the thermal pollution of power plants. We begin to realize that our past mechanisms for guiding technology were similarly limited in their focus of attention and have not been structured to react to this impinging of interests.

Simultaneously we realize the tremendous new complexity that these interactions have created. The ubiquity of technology creates a universal interest in its effects. This greatly complicates the tasks of assuring that all importantly affected people are heard and contribute to the decisions that determine the paths of technological innovation.

We cannot overlook the fact that the systems that create and apply new technology are complex and include many segments of society. They include the university laboratory and the retail marketplace, the international tariff systems and the municipal licensing agencies, the financial stockholder and the industrial employee.

These innovation-generating systems have evolved to accommodate themselves to the environment in which they must function. Indeed, just as there is a complex ecology of man as a biological creature in his physical environment, there is also a complex ecology of technological innovation in its intellectual, social, political and economic environment.

Significant changes in any part of this ecological system can have substantial effects on its input requirements and on its output. The limnologist knows that a change in the temperature of lake water can cause some biological species to disappear and others to flourish. Similarly, a change in market taste, in capital availability, in basic university research or in government regulation can emphasize one direction of technological innovation, perhaps at the expense of another. We must be aware that there are hazards as we develop new guides for technology.

The implications of these changes are vital, particularly in the developing affluence of our society. Today as man's age-old problems of food and shelter are disappearing from the conscious concern of the majority of our citizens, we are beginning to develop new definitions of the quality of our environment and life. We are beginning to suggest that we might accept some decrease in the rate of growth of our material abundance in order to retain and restore some of our natural inheritance, such as our water resources, our forests, the purity of our air.

In the eyes of many, our concern is overdue. It can be demonstrated that in important areas we have already caused undesirable changes in the condition of some of our lakes and rivers, our woodlands and atmospheres. Fortunately, it is within the power of present technology to reverse these changes if we are willing to pay the costs. However, we must also solve the social and political problems of determining what price we are willing to pay and, of particular importance, how these costs should be distributed.

Important as our current problems are, however, our major problems lie in the future. As our concepts of the quality of life continue to evolve, technological innovation will continue to be the principal tool for providing the material abundance necessary to implement changes in that quality. In the past this technological innovation in our society has been guided most effectively by economic imperatives associated with short-range economic rewards for innovators which were granted by a relatively free and individualistic market. Such imperatives will no longer serve.

Today there are new and crucial questions: Will small modifications in our present guides be adequate to encourage technological innovation in the directions that we wish for the future?

If not, what new kinds of guides will be required?

How will these new guides be developed? And how will the new guides interact with the established ecology of technological innovation?

To a large degree these questions place the proverbial cart before the horse. One cannot intelligently devise guides until one has determined goals.

We must first derive a consensus position on priorities. When that is accomplished, we must develop guides to lead technology toward these priorities in a thoughtful way. Guided by wise men, technological innovation will continue achieving a social milieu of increasing material abundance and expanded individual freedom and choice.

WELFARE REFORM

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the House-passed welfare reform bill was a long-overdue effort to revise and reorient the Nation's public assistance programs.

By recognizing that welfare is a national, not a purely local problem, the measure was a step in the direction of relieving State and local taxpayers of the major financial burden of supporting the country's fast-growing public assistance programs, while attempting to establish a national minimum floor for family assistance, combined with work incentive and job training features.

Constantly rising public assistance costs now exceed the funding capability of many of our local jurisdictions to handle by any further increases in sales, income, or property taxes.

They have about reached their limit, and the Federal Government must step in to assume its rightful share of financial responsibility in this area.

In addition, the Supreme Court-mandated elimination of residency requirements for welfare recipients adds an element of urgency to the need for action to help solve the acute fiscal crisis facing already overburdened State and county governments in trying to meet the mounting cost of caring for those eligible for the Nation's public assistance programs.

With the Senate now considering the bill, together with the administration's proposed revisions, it is vital that final congressional action be taken this year to pass a comprehensive welfare reform measure.

In my opinion, national welfare reform is must legislation, if property taxpayers in metropolitan centers like Los Angeles are ever to be able to look forward to meaningful tax relief.

The urgent necessity for prompt congressional action is well illustrated by a fine editorial entitled, "Local Welfare Burden Can Be Eased," from the June 17 edition of the Los Angeles Times, which I include in the RECORD at this point:

LOCAL WELFARE BURDEN CAN BE EASED

Issue.—Is there any reason for further delay in Senate action on the Nixon Administration's proposed welfare reform plan?

County supervisors rightly complain that a major source of the strain on the property tax is the soaring welfare burden.

In Los Angeles County, for example, some 842,000 persons—or one out of every nine people—will be on welfare in the fiscal year which begins July 1.

The total bill will be an estimated \$888 million. Of this, the federal government will put up some \$440 million and the state will throw in another \$269 million. But \$178 million must come from the property taxpayers of Los Angeles County.

Since the latter figure represents a \$54 million increase over the current fiscal year, a property tax boost is necessary. In fact, of the increase of 94 cents per \$100 assessed valuation which is proposed by the supervisors, 57 cents is attributable to growing welfare costs.

In the long run, as The Times has pointed out before, the answer is the federalization of the welfare program—a step which would release massive state and local resources for education, urban transit, property tax relief and other purposes.

The Nixon Administration's proposed welfare reform program—the so-called Family Assistance Plan or FAP—would represent an important step in this direction. The net increase in the federal contribution to California has been estimated at \$143 to \$173 million.

The welfare reform measure passed the House in mid-April, but stalled in the Senate Finance Committee when objections were raised as to how the proposed FAP would mesh with other programs for aid to the poor—specifically Medicaid, food stamps and public housing.

The major complaint was that, since these benefits can be abruptly cut off as a beneficiary increases his earnings, there would in some cases be an actual incentive for FAP beneficiaries to hold their incomes below the cutoff level.

The senators had a point, and the Administration has properly been trying to come up with some correctives. The proposed changes announced a few days ago are the result.

Most important would be the removal of FAP beneficiaries from the Medicaid program—called Medi-Cal in California. In its place, there would be created a federally subsidized system of health insurance for the poor. One result would be a saving of up to \$250 million a year in this state's outlay for Medi-Cal.

The proposed changes, being complex and controversial, perhaps cannot be acted upon until next year. If action on the basic welfare reform plan is allowed to slide that long,

however, it could become irretrievably bogged down. The Senate should act on the basic package now.

THE IMPORT SITUATION

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the excellent letter of Roger S. Ahlbrandt, president of Allegheny Ludlum Industries, Inc., regarding the import situation in stainless and other specialty steels. As I believe the import situation is critical, I am also placing in the RECORD statements by George A. Stinson, chairman of the American Iron and Steel Institute and president and chief executive officer of National Steel Corp.:

ALLEGHENY LUDLUM INDUSTRIES, INC.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., June 22, 1970.

HON. JAMES G. FULTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: In a recent appearance before the House Ways and Means Committee, George A. Stinson, Chairman of the American Iron and Steel Institute, called the import situation in stainless and other specialty steels "particularly critical."

In the event you may not have noted these points made by Mr. Stinson, I wish to take this opportunity to underscore them.

"As far as the high performance steels are concerned," Mr. Stinson said, "the Voluntary Restraint Program (negotiated with Japanese and German producers) has been almost totally ineffective. If foreign producers had adhered to the provisions of the Voluntary Restraint Program regarding product mix, imports of stainless and tool steels would have decreased by 24% from 1968 to 1969. Instead, they rose nearly 7%, and imports of these key grades of steel exceeded the level implied in the Voluntary Program by 41%. Furthermore, this situation is continuing in 1970. If imports keep on at the same rate as in the first three months, they will exceed the Voluntary Restraint level by 50% for the year 1970 as a whole."

Mr. Stinson's import statistics relate to the overall market. In certain product lines and geographic areas, the effect of imports has been completely devastating of our markets. Here are some examples: imports of stainless steel wire rod in the first quarter of 1970 captured 70% of the domestic market; imports of cold rolled stainless sheet

took 33% of our markets in the same period; and for stainless steel totally, the annualized trend indicates an 11% increase for 1970 over 1969. The accompanying charts show the heavy inroads which imported specialty steels have made in our markets through 1969 and continuing through the first quarter of 1970.

There are still other factors in the world trade picture which raise questions as to how American producers can plan for the needed improvement and expansion of their plants, keep skilled American workmen on their jobs and maintain a viable industry capable of producing specialty steels critical to the nation's defense.

Government policies relating to stockpiles of critical materials have caused artificial shortages, inflationary price increases, and chaotic market conditions for some materials. A government embargo against Rhodesian sources of chrome ore and unwisely overseas sales of government-stockpiled tungsten have resulted in shortages and skyrocketing prices for these commodities. Excessive foreign purchases of nickel-bearing scrap have had the same effect on supplies of this vital material.

Needless to say, these are materials critical to the defense of this country, and our national resources are weakened not only by their diminished supply, but by the disruption of normal market patterns and the inflationary price spirals which they feed.

In short, we believe there are fundamental defects in our nation's foreign trade policies and in the administration of foreign trade affairs, and that this poses a continuing threat not only to American manufacturers and their employees but to the very security of the nation as well. We believe it is absolutely essential to develop a better understanding between industry and government of the critical nature of these problems.

We feel that it is important for you to know how serious the foreign trade situation is with respect to specialty steel producers. We are also concerned about the growing flood of fabricated products coming from Japan and Europe, which also has the effect of cutting into our markets for specialty steels.

Although the basic steel industry is asking only for extension and improvements to the Voluntary Restraint Program, I believe the time has come when we in the specialty steel industry must seek some kind of legislated relief and/or tariff protection.

We earnestly solicit your support of our contention that the United States must completely reevaluate and update its foreign policies if it is to reverse the declining position of American industry in its own and world markets.

Sincerely,

ROGER.

TABLE 1—TONS STAINLESS IMPORTS

	3 months 1969	3 months 1970	3 months 1970 vs 1969 (percent)	1969	Estimated 1970 (3 months at annual rate)	Estimated increase AR 1970 vs 1969 (percent)	3 months 1969	3 months 1970	3 months 1970 vs 1969 (percent)	1969	Estimated 1970 (3 months at annual rate)	Estimated increase AR 1970 vs 1969 (percent)
Strip:												
HR.....												
CR.....	2,220	3,119	+40	11,908	12,476	+5						
Total strip.....	2,220	3,119	+40	11,908	12,476	+5						
Sheet:												
HR.....	332	595	+79	1,993	2,380	+19						
CR.....	13,388	20,462	+53	62,739	81,848	+30						
Total sheet.....	13,720	21,057	+53	64,732	84,228	+30						
Plates.....	1,174	2,775	+136	7,153	11,100	+55						
Bars:												
HR.....	899	2,266	+152	6,507	9,064	+39						
CF.....	898	1,857	+107	6,121	7,428	+21						
Total bars.....	1,797	4,123	+129	12,628	16,492	+31						
Tubes.....	1,406	1,672	+19	7,929	6,688	-16						
Wire.....	2,201	4,780	+117	13,966	19,120	+37						
Wire rod.....	1,935	3,478	+80	14,864	13,912	-6						
Total wire.....	4,136	8,258	+200	28,830	33,032	+15						
Semifinish.....	14,870	9,543	-36	49,044	38,172	-22						
Total stain- less.....	39,323	50,547	+29	182,224	202,188	+11						

TABLE 2.—STAINLESS STEEL IMPORTS, COUNTRY OF ORIGIN COMPARISON

Country	Total			Country	Total		
	1Q 1970 Tons	Percent of total	Year 1969 percent of total		1Q 1970 Tons	Percent of total	Year 1969 percent of total
Japan	29,097	57.6	47.3	Austria	98	0.2	0.2
European Economic Community:				Canada	10,850	21.5	30.1
Belg-Lux	436	.8	1.1	Sweden	3,474	6.8	8.6
France	4,533	9.0	7.8	United Kingdom	1,105	2.2	2.8
Italy	289	.6	.8	All other	275	.5	.5
Netherlands				Total	50,547	100.0	100.0
West Germany	390	.8	.8				
Total EEC	5,648	11.2	10.5				

TABLE 3.—STAINLESS IMPORTS AS A PERCENT OF THE DOMESTIC MARKET

	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1Q 1970
Strip:													
HR													
CR	.1	.1	.4	.1	.2	1.1	2.1	2.1	3.2	3.0	4.4	4.1	5.5
Total strip	.1	.1	.3	.1	.2	1.0	1.9	1.8	2.9	2.8	4.1	3.7	4.8
Sheets:													
HR							5.5	6.1	7.5	4.0	3.8	6.6	11.5
CR	.3	.6	1.6	1.7	8.1	15.3	14.2	17.7	20.1	23.6	28.0	22.7	33.1
Total sheets	.2	.4	1.0	1.3	6.8	12.8	12.9	16.6	19.2	22.1	26.0	21.0	31.4
Plates						.2	1.3	1.2	2.4	5.9	8.4	9.6	15.9
Bars:													
HR							2.4	2.8	4.7	7.4	10.9	11.8	16.5
CF							1.9	2.8	2.7	5.4	4.7	5.7	7.4
Total bars	.4	.7	1.2	1.0	.9	1.7	2.1	2.8	3.4	6.2	6.9	7.8	10.6
Tubes	6.2	4.9	9.0	9.6	11.1	10.5	6.0	7.8	8.0	16.6	20.4	22.0	17.9
Wire	.5	2.2	3.3	4.1	5.2	8.0	16.6	19.3	21.6	29.1	31.6	35.4	50.6
Wire rod	.1	2.1	6.4	15.9	19.9	28.8	40.3	36.9	42.0	53.2	63.7	59.2	70.5
Total wire	.4	2.2	4.3	8.5	10.9	16.8	26.0	26.6	20.5	38.2	44.8	44.7	57.4
Semifinish	3.2	4.9	8.8	6.3	13.1	26.7	33.2	32.4	37.6	41.0	40.1	44.1	36.5
Total stainless	.8	1.1	2.6	2.3	4.4	8.5	10.2	12.0	13.4	16.2	18.3	17.3	21.6

TABLE 4.—TOOL STEEL IMPORTS AS A PERCENT OF THE DOMESTIC MARKET (NET TONS)

Year	New industry shipments	Imports	Exports	Domestic market	Imports as a percent of domestic market	Year	New industry shipments	Imports	Exports	Domestic market	Imports as a percent of domestic market
1969	113,921	15,253	2,725	126,449	12.1	1965	118,242	12,954	1,652	129,544	10.0
1968	106,366	15,162	1,606	119,922	12.6	1964	102,379	9,081	2,275	109,185	8.3
1967	109,929	18,859	1,639	127,149	14.8						

STATEMENT BY GEORGE A. STINSON, CHAIRMAN, AMERICAN IRON AND STEEL INSTITUTE AND PRESIDENT AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF NATIONAL STEEL CORPORATION

INTRODUCTION

My name is George A. Stinson. I am President and Chief Executive Officer of National Steel Corporation. I am also Chairman of the American Iron and Steel Institute, a non-profit trade association of 65 member companies which account for about 95 percent of the raw steel produced in the United States.

I wish to express my appreciation and that of the steel industry for the opportunity to present this statement on the proposed Trade Act of 1969 and other trade issues.

Although I am appearing here on behalf of the steel industry, I don't intend to dwell on the particulars of our own trade problems. This is not to say that these problems have disappeared, as many would have you believe. Rather, they have been partially submerged in a sudden and temporary flood tide of steel demand throughout the world. When this flood tide recedes, they will surface again as a serious and continuing threat to the health of our steel industry and its ability to support the national security.

But the specifics of our case have been documented before this Committee and others on numerous occasions, and I'm sure you are quite familiar with them. Furthermore, steel's problems are symptomatic . . . or even prophetic . . . of a more pervasive and deep-seated illness which is affecting one American industry after another, with the results that more and more of them are steadily losing position in the world markets.

Consequently, I want to address my remarks today to this broader problem, and to the need for change in the policies and objectives, both domestic and foreign, which affect the international trade position of the United States.

The world economic and political environment in which international trade takes place has changed drastically since the inception of our current trade policy many years ago. President Nixon's trade message last November anticipated a continuing of this trend and calls for new responses and new initiatives to meet the significantly different trade problems that will clearly occur during the 1970's.

The steel industry concurs wholeheartedly in these conclusions. However, the Trade Act of 1969 just begins to scratch the surface of the problem, and more far-reaching meas-

ures will be necessary to achieve balanced trade expansion between the United States and the rest of the world. The President, in his trade message, indicated a similar awareness. He described the bill as "a necessary beginning," but added, "As we look further into the Seventies, it is clear that we must reexamine the entire range of our policies and objectives."

It is my intention, through this testimony, to expand upon this theme in the hope of encouraging Congress as well as the Administration to examine thoroughly the assumptions on which our present trade policies are based, the conditions under which international trade is likely to take place during the coming decade, and the inter-relationship between our domestic requirements and policies and those governing international trade.

TRADE DETERIORATION

The vital need for attuning our foreign trade and economic policies to the realities of the Seventies is made appallingly clear when we see what has happened to our trade balance. Persistent deterioration of the position of the United States in international trade is evident in nearly every context in which such comparisons are made. In terms of total world trade, the U.S. share has been

in a downtrend throughout the post-World War II period.

Some downward adjustment in our share of world exports was to be expected following the rebuilding of the war-ravaged economies of Europe and Japan. However, the slippage has persisted to the point where the merchandise trade balances which used to offset the cost of our foreign aid programs and overseas military operations have practically faded into oblivion. In 1964 our merchandise trade surplus peaked out at around \$7 billion. By 1968, it had dwindled to only \$800 million and rose slightly to \$1.3 billion last year. However, if only commercial exports are counted (i.e., excluding government-financed AID and PL-480 shipments) the surplus disappears completely, and we find that our commercial trade balance was in deficit by \$1.4 billion in 1968 and an estimated \$800 million in 1969.

The growing obsolescence and inadequacy of U.S. foreign trade policy is further evidenced by statistics which show a deteriorating trade surplus or an actual deficit in nearly every manufactured goods category. Between 1960 and 1968, the only major commodity group showing a significantly greater rise in exports than in imports is chemicals. Country-by-country comparisons also lend added support to the thesis that United States policies are clearly out of step with the realities of the 1970's.

These trade policies, rooted in the worldwide depression of the Thirties and the aftermath of World War II, were formulated under vastly different economic and political conditions that exist today. The emergence of strong, managed economies and supranational trading blocs has significantly reduced the once overwhelming advantages held by the United States in the form of abundant natural resources, a highly educated work force, vast supplies of capital, superior technology, mass markets and a well-developed distribution system.

With the narrowing of these advantages, the failure of our trade policy to adapt to the changing conditions of trade is causing serious dislocations in the U.S. economy.

It is no longer valid to view such dislocations as minor, transitory occurrences easily remedied by palliative measures on the part of government, such as those embodied in H.R. 14870, but rather as permanent dislocations whose prevention requires a trade philosophy in tune with the new circumstances that exist today.

Another factor frequently overlooked by proponents of the classical theory of free trade, but which was pointed out by a group of economists from the academic world during testimony before this Committee in 1962, is that free trade was never meant to operate in a vacuum, but only within the context of certain conditions which would guarantee that the flow of trade between countries results from natural rather than artificial economic influences.

Some of the more important prerequisites for mutually beneficial free trade are:

That there be full and complete convertibility of currencies, and a free market in exchange rates.

That there be no restrictions on the international movement of capital and labor.

That no country be given a special advantage over the others by virtue of its tax structures, use of subsidies, or laws governing domestic monopolies and cartels.

That there be no quantitative restrictions on trade.

That the countries involved follow roughly parallel fiscal and monetary policies.

That unit labor costs be increasing at approximately the same rate within the area of free trade.

Unless these conditions are present—and I am sure you would agree that few, if any, of them are today—free trade can only work to the detriment of those countries who are at

a disadvantage with respect to the conditions listed, and whose industries therefore risk exploitation by their competitors abroad.

INTERNAL FACTORS IN TRADE POLICY

Fundamental solutions to the deterioration of the United States trade position must go beyond what has long been considered as the traditional approach. There has been a tendency in the past to treat domestic economic policies and international trade policies as two quite separate matters, and our declining competitive strength in world markets reflects this short-sighted viewpoint. In the overall national interest, they must be considered together.

Our country's citizens will not be well served by international trade policies which increase the difficulty of dealing effectively with such major issues as environmental pollution, poverty and urban decay. Our well-being will not be enhanced by trade policies which may weaken the economic and social base on which our security depends. The costs associated with solving our domestic social and environmental problems cannot be met in the face of competition from producers abroad who do not have to bear similar costs, or whose export prices do not have to reflect them. In short, we must harmonize our domestic and foreign economic policies if we are to advance the well-being of our citizens during the coming decade.

Foremost in need of examination and re-evaluation among domestic policies that impinge on our international trade posture are those which result in inflation. Restoration of fiscal stability through a reordering of national priorities so as to achieve better balance between Federal Government spending and income is of utmost importance. Tax policy that unduly penalizes investment also inhibits productivity gains which are needed to restrain inflation and to help restore the competitive ability of U.S. producers in world markets. Depreciation policies in the United States need to be reexamined in the light of practices and policies followed by other major industrialized countries.

Consideration needs to be given to the appropriate balance between fiscal and monetary policy in restraining inflation. Excessive reliance on monetary policy at the moment appears to be masking underlying weakness in the balance of payments. Resulting high interest rates have attracted capital inflows recently which may just as easily become outflows when domestic economic conditions require a less stringent credit posture by the Federal Reserve System.

In contrast with the highly coordinated trade policies of countries that manage their economies to a greater or lesser degree, United States trade policy is fragmented and diffused throughout many Government agencies. The objectives of U.S. policy are ill-defined, vague, and may actually be contradictory, in stark contrast with those of countries like Japan. Therefore, it would seem that action needs to be taken to bring about a more centralized, cohesive and lucid United States trade policy and administration thereof.

EXTERNAL FACTORS IN TRADE POLICY

Putting our domestic house in order is a necessary first step in strengthening our competitive ability in world markets, but by itself, it cannot solve the problem of an eroding trade surplus and its consequences for companies, communities and workers. Foreign competitors must be made to realize that in today's changed economic environment, further expansion of world trade rests heavily on the establishment of conditions which promote fair trade.

It is an unarguable fact that international trade and competition can bestow benefits too great to be foregone, much the same as our own domestic trade and competition have done, and their expansion should be encouraged. But domestic trade is conducted

within a framework of laws and regulations that are constantly reviewed and revised when necessary to insure fair trade. Unfortunately, the same is not fully true in the case of international trade.

As tariffs have been reduced to expand trade, non-tariff barriers in foreign countries have assumed even greater importance. Such barriers take a variety of forms, but their purpose and effects have one feature in common . . . to effectively insulate the domestic markets of their originators. Trade flow is then artificially diverted to countries having relatively open markets, of which the United States is the foremost example.

In Japan, for instance, import controls, as well as export stimulants, are effectively implemented through both open and hidden rules. Secretary Stans has identified Japan as the most restrictive major industrial country in the free world, in both trade and investment. The AFL-CIO confirms this, stating that Japan maintains import quota controls on more commodities than any other country. They go on to say, however, that the "administrative guidance" of the Japanese government is the most important barrier to imports and spur to exports.

In the European Economic Community, border taxes are one of the main roadblocks to imports. These add substantially to the cost of entry for foreign goods. On the other hand, such taxes are rebated on exports, thus constituting a significant stimulus to the sale of Common Market goods to other countries. The rebate of these taxes is especially injurious with respect to our efforts to compete in non-EEC countries. Harmonization of the system of value added taxes within the EEC at a higher level than exists today will magnify the adverse impact on the United States. The Common Market countries will then be able to make larger tax rebates, increasing the subsidy effect on exports while further burdening imports into those nations.

There are many other devices used abroad to block imports or to give exports an artificial competitive edge in world markets. These have been catalogued many times before, and I'm not going to subject you to another recitation. Suffice it to say that they directly contravene the concept of "fair" trade which has to be a prerequisite for "free" trade.

Progress in eliminating these inequities has not been just painfully slow, it is practically non-existent. In this connection there appears to be a "credibility" gap between the United States and other major trading nations as to the serious one-sided effect these practices have on United States trade. We believe that the President should have significantly increased means at his disposal for dealing with the problem of their prompt removal.

THE TRADE ACT OF 1969

Considering the momentum of our deteriorating trade balance, and recognizing that fundamental solutions involving both domestic and foreign policy issues will take time, the steel industry believes that interim measures are necessary to prevent the irreversible decline of vital U.S. industries. For that reason we support the Trade Act of 1969, but only as a first step toward fundamental reform of the conditions that make such assistance necessary in the first place. Our endorsement presumes, of course, that the provisions for remedial action against harmful imports would be administered more stringently and effectively than they have in the past.

As indicated earlier in this statement, it is apparent that nearly every important industry in the United States is losing ground in the struggle against foreign competition. Thus, the assumption that principal reliance on adjustment assistance for injured industries and their employees will adequately compensate for dislocations caused by rising

imports no longer has much validity, since opportunities for shifting resources to less impacted industries are shrinking. Therefore, we cannot stress strongly enough our deep belief in the need for positive action to establish the conditions leading to fair as well as free trade, rather than the adoption of palliatives which deal with individual problems but fail to get at the root causes. At an appropriate time, we would be pleased to offer suggestions for strengthening certain provisions of H.R. 14870.

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS ON TRADE MATTERS

The steel industry recognizes, as President Nixon did, that H.R. 14870 is only the "beginning" of a program to update our trade policies. Intelligent and realistic future trade policy cannot be formulated in a welter of conflicting claims, nor within a framework of outmoded economic assumptions. We urge, therefore, that comprehensive studies be undertaken promptly to provide answers to the following questions:

1. What are the causes, both domestic and foreign, of the decline in competitive strength of important American industries?

2. How effective are the existing mechanisms for adjusting imbalances in international trade in terms of the overall interests of the United States, and what new ones—both internal and external—are needed to serve those interests in the future?

3. Until more responsive and realistic adjustment mechanisms have been adopted, what should be done in light of the realities of international trade and the interests of the United States to prevent the irreversible decline of vital domestic industries?

Such studies should go well beyond what has been thought of traditionally as "trade" policies, but should delve into domestic issues that affect foreign trade indirectly or through linkages not readily apparent to casual observers of the problem. They should also investigate bold new approaches to the many related segments of our foreign trade problem . . . free exchange rates as a substitute for current international monetary mechanisms, for example.

Still others might include means of improving the collective bargaining process so as to achieve a better balance between wage and productivity gains, and to avoid waves of imported products in import-prone industries during the period of contract negotiations.

Where fair foreign competition may be rendering companies or industries economically obsolete, the studies should explore the feasibility of Government assistance in redirecting effort of diversifying so as to reemploy both the assets and workers of affected companies.

The present procedure for remedial action in the case of import damage leaves much to be desired. Relief from the debilitating effects of unfair trade practices is more often than not "too little, too late." The studies should look into the desirability of a single government agency to hear, investigate and act upon complaints under significantly shorter time limits than now exist.

As indicated earlier in this statement, there is need of a more centralized, cohesive and lucid foreign trade policy in the United States. This, too, should be considered in the studies.

Studies of such far-reaching dimensions will take time, and we are under no illusions that broad reform of United States trade policies can be accomplished easily or quickly. Reconciliation of diverse interests and the intertwining of other domestic and foreign policy objectives with the problem of international trade necessarily contribute to its delay. In the meantime, the problem continues to grow and interim measures are necessary to insure the continued welfare and security of all Americans.

H.R. 14870 is a stop-gap measure which contains substantial improvements over the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. It does not, however, deal with the causes of our growing difficulties in the foreign trade area. Until more fundamental and lasting solutions are found, Congress should take additional action to insure that import-injured industries are given temporary relief through voluntary limitations by exporting countries, government-to-government agreements, or legislative measures to provide for orderly trade as in H.R. 16920, H.R. 3 and similar bills.

In particular, the steel industry supports and urges negotiations to extend and improve the Voluntary Restraint Program on exports of steel to the United States. That program, now in the second year of its three-year life, will expire in 1971. In the absence of conditions that would assure a continued reasonable balance in world steel trade beyond then, an improved Voluntary Restraint Program literally becomes the lifeline of the domestic steel industry.

The need for improvements is clearly evidenced by the fact that imports of several important products actually increased last year, instead of declining as was to be expected from the Voluntary Restraint Program. The situation in stainless and other specialty steels is particularly critical, and I would like to elaborate on it briefly. Because of the seriousness of this problem, we have also included a more complete discussion as an Appendix to this statement.

As far as these high performance steels are concerned, the Voluntary Restraint Program has been almost totally ineffective. If foreign producers had adhered to the provisions of the Program regarding product mix, imports of stainless and tool steels would have decreased by 24 percent from 1968 to 1969. Instead, they rose nearly 7 percent. As a result, imports of these key grades of steel exceeded the level implied in the Voluntary Program by 41 percent. Furthermore, this situation is continuing in 1970. If imports keep on at the same rate as in the first three months, they will exceed the Voluntary Restraint level by 50 percent for the year 1970 as a whole.

Imports of some carbon steel products also exceeded the Voluntary Restraint level last year. However, the failure of the Program with respect to specialty steels is particularly serious since producers of these grades tend to be smaller companies which are especially vulnerable to damage by continually increasing imports. Many of them have neither the production and sales alternatives, nor the financial resources, to withstand the loss of basic markets over an extended period of time.

Returning now to the Voluntary Program as it applies to all steel mill products, there were also deviations with respect to geographic distribution. Imports into the Pacific Coast were 25 percent greater than the level to be expected under the Program.

Therefore, if the Voluntary Restraint Program is to be truly effective in preventing irreparable damage to the steel industry or important segments thereof, it must include firm commitments as to maintenance of distribution by product categories and market areas. Similarly, the 5 percent annual growth factor is substantially higher than the long term rate of growth in the market here, and must be brought more into line.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, we in the steel industry believe that:

The current foreign trade policy in the United States is based on archaic assumptions that are out of line with present day realities and the conditions upon which free trade is supposed to be based.

The domestic and foreign economic policies of the United States are inseparably related

in their effect on our competitive position in world trade, and that both must be subjected to intense study in developing a new foreign trade policy appropriate to today's world.

A more realistic and tough-minded approach must be taken in convincing other countries that "fair" trade must precede "free" trade.

We do not pretend to know all the answers to the thorny trade problems confronting this nation; that is why we have suggested that studies be initiated in great breadth and depth. But we are confident that a pragmatic approach to domestic and international policy that is based upon economic realities of today rather than theoretical hopes of the past will result in an easing of the difficulties which this nation has encountered in its international trade and payments.

I thank you again for this opportunity to appear here today, and on behalf of the steel industry I offer our full cooperation and resources in the search for a modern, equitable and more effective international trade policy.

APPENDIX TO STATEMENT BY GEORGE A. STINSON, PRESIDENT AND EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF NATIONAL STEEL CORPORATION, AND CHAIRMAN, AMERICAN IRON AND STEEL INSTITUTE THE SPECIALTY STEEL IMPORT PROBLEM

The specialty steel industry

The import problem is particularly severe in specialty steels. The voluntary restraint arrangements have not reduced imports of specialty steel mill products, and recent trade trends reflect a shift in imports into these higher grade, more expensive steels.

Specialty steels are thought of as stainless steels, tool steels, high temperature steels, and refractory, reactive, and electronic metals. This Appendix concentrates primarily on the stainless and tool steel segments of the specialty steel industry because these steels are readily identifiable in available statistical data published by the American Iron and Steel Institute and the U.S. Department of Commerce.

It is generally recognized that specialty steels are a distinct and readily identifiable part of the overall steel industry in the United States. In 1969 American producers of tools and stainless steel accounted for 1.1 per cent of net industry shipments of total steel mill products. These specialty steel products, however, represented approximately 7 per cent of total steel industry dollar sales.

Specialty steels are designed and produced for use in extreme environments requiring exceptional hardness, toughness, tensile strength, resistance to heat, corrosion, or abrasion, or a combination of these factors. These steels contain substantial amounts of expensive alloys such as chromium, nickel, molybdenum, titanium, columbium, tungsten, vanadium, cobalt, and other elements which provide their unique characteristics.

Because of the technological properties and alloy content of these sophisticated steels, specialty steels are difficult and costly to manufacture. Moreover, these steels are frequently produced to the specific requirements of individual customers. They are generally sold in pound weights rather than in tons.

Rising imports of specialty steels are a critical problem for American specialty steel producers. The voluntary restraint arrangements involving Japan and the EEC countries, which helped reduce total steel mill product imports to 14 million tons in 1969, have not produced a reduction in specialty steel imports. While the program of voluntary restraints is in effect, the strict adherence of foreign producers to their commitment not to change greatly the existing product mix is essential to prevent the continued loss of domestic specialty steel markets to imports and the disruption of the domestic specialty steel industry.

Foreign trade trends in specialty steel mill products

Approximately 90 percent of identifiable specialty steel mill product imports are stainless steels; the remaining 10 per cent are primarily tool steels which can be separated into two groups: high speed and other alloy tool steels. Between 1964 and 1969 imports of these specialty steel mill products rose rapidly from 88.4 thousand net tons to 197.5 thousand net tons, an average rate of 17.4 per cent annually. Imports increased their participation in the U.S. market for specialty steel mill products during this period from 10.2 per cent to 17.1 per cent, as shown in attached Table 1S. The steadily rising trend of specialty steel imports was discernible in the late 1950's and became significant between 1959 and 1964. Comprehensive statistical data on U.S. foreign trade in specialty steel mill products, however, was not published by the U.S. Department of Commerce until 1964. Therefore, references to the import problem before 1964 reflect general import trends indicated by the limited information available at the time.

Market penetration and product mix

Imports of stainless steel mill products have increased every year, rising from 79.4 thousand net tons in 1964 to 182.2 thousand net tons in 1969 as illustrated in Table 2S. Throughout this period imports of stainless steel mill products increased at an average rate of 18.1 per cent annually, while the corresponding rate of growth for domestic shipments was only 3.4 per cent. This large continuing disparity between the rates of growth of imports and domestic markets and the absorption of a significant share of the net growth in these markets by imports in recent years. For example, imports of stainless steel mill products rose from 10.5 per cent to 19.2 per cent of apparent consumption between 1964 and 1968, dropping only to 17.7 per cent in 1969, still the second highest level of import penetration on record. In this six year period, apparent consumption of stainless steel increased 276 thousand net tons. Stainless steel imports captured 103 thousand net tons, or 37.2 per cent of the growth in the domestic market.

By 1964 imports of stainless steel mill products had made significant inroads into virtually every product line. Products imported in largest volume were cold rolled sheets, semi-finished products, were rods, round wire, and strip and flat wire, as illustrated in Table 3S. This table also shows the shift of stainless steel imports from lower to higher value products. Imports of flat-rolled products now account for 46 per cent of total stainless imports, whereas in 1964 their share represented 41 per cent. Imports of other, more sophisticated products such as bars and pipe and tubing also have increased while the share of total imports represented by semi-finished products and wire rods has receded.

With respect to tool steels, imports of these products rose sharply from 9 thousand net tons to over 15 thousand net tons during the 1964-1969 period. The growth in imports occurred at an average annual rate of 10.9 per cent per cent while the rate of growth of domestic tool steel shipments increased only 2.2 per cent annually. Imports as a percentage of apparent consumption increased steadily, from 8.3 per cent in 1964 to a high of 14.8 per cent in 1967 and 12.1 per cent in 1969 as shown in Table 4S. Apparent consumption of tool steel increased from 109 thousand net tons in 1964 to 126 thousand in 1969, an increase of 15.8 per cent. Imports captured 6 thousand tons, or over 35 per cent of the 17 thousand ton growth in the domestic market.

Imports of each of the two groups of tool

steel, high speed and other alloy tool steels, increased rapidly in the 1964-1969 period, as shown in Table 5S. Imports of high speed tool steels increased from 2.7 thousand net tons in 1964 to approximately 5 thousand net tons in 1969, an increase of 87 per cent. Growth of imports has been substantial in most high speed tool steel products. Table 5S shows the largest increase in tonnage have occurred in bars and wire rods.

Imports of other alloy tool steel during the 1964-1969 period increased from approximately 6.4 thousand net tons to 10.2 thousand net tons, an increase of 60 per cent. Table 5S indicates most of the increased tonnage has been in hot rolled bars.

Country of origin imports

Japan is the largest supplier of stainless steel mill product imports to the United States, accounting for better than 45 per cent, on the average, of total imports. Imports from Japan rose from 34 thousand net tons in 1964 to 86 thousand net tons in 1969, an increase of 153 per cent. While it is generally believed that some of the Canadian tonnage is processed and re-exported, Canada is still a major supplier with 30.1 per cent of total imports in 1969. Sweden ranks third with 8.6 per cent of total imports, followed by France with 7.8 per cent, and the United Kingdom with 2.8 per cent, as shown in Table 6S. Imports from every major foreign supplier of stainless steel mill products have increased steadily through the 1964-1969 period. In 1969 more than 40 per cent of our stainless steel mill product imports were supplied by countries not participating in the voluntary restraint program.

In tool steels, Sweden, Austria, Canada, and Japan, in that order, are the major suppliers of both high speed and other alloy tool steels, as indicated in Tables 7S and 8S. Again more than two-thirds of tool steel imports in 1969 came from countries which did not participate in the voluntary restraint program.

Port of entry and imports

Since 1964 there has been a major shift in the geographic distribution of stainless steel imports. The greatest volume of imports in this period entered through the Great Lakes and other ports of entry along the Canadian border. In 1969 the import tonnage through this area was 73.3 thousand tons, or 40.3 per cent of total imports. The second largest customs regions is the Atlantic Coast through which 73 thousand tons, or 40.1 per cent of total imports, entered the United States in 1969. However, as Table 9S illustrates, in the last six years the share of total imports into these two largest customs regions dropped off, while the share of total imports into the Pacific and Gulf Coasts increased. The most significant gain took place in Pacific Coast imports which represented only 8.1 per cent of total imports in 1964 but accounted for 14.3 per cent in 1969.

In tool steels imports expanded steadily into all major custom regions through 1967. The Atlantic Coast received the largest share of tool steel imports, followed by the Canadian border and Great Lakes region. In 1968 and 1969, however, imports into these regions declined while imports to the Pacific Coast increased, as shown in Table 10S.

Impact of specialty steel imports

The specialty steel industry includes many comparatively small business enterprises, as measured by volumes of production and sales. Although some of the large carbon steel producers also produce specialty steels, it is estimated they account for no more than one-third of total industry shipments of stainless and tool steel mill products.

Specialty steels are high-fixed-cost products, and high operating rates must be maintained to minimize unit production

costs. Changes in the volume of production, which in turn reflect the market demand for specialty steels, quickly influence profitability. The steady loss of the domestic market to imports could result in the eventual curtailment of production or the inability of the specialty steel industry to grow and modernize. These effects are particularly severe on small companies since many have neither the production and sales alternatives nor the financial resources with which to minimize the negative impact on their operations of the loss of basic markets over an extended period of time.

The fundamental reason for the loss of domestic markets to imports is price. In recent years prevailing import prices for specialty steel products have been substantially below comparable domestic prices. An indication of the magnitude of this disparity is shown in statistics on stainless steel published by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. The average domestic sales realization for all stainless grades of steel mill products was \$1,130 per net ton in 1967, the latest year for which the information is available. The comparable f.o.b. value of imports of stainless steel mill products was \$673 per net ton. Adding an average duty of \$93 and freight, handling, and insurance costs of \$29 brings the estimated average delivered price of imported stainless steel to \$795 per ton. This average import price is 30 per cent, or \$335, below the average domestic price for stainless steel.

The prevailing market price of individual transactions may vary substantially from these averages, depending upon the specifications of the product and other competitive factors. However, the magnitude of the disparity between domestic and import prices indicated by these general averages demonstrates the competitive dilemma which confronts the domestic specialty steel producer. On the one hand, when the price differential between import and domestic specialty steels is at least four times greater than the average rate of return on sales for the domestic industry, the possibility of profitable competition by across-the-board alignment of domestic prices with prevailing import prices is foreclosed to the domestic producer. On the other hand, the magnitude of this price differential is a strong inducement to consumers to purchase foreign steel, particularly during inflationary periods. This latter condition is readily apparent in the steady deterioration of the balance of trade in specialty steel mill products from a surplus of \$31 million in 1964 to a deficit of \$70 million in 1969, as illustrated in Table 11S.

As a greater share of the domestic market is relinquished to imports, the United States is becoming increasingly dependent upon imports as a source of supply for specialty steels. Because of the strategic importance of specialty steels in our contemporary industrial economy, national military, economic, and political considerations suggest that an equitable balance should be achieved between imports and domestic production.

National requirements for specialty steels

The national requirements for specialty steels are best classified into two groups: those industrial needs of the United States which are necessary to maintain both the civilian economy and a strong industrial base in peacetime and in emergencies and those defense needs which bear directly on military preparedness. Many uses of specialty steels in these two areas are interrelated, and often manufactured products containing specialty steels can be used for both civilian and military purposes. However, the needs of our civilian economy and our defense operations are dependent upon the ability of this nation to maintain a strong, viable industrial base. Impairment of this industrial base is a direct threat to our national security.

With respect to the industrial needs of the United States for specialty steels, our industrial economy is dependent upon these steels because there are many critical applications for specialty steels for which there is no economic, or readily available, substitute material. To keep the highly mechanized and broadly diversified economy of this country running smoothly, specialty steels are an indispensable basic material used by many industries in producing goods and services for the American people.

For example, the electrical power system of the United States could not function without specialty steels because there is no economic, or readily available, substitute for these steels in the shafting, buckets, blades, and other parts of the giant turbines, which are the basic power unit of the electrical power system. To prevent the immobilization of part of the nation by a massive power failure such as the East Coast blackout in the fall of 1965, jet turbine engines, which cannot be made without specialty steels, are now being used as standby and auxiliary units. In the nuclear power industry also, specialty steels are standard in certain equipment applications such as pool liners and tubing for condensation and feedwater exchange processes.

The aircraft industry must have specialty steels. Applications of specialty steels in this industry vary widely from jet engines to aircraft firewalls, exhaust systems, heating units, and engine cowlings. Another critical application is found in sensitive electronic instrumentation devices which are essential to the performance of the aircraft and the identification and regulation of the flow of air traffic. For the United States, air travel has become not only a basic transportation system for passengers and freight but also a vital force in the nation's defense system.

Technological advancement in the aviation industry and in other industries has resulted in the need for new, high temperature, critical performance specialty steels. One of the crucial factors in developing steels for new applications is that time required to translate metallurgical and technological know-how and materials into a quality-performance product. The benefits of technological development are cumulative. Therefore, the United States must not only preserve but also build on its present reservoir of knowledge about the production and application of specialty steels in our industrial society. There is no better example of this requirement than the space industry which is, itself, an outgrowth of the aviation industry. The moon shot and other space projects would be impossible without specialty steels for rocket engines, mobile launching stations, lunar landing modules, electronic instrumentation devices, and related instruments, machinery, and equipment.

The magnetic and electronic properties of some specialty steels are invaluable in all types of contact-switches, and none of these applications is more essential, or more mundane, than the simple telephone switch. Many semiconductor devices, including transistors and integrated circuits, require electronic glass sealing alloys. The uses of the vacuum tube in electronic applications are countless.

Specialty steels are used widely in the food processing industry, including the dairy industry, because the corrosion resistance properties and the fabricating characteristics of these steels reduce contamination and facilitate the sanitary handling of foods. There are many uses of specialty steels in this industry for which there is no generally acceptable substitute material, and there are some equipment applications in meat packing equipment, dairy handling equipment,

and milking machines where specialty steels are required by law.

Critical bearing applications, gears, valves and valve stems, gauge parts, pump parts, dies, and cutting tools are essential to industry and science. Specialty steels are used extensively in these applications.

The foregoing examples point up a few of the basic civilian and industrial requirements of the United States which must be met with specialty steels because there is no economic, or readily available, substitute material. This list of critical applications is by no means exhaustive; however, these examples illustrate three basic conclusions with respect to the importance of specialty steels to the nation.

1. The national security of the United States starts with the ability of this nation to maintain a viable industrial base and civilian economy both in peacetime and in a period of national emergency.

2. Specialty steels are an indispensable industrial material, and, therefore, this domestic industry is a strategic national resource.

3. This nation should maintain an adequate level of self-sufficiency, not only in the production and supply capability of the domestic industry, but also by maintaining a contemporary reservoir of technology and a skilled, experienced, and adequate labor force. In short, the national security requirements of the United States are best met by providing an economic climate in which the domestic specialty steel industry will continue to grow and to expand.

The higher price of domestic specialty steel in comparison with prevailing import prices includes not only the cost of our security but also the price of our prosperity. These domestic prices reflect fundamental social and economic costs: the cost of full employment, the cost of good government, the cost of capital, and the cost of basic economic gains such as profits, growth, and expansion. As former Secretary of Commerce Smith said on September 18, 1968, "Disruptions in the country's ability to produce can threaten our security from within. The billions of dollars we spend on education, health, manpower training, and other social purposes will disappear unless the private sector produces the revenue base for these programs. And, without funds for worthy purposes, domestic disquiet can reduce our capacity to defend our borders. . . .

" . . . Without a healthy economic base, much of our leadership in outer space becomes forfeit, scientific and technological gains slide out of reach, our prestige and influence in world councils diminishes.

"There is much, in short, that we need to do and continue to do by way of national defense, but little achievement will be possible without the foundation—economic strength."

With respect to our national defense requirements for specialty steels, the Department of Defense estimates that 9.5 per cent of total industry shipments of stainless steel in 1968 were needed to meet military requirements for these steels. Future projections for the mid-1970's, made by the Office of Emergency Preparedness in accordance with its planning assumptions, indicate that 10.4 per cent of total industry shipments of stainless steel will go to direct defense applications. These applications primarily include: aircraft, missiles, ships, tanks, automotive vehicles, weapons, ammunition, electronics, and construction uses. A few examples illustrate the importance of specialty steels in these applications. For instance, specialty steels are essential for the manufacture and transportation of nitric acid. The anti-spike innersole of the combat boot now being worn in Vietnam is a specialty steel. The major parts of the Minuteman 2 and 3, the Poseidon, as well as other smaller

missile systems are made from specialty steel.

Increasing dependence upon imports of specialty steels is perilous should the availability of imports be disrupted. The production of specialty steels in Canada and Mexico is small. Consequently, these countries cannot now be considered as adequate, contiguous sources for specialty steels in the event that the inflow of steel from Europe and Japan is impeded. Self-sufficiency in specialty steel production is imperative for the United States, and a reasonable balance between imports and domestic production will ensure the stability and viability of this essential industry.

The U.S. Government stockpiles strategic metallic elements, among which are chromium, nickel, molybdenum, tungsten vanadium, and cobalt, to ensure the availability of these materials for the production of specialty steel and other products in the event of a national emergency. Impairment of our domestic production capability from excessive imports is inconsistent with the purpose of this national security objective of guaranteeing a raw materials base for U.S. industry.

The military requirements for specialty steels cannot be met without a permanent, viable domestic source of production since it is impossible to predict the advent, or duration, of a national emergency and since military security involves a perpetual state of readiness and forward planning. Furthermore, military security is contingent upon the maintenance of a minimum, essential civilian economy in the United States during national emergencies. This implies the ability of the civilian economy to meet the general economic requirements of the population, as well as the productive capability of industry.

The voluntary restraint arrangements

The voluntary restraint program has not reduced imports of specialty steel mill products, in 1969 imports of stainless and tool steels not only exceeded the targets of the voluntary restraint program but also increased substantially over the 1968 level of imports as illustrated in Table 12S. Similarly, total imports from Japan, the EEC, and the category of "all other" countries were over the voluntary restraint targets. With the exception of tool steel imports from Japan and stainless steel imports from the EEC, imports from these countries also exceeded 1968 imports.

In general product categories 1969 imports of all stainless steel mill products, shown in Table 3S, were over their voluntary restraint levels even though imports of stainless steel wire rods, hot rolled bars, cold rolled sheets, and strip and flat wire receded from 1968 imports. In tool steels, 1969 imports of other alloy tool steel products, shown in Table 5S, were both over the voluntary restraint target and over the level of imports in the previous year. In high speed tool steels, hot rolled bars and wire were substantially below the voluntary targets, but cold finished bars and plates and sheets were above both the targets and 1968 levels.

Imports of specialty steel mill products did not follow the 1968 pattern of geographic distribution. In stainless steel there was a significant shift in imports to the Canadian border and Great Lakes customs region and to the Pacific Coast ports, as illustrated in Table 9S. The shift in tool steels was toward the Atlantic Coast for imports of high speed tool steels and the Atlantic Coast and Pacific Coast for imports of other alloy tool steels, as shown in Table 10S.

The import record for 1969 indicates strongly that compliance with, and possibly renegotiation of, the voluntary restraint ar-

rangements is essential to the welfare of the specialty steel industry. More supplying nations, specifically Canada, Austria, Sweden,

and the United Kingdom, must be encouraged to participate in this program, and the product mix and geographical distribution

patterns must be more rigorously observed in order to avoid serious dislocations of specialty markets.

TABLE 1-S.—U.S. FOREIGN TRADE IN TOTAL SPECIALTY STEEL (STAINLESS AND TOOL STEEL)

[In net tons]													
Year	Net industry shipments	Imports	Exports	Apparent consumption	Imports as a percent of apparent consumption	Exports as a percent of net industry shipments	Year	Net industry shipments	Imports	Exports	Apparent consumption	Imports as a percent of apparent consumption	Exports as a percent of net industry shipments
1969	1,023,374	197,477	63,599	1,157,252	17.1	6.2	1966	1,054,286	155,004	90,979	1,118,311	13.9	9.6
1968	925,408	189,193	89,258	1,025,433	18.5	9.6	1965	997,412	126,414	94,717	1,029,109	12.3	9.5
1967	947,009	168,180	117,658	997,531	16.9	12.4	1964	873,621	88,433	98,276	863,778	10.2	11.2

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 2S.—U.S. FOREIGN TRADE IN STAINLESS STEEL¹

[Net tons]													
Year	Net industry shipments	Imports	Exports	Apparent consumption	Imports as a percent of apparent consumption	Exports as a percent of net industry shipments	Year	Net industry shipments	Imports	Exports	Apparent consumption	Imports as a percent of apparent consumption	Exports as a percent of net industry shipments
1969	909,453	182,224	60,874	1,030,803	17.7	6.7	1966	932,941	137,390	89,204	981,127	14.0	9.6
1968	819,042	174,031	87,652	905,421	19.2	10.7	1965	879,170	113,460	93,065	899,565	12.6	10.6
1967	837,080	149,321	116,019	870,382	17.2	13.9	1964	771,242	79,352	96,001	754,593	10.5	12.4

¹ Includes heat-resisting steels.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 3S.—IMPORTS OF STAINLESS STEEL BY PRODUCT GROUPS

[In net tons]											
Year	Total	Semi-finished	Wire rods	H.R. bars	C.F. bars	Round wire	Plates	H.R. sheets	C.R. sheets	Strip and flat wire	Pipe and tube
Net tons:											
1969	182,224	49,044	14,864	6,507	6,121	13,966	7,153	1,993	62,739	11,908	7,929
1968	174,031	39,602	15,925	8,003	4,640	11,364	5,198	860	69,012	12,736	6,691
1967	149,321	41,658	13,227	4,391	5,405	12,012	3,787	722	53,066	7,787	7,266
1966	137,390	44,091	12,688	5,006	2,903	9,156	1,899	1,320	47,228	8,967	4,132
1965	113,460	44,110	9,073	2,251	2,463	6,625	884	1,317	37,245	5,902	3,590
1964	79,352	28,993	8,076	1,112	1,375	5,028	786	1,662	24,985	5,230	2,105
Percentage of total:											
1969	100.0	26.9	8.1	3.6	3.4	7.7	3.9	1.1	34.4	6.5	4.4
1968	100.0	22.8	9.2	4.6	2.7	6.5	3.0	.5	39.6	7.3	3.8
1967	100.0	27.9	8.9	2.9	3.6	8.1	2.5	.5	35.5	5.2	4.9
1966	100.0	32.1	9.2	3.6	2.1	6.7	1.4	1.0	34.4	6.5	3.0
1965	100.0	38.9	8.0	2.0	2.2	5.8	.8	1.1	32.8	5.2	3.2
1964	100.0	36.5	10.2	1.4	1.7	6.3	1.0	2.1	31.5	6.6	2.7

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 4S.—U.S. FOREIGN TRADE IN TOTAL TOOL STEEL

[Net tons]													
Year	Net industry shipments	Imports	Exports	Apparent consumption	Imports as a percent of apparent consumption	Exports as a percent of net industry shipments	Year	Net industry shipments	Imports	Exports	Apparent consumption	Imports as a percent of apparent consumption	Exports as a percent of net industry shipments
1969	113,921	15,253	2,725	126,449	12.1	2.4	1966	121,345	17,614	1,775	137,184	12.8	1.5
1968	106,366	15,162	1,606	119,922	12.6	1.5	1965	118,242	12,954	1,652	129,544	10.0	1.4
1967	109,929	18,859	1,639	127,149	14.8	1.5	1964	102,379	9,081	2,275	109,185	8.3	2.2

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 5S.—IMPORTS OF TOOL STEEL BY PRODUCT GROUPS

Year	High-speed tool steel (net tons)					Other alloy tool steel					Grand total tool steel
	Wire rods	H.R. bars	C.F. bars	Plates and sheets	Wire	Wire rods	H.R. bars	C.F. bars	Total other alloy tool steel		
1969	1,390	1,410	1,180	477	550	5,007	1,606	7,584	1,056	10,246	15,253
1968	916	2,319	980	172	1,717	6,104	1,393	6,911	754	9,058	15,162
1967	650	1,667	1,262	105	1,890	5,574	1,830	10,589	8,661	13,285	18,859
1966	600	1,908	1,664	478	379	5,029	2,497	9,297	791	12,585	17,614
1965	254	1,831	635	134	326	3,180	3,774	5,555	445	9,774	12,954
1964	90	1,202	462	132	788	2,764	1,773	4,214	420	6,407	9,081
	Percentage of total high-speed tool steel					Percentage of other alloy tool steel					
1969	27.7	28.1	23.6	9.6	11.0	100.0	15.7	73.8	10.5	100.0	
1968	15.0	38.0	16.0	2.8	28.2	100.0	15.4	76.3	8.3	100.0	
1967	11.7	29.9	22.6	1.9	33.9	100.0	13.8	79.7	6.5	100.0	
1966	11.9	38.0	33.1	9.5	7.5	100.0	19.8	73.9	6.3	100.0	
1965	8.0	57.6	20.0	4.2	10.2	100.0	38.6	56.8	4.6	100.0	
1964	3.4	44.9	17.3	4.9	29.5	100.0	27.7	65.8	6.5	100.0	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 6-S.—U.S. IMPORTS OF STAINLESS STEEL BY COUNTRY OF ORIGIN

Year	Japan	Canada	Sweden	United Kingdom	France	Belgium-Luxembourg	West Germany	Italy	EEC total ¹	Austria	Other	Total ¹
Net tons:												
1969	86,235	54,790	15,615	5,099	14,222	2,098	1,422	1,385	19,129	397	959	182,224
1968	83,141	42,609	17,599	5,641	16,881	3,036	1,481	1,819	23,218	1,483	340	174,031
1967	67,989	46,204	13,965	3,077	12,522	1,173	1,737	1,513	16,972	511	603	149,321
1966	65,299	46,778	10,225	1,789	10,013	722	1,223	781	12,759	140	400	137,390
1965	51,929	44,454	6,171	1,343	7,761	264	808	230	9,063	175	325	113,460
1964	34,155	30,050	5,889	1,037	6,526	484	679	89	7,840	270	111	79,352
Percentage of total:												
1969	47.3	30.1	8.6	2.8	7.8	1.1	0.8	0.8	10.5	0.2	0.5	100.0
1968	47.8	24.5	10.1	3.2	9.7	1.7	0.9	1.0	13.3	0.9	0.2	100.0
1967	45.5	30.9	9.4	2.1	8.4	0.8	1.2	1.0	11.4	0.3	0.4	100.0
1966	47.5	34.1	7.4	1.3	7.3	0.5	0.9	0.6	9.3	0.1	0.3	100.0
1965	45.8	39.2	5.4	1.2	6.8	0.2	0.7	0.2	8.0	0.2	0.3	100.0
1964	43.1	37.9	7.4	1.3	8.2	0.6	0.9	0.1	9.9	0.3	0.2	100.0

¹ Includes negligible tonnage from the Netherlands.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 7S.—U.S. IMPORTS OF HIGH SPEED TOOL STEEL BY COUNTRY OF ORIGIN

Year	Sweden	Austria	Canada	Japan	United Kingdom	West Germany	Belgium-Luxembourg	France	EEC ¹ Total	Total ¹
Net tons:										
1969	1,756	737	620	549	231	717	-----	383	-----	5,007
1968	1,361	930	995	751	663	529	653	218	-----	6,104
1967	1,053	1,205	744	706	28	599	751	161	-----	5,574
1966	1,058	1,367	1,128	716	45	209	146	348	-----	5,029
1965	700	827	882	540	35	123	-----	73	-----	3,180
1964	418	759	328	421	81	284	-----	78	-----	2,674
Percentage of total:										
1969	35.1	14.7	12.4	11.0	4.6	14.3	-----	7.7	-----	100
1968	22.4	15.2	16.3	12.3	10.9	8.6	10.7	3.6	-----	100
1967	18.9	21.6	13.3	12.7	0.5	10.7	13.5	2.9	-----	100
1966	21.0	27.2	22.4	14.2	0.9	4.2	2.9	6.9	-----	100
1965	22.0	26.0	27.7	17.0	1.1	3.9	-----	2.3	-----	100
1964	15.6	28.5	12.3	15.7	3.0	10.6	-----	2.9	-----	100

¹ Includes negligible tonnage from other EEC countries not listed.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 8S.—U.S. IMPORTS OF OTHER ALLOY TOOL STEEL BY COUNTRY OF ORIGIN

Year	Sweden	Austria	Canada	Japan	United Kingdom	West Germany	Belgium-Luxembourg	France	EEC ¹ Total	Total ¹
Net tons:										
1969	2,978	2,417	1,854	911	637	810	-----	463	-----	10,246
1968	2,444	1,892	1,887	1,490	393	626	20	145	-----	9,058
1967	3,254	2,057	4,724	1,269	404	1,302	96	168	-----	13,285
1966	3,690	2,628	1,645	2,190	358	1,419	152	486	-----	12,585
1965	2,389	1,796	977	228	424	2,236	1	1,706	-----	9,774
1964	2,016	776	783	296	492	340	4	1,700	-----	6,407
Percentage of total:										
1969	29.0	23.6	18.1	8.9	6.2	7.9	-----	4.5	-----	100
1968	27.0	20.9	20.8	16.4	4.3	6.9	-----	1.6	-----	100
1967	24.5	15.5	35.6	9.6	3.0	9.8	-----	1.3	-----	100
1966	29.3	20.9	13.1	17.4	2.8	11.3	-----	3.9	-----	100
1965	24.4	18.4	10.0	2.3	4.3	22.9	-----	17.5	-----	100
1964	31.5	12.1	12.2	4.6	7.7	5.3	-----	26.5	-----	100

¹ Includes negligible tonnage from other EEC countries not listed.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 9S.—U.S. IMPORTS OF STAINLESS STEEL BY REGION OF ENTRY

	Net tons						Percentage of total					
	1969	1968	1967	1966	1965	1964	1969	1968	1967	1966	1965	1964
Atlantic coast	73,062	79,369	64,259	56,058	43,273	32,736	40.1	45.6	43.0	40.8	38.1	41.2
Canadian border and Great Lakes	73,311	64,053	61,820	63,575	57,109	38,532	40.3	36.8	41.4	46.3	50.3	48.6
Pacific coast	26,064	20,217	16,221	12,926	9,932	6,391	14.3	11.6	10.9	9.4	8.8	8.1
Gulf coast	9,182	9,899	6,813	4,625	3,012	1,569	5.0	5.7	4.6	3.4	2.7	2.0
Offshore	605	493	208	206	134	124	3	3	1	1	1	1
Total	182,224	174,031	149,321	137,390	113,460	79,352	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 10S.—U.S. IMPORTS OF TOOL STEEL BY REGION OF ENTRY

	Net tons						Percentage of total					
	1969	1968	1967	1966	1965	1964	1969	1968	1967	1966	1965	1964
High speed tool steel:												
Atlantic coast	3,158	3,386	3,168	2,843	1,730	1,997	63.1	55.5	56.8	56.5	54.4	74.7
Canadian border and Great Lakes	1,598	2,059	1,788	1,698	1,373	671	31.9	33.7	32.1	33.8	43.2	25.1
Pacific coast	207	422	197	379	38	3	4.1	6.9	3.5	7.5	1.2	2
Gulf coast	3	173	384	78	39	-----	8	2.8	6.9	1.6	1.2	-----
Offshore	41	64	37	31	-----	3	1	1	7	6	-----	-----
Total	5,007	6,104	5,574	5,029	3,180	2,674	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Other alloy tool steel:												
Atlantic coast	3,862	4,773	6,176	6,631	5,238	4,615	37.7	52.7	46.5	52.8	53.6	71.9
Canadian border and Great Lakes	4,881	3,200	6,345	5,019	4,187	1,553	47.6	35.3	47.8	39.9	42.9	24.2
Pacific coast	1,320	1,004	682	781	348	239	12.9	11.0	5.1	6.2	3.5	4.9
Gulf coast	183	81	79	144	1	-----	1.8	1.0	6	1.1	-----	-----
Offshore	-----	-----	3	10	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total	10,246	9,058	13,285	12,585	9,774	6,407	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 11S.—BALANCE OF TRADE OF TOTAL SPECIALTY STEEL (STAINLESS AND TOOL STEEL)

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Year	Imports		Exports		Balance		Year	Imports		Exports		Balance	
	Net tons	Amount	Net tons	Amount	Net tons	Amount		Net tons	Amount	Net tons	Amount	Net tons	Amount
1969.....	197,477	\$139,782	63,599	\$69,485	-133,878	-\$70,297	1966.....	155,004	\$99,004	91,079	\$80,043	-63,925	-\$18,961
1968.....	189,193	132,783	89,257	67,083	-99,936	-65,700	1965.....	126,414	76,887	94,717	84,267	-31,697	+7,380
1967.....	168,180	112,950	116,659	85,059	-51,521	-27,891	1964.....	88,433	50,037	98,276	81,407	+9,843	+31,370

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 12S.—IMPORTS OF STEEL MILL PRODUCTS BY GRADES, YEARS 1969 AND 1968

	Year 1969 (net tons)	Percent of total	Year 1968 (net tons)	Percent of total	Voluntary restraint level	Percent change 1969 versus	
						Year 1968	Voluntary restraint level
Carbon steel.....	13,498,656	96.18	17,471,248	97.28	13,633,334	-22.7	-1.0
Japan.....	5,997,597	95.92	7,078,617	97.05	5,580,072	-15.3	+7.5
EEC.....	5,151,469	99.08	7,046,079	99.28	5,708,473	-26.9	-9.8
All other.....	2,349,590	90.99	3,346,552	93.79	2,344,789	-29.8	+0.2
Stainless steel.....	182,224	1.30	172,168	.96	130,512	+5.8	+39.8
Japan.....	6,236	1.38	82,664	1.13	65,364	+4.3	+32.3
EEC.....	19,129	.37	22,133	.31	17,941	-13.6	+6.7
All other.....	76,859	2.98	67,371	1.89	47,207	+14.1	+62.8
Tool steel.....	15,262	.11	13,106	.07	9,511	+16.5	+60.5
Japan.....	1,460	.02	1,576	.02	1,242	-7.4	+17.6
EEC.....	2,387	.04	1,738	.02	1,408	+37.3	+69.5
All other.....	11,415	.44	9,792	.27	6,861	+16.6	+66.4
Other alloy steel.....	338,145	2.41	302,790	1.69	226,643	+11.7	+49.2
Japan.....	167,322	2.68	131,069	1.80	103,322	+27.7	+61.9
EEC.....	26,472	.51	27,375	.39	22,178	-3.3	+19.4
All other.....	144,351	5.59	144,346	4.05	101,143	+42.7
Total steel.....	14,034,287	100.00	17,959,312	100.00	14,000,000	-21.9	+0.2
Japan.....	6,252,615	100.00	7,293,926	100.00	5,750,000	-14.3	+8.7
EEC.....	5,199,457	100.00	7,097,325	100.00	5,750,000	-26.7	-9.6
All other.....	2,582,215	100.00	3,568,061	100.00	2,500,000	-27.6	+3.3

Source: BDSA and AISI.

BAN DDT EVENTUALLY—WHY NOT NOW?

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1970

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, just about a week ago 39 of my colleagues and I either signed or indicated that we support the intent of a letter which was sent to President Nixon asking him to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to comply with a U.S. Court of Appeals ruling by immediately suspending the registration of DDT and preventing its shipment in interstate commerce.

Support for this action has come from many sources; from housewives who may have a new interest in the protection of our environment and from respected conservation groups which have long sought to protect the birds, fish, and wildlife with which this country is graced.

Support for this action has now come from one of the major newspapers in the Nation—the New York Times. In an editorial with respect to this ban a few days ago, the Times asked "why not now?" Those of us who wrote to the President feel the same way.

The Court of Appeals decision has given the administration the opportunity to act quickly to rid our environment of this hazardous pesticide. I urge the President again to act now in the interest of environmental protection by

suspending the registration of DDT now. A copy of the New York Times editorial follows:

EVENTUALLY—WHY NOT NOW?

To prevent the "law's delay" from deepening the silence of successive springs, killing off millions of fish and possibly raising the toll of cancer in humans, President Nixon has only to order his Secretary of Agriculture to suspend immediately the use of DDT. Appeals from the Department's ruling of last November to that effect could then take their long and tortuous course without harm to man or beast.

That ruling ordered the phasing out of DDT, except for a few stipulated uses, by 1971. But hopes that the decision would soon eliminate this most dangerous of all pesticides were quickly dashed when six manufacturers of the product appealed. A move to arrest the damage that prolonged legal delays would entail was then made by a group of conservation organizations—the Environmental Defense Fund, the Sierra Club, the West Michigan Environmental Council, the Audubon Society and the Izaak Walton League.

All these agencies asked was the removal of DDT from the market while the case was pending. But Secretary Hardin denied the petition on the ground that they did not have legal standing in the matter. On May 28 Chief Judge David Bazelon of the U.S. Court of Appeals wisely ruled otherwise: "the interest of the public in safety" was as good a ground for legal action as the manufacturers' commercial interest. The Secretary was given thirty days to suspend registration of the pesticide for interstate shipment or give the court his reasons.

If Mr. Hardin is looking for reasons to keep DDT on the market a while longer, he will doubtless find them—as well as grounds for

appealing an adverse decision by the court. But surely there is little validity in such action—and grave danger. The Olin Corporation, which produces some 20 per cent of the DDT manufactured in the country, is so sure that the compound will be banned in the next few years that it has already announced its intention to stop production at the end of this month. Secretary of the Interior Hickel has virtually banned the use of hard pesticides on Federal lands, approximately a quarter of the land area of the United States.

If the courts should eventually favor the pesticide, which we can hardly conceive, manufacturers can always resume its production; if they do not, a suspension now will have spared the earth that much more of needless affliction. Here is a clear case where "if it were done when 'tis done, then 'twere well it were done quickly." The President has only to give the word.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 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 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?