

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## BRIGHT FUTURE FOR NORTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA

## HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. SCOTT. Mr President, on June 6, 1970, the secretary of commerce of Pennsylvania, Hon. William T. Schmidt, delivered a speech to the conference of the Department of Community Affairs. In that speech he outlined the bright future he predicts for northeastern Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, since I, too, feel that this region has a great potential for growth and increasing prosperity, and since Mr. Schmidt has expressed that fact so eloquently, I ask that his speech be reprinted in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM T. SCHMIDT

"What's New?"

That can be a casual greeting of friends, a way of taking inventory, or the measure of man's planning in a community like the northeast. If we ask what's new in the way of accomplishment in our country today, we can point to moon exploration, supersonic aircraft, heart transplants, interstate highways, modern schools and hospitals, the highest living standard ever achieved in the history of mankind.

If we ask the same question within the area we know as the northeast, we can say expansion of industry, development of recreation, attention to problems of environment, improved transportation facilities, a booming tourist business, a new lease on life for people who had much reason for despair a decade ago.

That's why I believe that the most important thing that is new in the northeast is not so much the material accomplishments, but the "attitude." Theodore Roosevelt once said that "It is not the critic who counts, not the man who points out how the man stumbled, or where the doer of deeds could have done them better. The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena; whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood; who strives valiantly; who errs and comes short again and again; who knows the great enthusiasms, the great devotions; who spends himself in a worthy cause; who, at the best, knows in the end the triumph of high achievement; and who, at the worst, if he fails, at least fails daring greatly."

Ladies and Gentlemen, it is our responsibilities, not ourselves, that we should take seriously. That's what's new in northeast and that's a proven formula for success.

That attitude is evident, too, in the major topics on the program today. So often we seem to take the government approach to the social and economic ills of the day, and place too little emphasis on the improvement of man himself.

The panels of the day are symbolic of the awareness that comfortable and adequate housing, security from lawlessness and fear, contribute immeasurably to the prosperity of a community and the well being of its citizens.

Something else is new, perhaps not in the recent past, but over a period of time. The coordinated efforts of these two agencies of

the Commonwealth, the Department of Community Affairs and the Department of Commerce will benefit the northeast and other regions as they work in the seventies.

Once a Bureau within the Department of Commerce, the Department of Community Affairs has blossomed into an effective agency for direct involvement in vital areas that have mushroomed into prominence in recent years. I believe it is an unheralded blessing for the citizens of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to have such close cooperation and such common dedication among the personnel of two organizations that can provide so much assistance to them.

Our efforts in economic development have been affected by recent legislative decisions, but Governor Shafer has committed us to tax reform, and as I have said on numerous occasions, "Don't hand out the band-aids, we are not bleeding, because we have many things going for us in Pennsylvania."

The nation's finest highway system; air, rail, truck, and water transportation facilities; a rapidly expanding system of vocational-technical schools to keep a steady flow of trained labor available; our geographic proximity to the world's greatest markets, where more than half of the population in the nation lives within 500 miles of the state; energetic public utilities; a most cooperative banking community; cooperative community leaders in local development programs; excellent recreation diversification.

We have had interest by firms from foreign countries for relocation in Pennsylvania. We already have attracted industries from Norway, Italy, Canada, Germany, Mexico, and France. We expect to pursue other possible contacts this month during a reverse investment mission to Germany. Deputy Secretary Ketner will lead the Commerce delegation.

We face the challenge of competition from other states. We must overcome the image of "sock it to business" taxes. We must seek protection from foreign imports that compete with our native products. We must recognize the obligation of tighter environmental control of industrial waste, and we must qualify for the increasingly rigid requirements of corporations seeking new sites.

In that respect, John Harper of the Aluminum Company of America, ran down a check list of considerations important in choosing a site for a large facility. High on the list was the "quality" of a community, its attitude toward schools, its initiative in tackling pollution problems, the ability of its leaders. His firm studies fairness of taxes, attitude toward business, fiscal responsibility, zoning and land use, anticipated residential buildup, population growth projections, transportation availability and costs, supply and cost of power, price of land and availability of water, skilled labor pool and at what rates, local management-labor relations, attitudes toward modern schools, hospitals, libraries, and even religious and political attitudes.

That's a large order and the community that can meet those standards deserves a secure place in the industrial development picture. But that's the way the rules are written today, and that bridge must have a connection at both ends to handle the traffic. We in the Department of Commerce have found the northeast regional industrial development programs a bustling expressway to successful accomplishment.

So what will be new in the northeast in the 70's? I have difficulty tempering my optimism so as to sound realistic. Why? Because an area that was regarded a decade ago as one accommodating poor country cousins has become the symbol of achievement throughout the world.

With a good reputation for action it is difficult to slow the momentum of a winner. And it has not been done with magic, with rabbits in a hat—not by any one local, state or federal agency, but with the combined efforts of responsible people, hardworking, backed by substantial private investment—with faith, dimes, dollars, of people who believed it could be done.

Specifically, the pace was set by successful industrial expansion and relocation programs. PIDA activity in a seven county area of northeastern Pennsylvania resulted in 241 loans in the amount of \$58,760,000 since 1956 to date (in excess of 25%). These projects provided 36,101 jobs with an annual payroll of \$154 million.

During the period 1965-1969, Luzerne County led the state in expanded and relocated industries, Lackawanna County was third in the state, Schuylkill fifth.

Adding to the pattern was the major development of highways. From 1965 through 1969 accelerated construction of Interstate Routes 80, 81, 81-E joining the northeast extension of the turnpike, and Interstate 84.

When opportunity appeared through Appalachia assistance programs, a mountain was literally moved into a ravine to provide a modern airport and entrance to the jet age. Wyoming Valley Sanitary Authority linked communities to solve waste disposal problems for today, and provided opportunity for residential and industrial development in the future.

Vocational-technical schools are being built to help provide a continuing flow of skilled labor, new shopping malls, new schools, new efforts to provide community services and attractive surroundings were part of the new image that said . . . "See us as we are now, not as we were twenty years ago."

Perhaps with some nostalgic regret—but not reluctantly—we saw recreation and tourism surpass the anthracite industry as a factor in the economy of the northeast. And we proudly accepted the designation as the "Honeymoon Capital of the World," and extended our sympathy to New York, Florida, and California. We modestly acknowledged that in the northeast, our newly affluent society has the highest number of second home ownership in the nation, another tribute to our attractive facilities for rest and relaxation.

So what of the future? The Bureau of Labor Statistics in Washington projects a labor force in this country climbing by twenty percent in the 70's to 100 million workers, with 26 million of them in the 25-34 age bracket. Has the northeast made itself attractive and available to this age group . . . It has!

BLS says the work week will decline in hours to 38 to provide more leisure time. The northeast can supply the fun! The swing to a service economy—including trade and government—will accelerate, and the long term shift toward white collar jobs.

Training will continue. White collar jobs will total 50 percent of the work force by the end of this decade. Increases are predicted in demands for personnel in transportation, communications and public utilities. The largest increase in service industries will rise about twenty percent, mainly in general merchandise stores and eating establishments.

Services will enjoy a surge faster than the total employment rate, with all segments benefitting. The northeast will be ready—and because the facilities have been provided, the tourist and recreation people can meet the demand.

Construction will be stimulated by the prosperity in the northeast and the housing

demand will provide employment for the tradesman, the northeast is ready!

The giant megalopolis extending from Boston to Washington will have the northeast as its heart, with easy access in—and transportation out—to a huge market for local products.

The motto of the "Boy Scouts of America" is . . . "Be Prepared".

The northeast is prepared . . . and its strongest asset, with all the physical accomplishments, is still—people of strong will and confidence who are willing to cooperate in a worthwhile endeavor.

#### EDUCATION FUNDS

### HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the editorial from the American Medical News which effectively emphasizes the need for strong Federal financial support for medical education programs. If we are to effectively provide for delivery of health services to the people of our Nation, the Government, and the private sectors must adequately meet their responsibilities in financing educational opportunities.

The editorial follows:

#### EDUCATION FUNDS

Once again, the American Medical Association has emphasized to Congress the vital need for strong federal financial support for medical education programs.

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare of the House Committee on Appropriations, C. H. William Ruhe, MD, director of AMA's Division of Medical Education, explained that the AMA believes "that in any appropriation priorities established for all government programs, those which affect health care should be given primary consideration."

Further, he emphasized, "because of the special need that exists at this period in our history for more physicians, we urge that appropriations relevant to the production of physicians be given first priority."

The urgency of training increasing numbers of physicians is apparent to almost everyone. While the 8,500 who received MD degrees this spring represented an increase of about 20% over the figure 10 years ago, estimates by the AMA and Assn. of American Medical Colleges show that a substantial increase in current enrollments—as much as 50%—is needed to permit admission of all qualified students under present conditions. Even greater increases will be necessary in the future.

Expanded enrollment, of course, can come about in two ways—increasing enrollment in existing schools and the development of new schools.

In a recent editorial, the *New York Times* described the financial difficulties encountered by the Mount Sinai School of Medicine—a new institution which graduated its first class of MDs last month. Planning for the New York City school had begun almost 10 years ago. At that time, the cost of its development was estimated at \$107 million, but inflation has elevated the total to about \$150 million. So far, only about two-thirds of this amount has been raised.

This, commented the *Times*, "points up how expensive and time consuming is the creation of a new medical school, especially one depending heavily upon private resources."

Increasing enrollment also is expensive, as the *Times* pointed out:

"The expansion of existing medical schools is under way, but that process, too, is being hindered by shortages of money and of trained staff. Recent cutbacks in federal medical and related research funds have hit many medical schools hard. Some are near insolvency.

"Republicans and Democrats alike insist that they want to assure adequate, high quality medical care for all Americans. That assurance can become reality only if both the government and private sectors are willing to supply the substantial funds required to increase the number of new doctors, nurses, and other essential personnel much more rapidly than presently available resources will make possible."

Much has been said by members of Congress about the need for more medical manpower. Now, the time has come when they must match their words with actions.

#### WATER POLLUTION CONTROL NEEDS FOR NEXT 6 YEARS

### HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to release today a report containing firm figures on the Nation's water pollution control needs for the next 6 years.

The report was prepared at my request by the National League of Cities and U.S. Conference of Mayors. I believe many Senators will join me in expressing thanks for the depth and early delivery of the report.

Mr. President, the report strongly urges approval of a Federal funding program of at least \$2.5 billion a year for the construction of municipal facilities.

It adds that a Federal program of \$3 to \$4 billion a year can be easily justified in light of present needs.

More than 1,000 cities, counties, and special districts responsible for water pollution control are covered by the survey. These jurisdictions include 89.4 million persons.

The report observes that between 50 and 60 million more Americans now are served by sewage treatment plants "or should be so served by 1976."

As Senators know, the Federal share of sewage treatment construction funds under existing law is authorized at \$1.25 billion in fiscal year 1971. The authorization expires next June 30.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES; U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

July 6, 1970.

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: The National League of Cities and U.S. Conference of Mayors are pleased to submit to you the survey of municipal needs for water pollution abatement facilities which you requested during the appearance before your Subcommittee of Mayor Robert Knecht and Mayor Carl Stokes. The survey includes specific needs data for 1008 cities, counties, and special districts responsible for water pollution control. These local jurisdictions cover

approximately 89.4 million persons and reported needs totalling \$13,967,031,676 which could be spent through 1976 if funds are available.

Based on this survey, we estimate that \$33 to \$37 billion in public expenditures will be necessary to meet the nation's water pollution control needs in the next six years. We recognize that these costs are substantial; however, they represent what is necessary to get the job done. In light of these findings we strongly urge approval of a new funding program providing at least the \$2.5 billion a year assistance suggested in S. 3687. A \$3 to \$4 billion a year federal program can be easily justified in light of present needs.

We appreciate your continuing interest in and support for pollution abatement programs. We look forward to working with you to develop a successful federal program for financing the nation's clean water efforts.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. GUNTHER,  
Executive Director, U.S. Conference of  
Mayors.

PATRICK HEALY,  
Executive Vice President, National  
League of Cities.

#### STUDY BACKGROUND

During testimony of Mayor Robert W. Knecht of Boulder, Colorado and Mayor Carl B. Stokes of Cleveland, Ohio before the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Public Works Committee, Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Chairman of the Subcommittee, requested the Mayors to provide his Committee with such specific information as they could obtain on the extent of local needs for water pollution control facilities in the next six years. To obtain this data, NLC and USCM undertook an extensive survey, sending questionnaires (a copy follows) to all state leagues of municipalities and direct member cities of NLC and USCM. In addition, NLC and USCM staff studied local needs data developed by some states and by the Association of Metropolitan Sewerage Agencies, which also prepared a needs report at Senator Muskie's request.

As a result of the returns of questionnaires and other material studied, NLC and USCM have obtained data indicating the specific needs for water pollution control facilities in 1008 local communities covering approximately 89.4 million persons. The combined needs reported by these communities is \$19,967,031,676. The needs were broken into three categories by the NLC questionnaire.

1. Needs for primary and secondary treatment facilities.
2. Needs for tertiary treatment facilities.
3. Needs for interceptor and storm sewers, including projected costs of separating storm and sanitary sewers, and/or storing storm water overflows (interceptor sewers are currently eligible for Federal assistance under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, storm sewers are not).

Replies to NLC and USCM survey indicated that some communities counted interceptor sewer needs as part of their primary and secondary treatment facility costs. The cost breakdown as reported is:

For primary and secondary treatment .....	\$8,701,541,974
For tertiary treatment .....	3,904,051,553
For interceptor and storm sewer improvement .....	7,361,438,149

In addition to the nearly 89.4 million people covered by the NLC and USCM survey, there are between 50 and 60 million persons living in the United States who are served by sewage treatment works and related facilities or should be so served by 1976. Based on this projection, and recognizing that needs in reporting jurisdictions averaged approximately \$220 per capita, we estimate total national needs for state and local water pollution control facilities to be between \$30 and \$33 bil-

lion today. Adding a five percent inflation factor, which we believe conservative in light of present trends, the total costs to provide these facilities over the next six year period will range from \$33 to \$37 billion.

There follows a compilation of local pollution control needs by state. Following this is

a listing of the needs in individual jurisdictions. Those needs figures<sup>1</sup> are needs figures where the city reporting indicated that it was reporting needs for an areas greater than its city limits, those needs figures<sup>2</sup> are gained from the survey prepared for Senator Muskie

by the Association of Metropolitan Sewerage Agencies; those needs figures<sup>3</sup> are from surveys prepared in 1970 by state governments. Idaho and Wyoming are omitted from the survey as no data was provided from these states.

State	Jurisdictions surveyed	Survey population coverage	Primary and secondary needs	Tertiary treatment needs	Interceptor and storm sewer needs	Total
Alabama	3	700,000	\$50,200,000	\$31,700,000	\$19,600,000	\$101,500,000
Alaska	4	85,000	168,500,000	0	40,000,000	208,500,000
Arizona	5	1,200,000	10,070,750	22,300,000	31,264,000	63,634,750
Arkansas	4	290,000	7,100,000	7,200,000	10,930,187	25,230,187
California	30	14,745,000	577,862,000	528,254,000	362,195,000	1,468,311,000
Colorado	4	1,100,000	24,900,000	7,865,000	80,500,000	113,265,000
Connecticut	7	720,000	32,680,000	8,000,000	130,830,000	171,510,000
Delaware	1	20,000	12,600,000	8,000,000	2,000,000	22,000,000
Florida	12	1,500,000	236,973,260	80,000,000	127,354,900	444,328,160
Georgia	5	1,300,000	85,200,000	21,400,000	248,000,000	354,600,000
Hawaii	1	330,000	86,000,000	32,000,000	16,000,000	134,000,000
Illinois	458	8,501,210	874,228,050	322,800,000	1,292,000,000	2,489,028,050
Indiana	10	1,300,000	88,800,000	50,000,000	236,000,000	374,800,000
Iowa	11	625,000	25,300,000	1,000,000	26,500,000	52,800,000
Kansas	6	600,000	15,850,000	16,750,000	84,300,000	116,900,000
Kentucky	1	50,000	10,600,000	12,900,000	6,200,000	29,700,000
Louisiana	2	250,000	7,625,000	12,000,000	9,875,000	29,500,000
Maine	2	58,000	7,850,000	12,000,000	15,850,000	35,700,000
Maryland	3	1,600,000	106,950,000	1,950,000	6,000,000	114,900,000
Massachusetts	13	3,340,000	295,450,000	29,500,000	314,000,000	638,950,000
Michigan	12	4,490,000	514,500,000	37,000,000	265,179,000	816,679,000
Minnesota	4	1,620,000	110,000,000	104,800,000	202,500,000	417,300,000
Mississippi	1	35,000	500,000	0	0	500,000
Missouri	13	3,270,000	366,005,500	9,511,000	60,141,000	435,657,500
Montana	1	55,400	5,100,000	0	4,640,000	9,740,000
Nebraska	4	570,000	62,599,400	3,160,000	12,283,000	78,042,400
Nevada	2	290,000	17,012,000	19,406,000	13,800,000	50,218,000
New Hampshire	52	350,000	168,785,600	0	45,400,000	214,185,600
New Jersey	7	2,500,000	496,500,000	49,500,000	88,155,000	634,155,000
New Mexico	1	250,000	2,500,000	5,000,000	38,000,000	46,500,000
New York	10	9,430,000	1,459,191,200	2,054,700,000	546,385,000	4,060,276,200
North Carolina	7	750,000	58,550,000	27,500,000	27,475,000	113,525,000
North Dakota	2	65,200	0	850,000	10,000,000	10,850,000
Ohio	20	5,500,000	516,770,000	53,100,000	633,207,500	1,203,077,500
Oklahoma	6	915,000	75,676,750	14,146,553	17,786,467	107,609,770
Oregon	79	920,000	108,288,000	40,500,000	111,145,000	259,933,000
Pennsylvania	24	7,280,000	941,740,000	58,560,000	1,370,305,095	2,370,605,095
Rhode Island	2	90,000	11,000,000	3,000,000	6,000,000	20,000,000
South Carolina	5	420,000	58,250,000	16,050,000	8,300,000	82,600,000
South Dakota	69	260,000	12,056,564	4,300,000	5,400,000	21,756,564
Tennessee	2	950,000	165,000,000	12,000,000	150,000,000	327,000,000
Texas	16	4,300,000	130,733,000	90,975,000	65,269,000	286,977,000
Utah	1	40,000	1,200,000	0	4,000,000	5,200,000
Vermont	2	50,000	3,800,000	3,300,000	13,000,000	20,100,000
Virginia	3	1,000,000	30,900,000	1,000,000	58,000,000	89,900,000
Washington	70	2,000,000	340,074,900	74,840,000	161,216,000	576,130,900
West Virginia	2	129,000	8,500,000	0	38,500,000	47,000,000
Wisconsin	8	2,100,000	130,470,000	15,234,000	344,952,000	490,656,000
District of Columbia	1	1,460,000	181,700,000	0	0	181,700,000
Total	1,008	89,403,810	8,701,541,974	3,904,051,533	7,361,438,149	19,967,031,676

State	Primary and secondary needs	Tertiary treatment needs	Interceptor and storm sewer needs
Alabama:			
Bessemer	\$6,200,000	\$1,700,000	\$4,600,000
Birmingham	40,000,000	30,000,000	
Montgomery	4,000,000		15,000,000
Total	50,200,000	31,700,000	19,600,000
Total needs, \$101,500,000.			
Alaska:			
Greater Anchorage Area Borough	\$154,000,000		40,000,000
Fairbanks (partial estimate)	\$4,500,000		
Juneau (partial estimate)	\$6,000,000		
Ketchikan (partial estimate)	\$4,000,000		
Total	168,500,000		40,000,000
Total needs, \$208,500,000.			
Arizona:			
Mesa	875,000	800,000	3,261,000
Phoenix	16,732,000	20,500,000	20,000,000
Tempe	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	3,673,000
Tucson	\$800,000		
Yuma	1,663,750	1,000,000	4,330,000
Total	10,070,750	22,300,000	31,264,000
Total needs, \$63,634,750.			
Arkansas:			
Fayetteville	( <sup>2</sup> )	2,000,000	2,800,000
Little Rock	5,700,000	2,500,000	3,630,187
North Little Rock	900,000	1,200,000	2,500,000
Pine Bluff	500,000	1,500,000	2,000,000
Total	7,100,000	7,200,000	10,930,187
Total needs, \$25,230,187.			

State	Primary and secondary needs	Tertiary treatment needs	Interceptor and storm sewer needs
California:			
Buena Park	( <sup>3</sup> )		\$4,000,000
Burbank	\$1,000,000	\$800,000	200,000
Culver City	( <sup>3</sup> )		900,000
Central Contra Costa Sanitary District	28,580,000	20,000,000	
Freemont, Newark, and Union City	( <sup>3</sup> )	7,500,000	1,233,000
Fresno	110,800,000	17,400,000	20,000,000
Glendale	6,000,000	1,000,000	2,000,000
Hayward	4,400,000	4,500,000	8,000,000
Los Angeles City	1102,500,000	1100,000,000	162,500,000
Los Angeles County	1100,000,000	1130,000,000	
Modesto	( <sup>3</sup> )	5,000,000	
Norwalk	( <sup>3</sup> )	( <sup>3</sup> )	1,600,000
East Bay Municipal Utility District	40,000,000		30,000,000
Oceanside	5,978,000	2,254,000	
Orange County	\$57,000,000		
Oxnard	\$1,666,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,600,000
Palo Alto	( <sup>3</sup> )	5,000,000	( <sup>3</sup> )
Redwood City	6,000,000	4,000,000	( <sup>3</sup> )
Riverside	( <sup>3</sup> )	4,000,000	1,000,000
Sacramento	4,000,000	6,000,000	( <sup>3</sup> )
Salinas	2,800,000	2,000,000	750,000
San Diego	55,000,000	1120,000,000	( <sup>3</sup> )
San Francisco	89,000,000		200,000,000
San Jose	\$30,000,000	\$70,000,000	15,232,000
San Leandro	1,675,000	300,000	1,500,000
San Mateo	2,000,000	3,500,000	1,000,000
Santa Barbara	6,000,000	5,000,000	2,000,000
Santa Clara	4,429,000	20,000,000	( <sup>3</sup> )
Santa Rosa	6,234,000		780,000
South San Francisco	4,000,000		3,500,000
Total	577,862,000	528,254,000	362,195,000
Total needs, \$1,468,311,000.			

Footnotes at end of table.

State	Primary and secondary needs	Tertiary treatment needs	Interceptor and storm sewer needs
<b>Colorado:</b>			
Aurora	(9)	(9)	\$20,000,000
Colorado Springs	\$8,500,000	\$1,500,000	1,500,000
Denver	\$16,400,000	\$3,865,000	29,000,000
Pueblo	(9)	2,500,000	30,000,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>24,900,000</b>	<b>7,865,000</b>	<b>80,500,000</b>
<b>Total needs, \$113,265,000.</b>			
<b>Connecticut:</b>			
Hartford Metro.	\$16,480,000		\$80,330,000
Bristol	1,500,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Greenwich	200,000	5,000,000	
Meriden	2,000,000	1,000,000	4,000,000
Middletown	3,500,000		30,000,000
New London	9,000,000		10,000,000
Torrington			4,500,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>32,680,000</b>	<b>8,000,000</b>	<b>130,083,000</b>
<b>Total needs, \$171,510,000.</b>			
<b>Delaware: Dover</b>	<b>\$12,000,000</b>	<b>\$8,000,000</b>	<b>2,000,000</b>
<b>Total needs, \$22,000,000.<sup>11</sup></b>			
<b>District of Columbia</b>	<b>181,700,000</b>		
<b>Total needs, \$181,700,000.</b>			
<b>Florida:</b>			
Daytona Beach	900,000		
Fort Lauderdale	10,000,000	7,000,000	
Hollywood	\$28,173,260	10,000,000	\$161,904,900
Jacksonville	\$75,900,000		\$1,150,000
Key West	4,000,000	(9)	300,000
Lakeland	\$15,000,000	1,000,000	5,000,000
Miami	9,000,000	15,000,000	10,000,000

State	Primary and secondary needs	Tertiary treatment needs	Interceptor and storm sewer needs
<b>Miami Beach</b>	<b>\$16,000,000</b>	<b>\$8,000,000</b>	
<b>Panama City</b>	<b>7,000,000</b>	<b>25,000,000</b>	<b>\$30,000,000</b>
<b>Pensacola</b>	<b>\$20,000,000</b>	<b>\$5,000,000</b>	<b>6,000,000</b>
<b>Sarasota</b>	<b>\$52,000,000</b>		<b>1,000,000</b>
<b>West Palm Beach</b>	<b>9,000,000</b>	<b>9,000,000</b>	<b>12,000,000</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>236,973,260</b>	<b>80,000,000</b>	<b>127,354,900</b>
<b>Total needs, \$444,328,160.</b>			
<b>Georgia:</b>			
Albany	\$17,600,000		15,000,000
Atlanta	\$50,000,000	20,000,000	\$200,000,000
Augusta	3,000,000		15,000,000
Brunswick	\$5,000,000		2,000,000
Savannah	\$9,600,000	\$1,400,000	16,000,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>85,200,000</b>	<b>21,400,000</b>	<b>248,000,000</b>
<b>Total needs, \$354,600,000.</b>			
<b>Hawaii: Honolulu</b>	<b>86,000,000</b>	<b>32,000,000</b>	<b>16,000,000</b>
<b>Total needs, \$134,000,000.</b>			
<b>Illinois:</b>			
Aurora			15,000,000
Bloomington-Normal		1,800,000	5,000,000
Joliet	10,000,000	20,000,000	30,000,000
Metro. S.D. of Greater Chicago	588,000,000	300,000,000	1,230,000,000
North Shore Sewer District	\$73,000,000		
Rock Island	2,000,000	1,000,000	12,000,000
452 localities listed below	201,228,050		
<b>Total</b>	<b>874,228,050</b>	<b>322,800,000</b>	<b>1,292,000,000</b>
<b>Total needs, \$2,489,028,050.</b>			

452 LOCALITIES AND NEEDS FIGURES

Abington	\$358,000	Catlin	\$244,000	Germantown	\$25,000
Addison	825,000	Cedar Point	8,250	Gibson City	318,000
Albion	66,000	Centralia	2,271,500	Gillespie	19,250
Aledo North	40,800	Chadwick	3,300	Gilman	171,750
Aledo South	35,700	Chester	290,000	Girard	147,000
Alexis	22,000	Chrisman	113,000	Glasford	25,500
Algonquin	200,000	Christopher	82,000	Glen Carbon	20,000
Alhambra	15,000	Cisne	3,300	Glen Ellyn	2,615,000
Allendale North	5,400	Clay City	115,500	Glendale Heights	850,000
Alpha	15,300	Coal City	15,500	Godfrey Twnsp	95,500
Altamont Lagoon	140,500	Cobden	25,000	Golconda	4,400
Altamont SW	33,000	Coffeen	2,750	Grafton	150,000
Amboy	11,000	Colchester	58,700	Grand Tower	5,000
Andalusia	4,400	Collinsville	4,300,000	Greenup	138,500
Anna	863,000	Columbia	16,500	Greenville	100,000
Arcola	50,000	Coulterville	27,500	Hamel	2,200
Arenzville	15,500	Cowden	13,750	Hamilton	185,000
Arthur	46,000	Creal Springs	19,250	Hampshire	32,000
Ashland	5,500	Crossville	69,400	Hanna City	96,000
Ashton	25,500	Crystal Lake	5,403,000	Hanover	37,700
Assumption	7,700	Cuba	35,700	Harrisburg	1,250,000
Astoria	109,000	Cutler	11,000	Hartford	150,000
Atlanta	87,500	Danvers	22,000	Hebron	100,000
Atwood	33,000	DeSota	19,250	Hecker	8,250
Auburn	231,000	Delavan	33,200	Herrin	822,000
Augusta	25,000	Dix	1,100	Highland	125,000
Ava	16,500	Du Page County	1,705,000	Hillsboro	105,100
Aviston	17,500	DuQuoin	35,750	Homer	187,500
Avon	25,500	Dupo	200,000	Homewood	415,500
Baldwin	8,250	East Dubuque	185,000	Heyworth	50,000
Bardolph	50,000	East Dundee	400,000	Hoopeston	566,500
Barrington	1,192,500	East Moline	1,500,000	Hoyleton	11,000
Barry	7,700	Earlville	38,500	Hull	3,000
Barteso	12,500	East St. Louis	5,500,000	Huntley	63,000
Batavia	1,344,000	Edinburg	25,500	Hurst	22,000
Beckemeyer	27,500	Edwardsville	310,000	Hutsonville	35,750
Belleville, S.D.	950,000	Effingham	2,975,000	Olava	52,000
Belleville No. 3	17,500	Elburn	180,000	Jerseyville	55,000
Bement	44,000	Eldorado	96,200	(sewage works)	
Benld	45,000	Elizabeth	270,000	Johnston City	110,000
Bensenville	220,000	Elizabethtown	35,000	Joy	12,750
Benton	192,500	Elkville	20,000	Karnak	65,000
Bethany	30,250	Ellis Grove	5,500	Keithsburg	65,500
Bloomington	41,250	Elmhurst	2,700,000	Kenney	2,200
Bluffs	3,850	Energy	13,750	Kewanee	1,428,000
Bradford	25,000	Enfield A	22,000	Kincaid	38,250
Bradley	1,097,000	Enfield B	24,750	Kimundy	22,000
Breese	105,000	Eureka	500,000	Kirchoefer	4,000
Bridgeport	12,000	Evansville	57,200	Kirkland	25,000
Brighton	80,600	Fairbury	240,000	Knoxville	233,750
Brookport	6,600	Fairfield	590,000	LaSalle	1,000,000
Brownstown	15,000	Farina STW	3,300	Ladd	30,600
Bunker Hill	37,500	Farina West	12,000	Lake County	
Bushnell	320,000	Farmer City	187,000	Vickry Man	30,000
Cairo	1,253,000	Farmersville	12,750	Lake in the Hills	265,000
Cambridge	38,200	Farmington	76,500	Lake Villa	250,000
Camp Point	6,000	Fayetteville	1,100	Lanark	38,250
Campbell Hill	5,500	Flat Rock	13,750	Lansing	1,260,000
Canton	1,156,200	Fiora	495,000	Lawrenceville	356,000
Carbondale	2,491,500	Forreston	28,000	Leaf River	12,750
Carlinville	130,000	Fox Lake	143,000	Lena	38,250
Carlyle	16,000	Fox River Grove	150,000	Lewistown	55,000
Carmi	707,000	Freeburg Lagoon	35,000	Lexington	176,000
Carpentersville	470,000	Fulton	240,000	Leroy	500,000
Carrier Mills	11,000	Galva N	266,500	Lincolnshire	180,000
Carrollton	13,750	Galva SW	51,000	Litchfield	180,000
Carthage	700,000	Geneseo	525,000	Livingston	217,500
Cary	1,580,000	Geneva	2,250,000	Louisville	5,000
Casey No. 1	82,500	Geroa East	100,000	Lovington	33,000
Casey No. 2	482,500	Georgetown	350,000	Mackinaw	28,000

Footnotes at end of table.

452 LOCALITIES AND NEEDS FIGURES—Continued

Mahomet	\$120,000	Ramsey	\$20,000	Wauconda	\$315,000
Manhattan	33,000	Rankin	22,000	Waverly	35,000
Manteno	70,000	Rantoul	1,500,000	Wayne City	35,750
Maquon	2,000	Raymond	102,000	West Dundee	178,000
Marine	5,000	Red Bud	324,000	West Frankfort	847,500
Marion	2,000,000	Richmond	71,500	West Salem	29,250
Marissa	50,000	Richton Park	98,250	White Hall	75,000
Maroa	102,000	Ridge Farm	100,000	Williamsville	110,000
Marseilles	410,000	Ridgeway	25,500	Willisville	13,750
Marshall	490,000	Robinson	247,500	Wilmington	342,000
Martinsville	35,000	Rochelle	916,000	Winchester	8,800
Maryville	17,500	Rochester	110,000	Windsor	93,500
Mascoutah	115,000	Romeoville	187,000	Winnsboro	152,000
Mason City	51,500	Roodhouse	250,000	Witt	6,000
Mathersville	15,300	Roseville	25,500	Wood River	940,000
Mattoon	1,931,000	Rosiclaire	120,000	Wyandot	25,000
McHenry	264,000	Rossville	1,500,000	Wyoming	138,800
McLean	20,000	Roxana	132,000	Yates City	17,900
McLeansboro	270,000	Royalton	6,600	Albany	4,400
Mendon	18,000	Rushville	418,000	Ashley	15,000
Mendota	25,000	St. Anne	400,000	Bethalto N.	45,000
Metropolis	1,250,000	St. Elmo	42,500	Bethalto NW	5,000
Millford	1,400,000	St. Jacob	12,500	Bloom Township	3,300,000
Milledgeville	30,600	St. Peter	7,500	Bonnie Brae	200,000
Millstadt	45,000	Salem	176,000	Brimfield	15,500
Minonk	183,000	Sandoval	120,750	Cahokia (ESLSD)	2,500,000
Mokena	46,000	Sauget	5,000,000	Caseville Twp. NE	95,000
Moline	3,600,000	Savanna	327,000	Caseville Twp. SW	45,000
Momence	186,000	Savoy	10,000	Central City	38,500
Monmouth	900,000	Seneca	121,500	Clearview	11,000
Monticello	785,750	Sesser	158,700	Clinton	631,000
Morrison	348,500	Shabbona	36,500	Creve Coeur	495,000
Morrisonville	130,000	Shannon	18,000	Danville	4,800,000
Morton	560,000	Shawneetown	1,714,000	DeKalb	300,000
Mound City	110,000	Shelbyville	448,000	Decatur (Skoville Park)	5,500
Mounds	49,500	Sherrard	18,000	Decatur (Main)	4,219,000
Moweaqua	1,180,000	Sibley	130,000	Downers Grove No. 2	300,000
Mount Carroll	50,000	Silvis	1,750,000	Durand	21,600
Mount Morris	76,500	Smithton	16,500	Elgin-S.	13,800,000
Mount Olive	115,700	Sparta	293,500	Elgin-N.	1,400,000
Mount Pulaski	42,000	St. Charles	444,000	Franklin Grove	18,000
Mount Sterling	86,000	Staunton	105,000	Galesburg (L. Rice)	500
Mulberry Grove	3,850	Steelville	41,200	Good Hope	7,650
Mundelein	200,000	Sterling	1,000,000	Highland Hills	49,850
Murphysboro	655,000	Stillman Valley	3,300	Hinsdale	150,000
Naperville	2,600,000	Stockton	51,000	Irvington	2,000
Nashville	151,500	Streator	110,000	Joppa	40,000
Neoga	121,200	Sullivan	339,200	Landsdowne (ESLSD)	2,481,000
New Athens	42,500	Sumner	139,000	Hoffman (sewage works)	8,000
New Baden	42,500	Swansea	25,000	Lou-Dei	13,750
Nokomis	60,000	Sycamore SW	200,000	Newark	15,000
Oak Grove Park	41,000	Tamms	2,800	North Elmhurst	171,200
Naplate	110,000	Tampico	18,000	Noble	19,250
Oblong	200,000	Taylor Springs	2,800	Norris City	113,000
Odin	86,000	Taylorville	1,200,000	Oak Highlands	5,500
Oglesby	115,500	Teutopolis	32,500	Patoka	16,500
Okawville	24,750	Tolono	1,200,000	Paw Paw	3,850
Olmsted	35,000	Tilden	22,500	Port Byron	26,000
Olney	50,000	Tilton	246,500	Salt Creek	1,800,000
Onida	51,000	Toledo	27,500	Seward	5,500
Oakwood	300,000	Toluca	107,150	Sheridan	30,000
Orion	30,000	Toulon	30,000	South Roxana	30,000
Oswego	138,000	Tremont	38,250	Springfield-Byp. Lag.	220,000
Ottawa	1,343,000	Trenton	52,500	Springfield	8,000,000
Palestine	35,000	Troy SW	42,500	Stokey Twp.—Dorchester	2,750
Pana	400,000	Utica	71,500	Stokey Twp.—AR No. 1	52,500
Paris	900,000	Valier	97,000	Stokey Twp.—AR Nos. 2-3	20,000
Paxton	150,000	Valmeyer	18,000	Stokey Twp.—AR Nos. 4-5	110,000
Payson	12,500	Vandalia	27,500	Stokey Twp.—AR Nos. 6-7	45,000
Pekin	3,600,000	Villa Grove	213,250	Urbana-Champaign (New)	3,200,000
Percy	22,000	Viola	18,000	Urbana-Champaign (Lake)	25,500
Petersburg	12,650	Virginia STW	110,000	Urbana-Champaign (Main)	3,712,500
Pinckneyville	415,000	Wamac	7,500	Vienna	93,500
Pittsfield	100,000	Warren	40,800	Virdeen	310,000
Pocahontas	22,000	Warsaw	10,450	Westville-Belgm.	467,500
Polo	63,750	Washington	507,000	Wheaton	715,000
Pontiac	3,675,000	Wataga	13,100	Woodhull	4,000
Pontoon Beach	52,750	Waterloo (Sunset)	7,700	Yorkville-Bristol	96,000
Poplar Grove	125,000	Waterman	228,000	Rockton	174,000
Princeton	470,000	Watseka	470,600		
Princetonville	30,600				
Quincy	288,400				

State	Primary and secondary needs	Tertiary treatment needs	Interceptor and storm sewer needs	State	Primary and secondary needs	Tertiary treatment needs	Interceptor and storm sewer needs
Indiana:				Iowa:			
Elkhart	\$6,300,000		\$15,000,000	Bettendorf			
Evansville	9,000,000		3,000,000	Clinton			
Fort Wayne	10,000,000	\$1,000,000	41,000,000	Davenport			
Indianapolis	1,250,000,000	1,350,000,000	100,000,000	Fort Madison	\$10,000,000		
Kokomo	4,500,000	1,500,000	6,000,000	Keokuk			
Mishawaka	25,000,000	5,000,000	2,000,000	Muscatine			
New Albany	3,000,000	2,000,000	10,000,000	Burlington			
Richmond	2,500,000		2,000,000	Council Bluffs	10,000,000		
Terre Haute			2,000,000	Sioux City			
South Bend	3,500,000	2,000,000	55,000,000	Des Moines	5,000,000		\$25,000,000
Total	88,800,000	50,000,000	236,000,000	Mason City	300,000	\$1,000,000	1,500,000
Total needs, \$374,800,000				Total	25,300,000	1,000,000	26,500,000
				Total needs, \$52,800,000			

Footnotes at end of table.

State	Primary and secondary needs	Tertiary treatment needs	Interceptor and storm sewer needs	State	Primary and secondary needs	Tertiary treatment needs	Interceptor and storm sewer needs
<b>Kansas:</b>				<b>Nebraska:</b>			
Hutchinson	\$350,000		\$2,500,000	Hastings	\$500,000	\$160,000	\$410,000
Kansas City	10,000,000		30,000,000	Lincoln	11,755,000	3,000,000	7,562,000
Lawrence	1,500,000	\$750,000	800,000	Norfolk	(17)		
Leavenworth		3,000,000	15,000,000	Omaha	\$50,344,400		4,311,000
Topeka	4,000,000		6,000,000	Total	62,599,400	3,160,000	12,283,000
Wichita		13,000,000	30,000,000	Total needs, \$78,042,400.			
Total	\$15,850,000	16,750,000	84,300,000	<b>Nevada:</b>			
Total needs, \$16,900,000.				Las Vegas	\$12,012,000	\$17,406,000	6,800,000
<b>Kentucky:</b>				Reno	\$5,000,000	\$2,000,000	7,000,000
Ashland	\$10,600,000	\$12,900,000	\$16,200,000	Total	17,012,000	19,406,000	13,800,000
Total needs, \$29,700,000.				Total needs, \$50,218,000.			
<b>Louisiana:</b>				<b>New Hampshire:</b>			
Baton Rouge	\$4,500,000	\$10,000,000	3,000,000	Allenstown-Pembroke	\$2,100,000		
Lafayette	\$3,125,000	\$2,000,000	6,875,000	Bath	\$400,000		
Total	7,625,000	12,000,000	9,875,000	Belmont	\$575,000		
Total needs, \$29,500,000.				Bennington	\$1,800,000		
<b>Maine:</b>				Berlin	\$35,000,000		
Brunswick	350,000		750,000	Bethlehem	\$1,000,000		
Lewiston	7,500,000	12,000,000	15,100,000	Charlestown	\$260,000		
Total	7,850,000	12,000,000	15,850,000	Claremont	7,000,000		
Total needs, \$35,700,000. <sup>14</sup>				Concord	10,500,000		
<b>Maryland:</b>				Conway	\$650,000		
Baltimore	\$106,950,000			Dover	3,500,000		
Bowie		450,000		Durham	\$1,400,000		
Salisbury		1,500,000	6,000,000	Enfield	\$1,800,000		
Total	106,950,000	1,950,000	6,000,000	Epping	\$1,200,000		
Total needs, \$114,900,000.				Farmington	\$1,110,000		
<b>Massachusetts:</b>				Franklin	3,000,000		
Boston (Metro. Dist. Comm)	\$26,950,000		\$287,500,000	Greenville	\$1,000,000		
Fitchburg	20,000,000		10,000,000	Haverhill-Woodsville	\$1,100,000		
Haverhill	\$20,000,000			Henniker	\$800,000		
Lawrence	35,000,000			Hillsborough	\$1,715,000		
Lowell	\$37,000,000			Hinsdale	\$4,900,000		
New Bedford	12,000,000	12,000,000	2,000,000	Hopkinton	\$1,700,000		
Newton			500,000	Hudson	\$3,900,000		
Pittsfield	(1)	4,000,000	(1)	Jaffrey	\$200,000		
Quincy	1,000,000		3,000,000	Lancaster	\$4,050,000		
Revere	1,500,000	500,000	1,000,000	Lebanon	3,400,000		
South Essex	\$58,000,000			Lisbon	\$875,000		
Springfield	\$40,000,000	13,000,000	10,000,000	Manchester	27,500,000		40,000,000
Worcester	\$44,000,000			Marlborough	\$1,200,000		
Total	295,450,000	29,500,000	\$314,000,000	Milford	\$2,800,000		
Total needs, \$638,950,000.				Milton	\$700,000		
<b>Michigan:</b>				Nashua	11,500,000		5,400,000
Bay City		9,000,000	15,000,000	New Castle	\$1,200,000		
Detroit	\$412,400,000		\$96,000,000	Newfields	\$600,000		
East Lansing	200,000	10,000,000	300,000	Newport	\$2,000,000		
Flint	12,000,000	3,000,000	3,700,000	Northumberland	\$700,000		
Grand Rapids	\$13,500,000	\$6,000,000	24,500,000	Ossipee	\$100,000		
Jackson	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$16,000,000	Peterborough	\$2,700,000		
Livonia	(16)	(16)	13,500,000	Pittsfield	\$1,190,000		
Muskegon	11,000,000	4,000,000	3,000,000	Portsmouth	1,500,000		
Pontiac	7,000,000	3,000,000	50,000,000	Rye	\$4,300,000		
Port Huron	9,500,000		19,700,000	Somersworth	4,500,000		
Saginaw	19,400,000		13,500,000	Stewartstown	\$350,000		
Southgate	20,000,000		8,000,000	Stratford	\$180,000		
Wyoming	7,500,000		1,979,000	Sunapee	\$1,850,000		
Total	514,500,000	37,000,000	265,179,000	Tilton-Northfield	\$2,215,000		
Total needs, 816,679,000.				Troy	\$750,000		
<b>Minnesota:</b>				Warner	\$550,000		
Austin	3,000,000	\$1,500,000	500,000	Walpole-No. Walpole	\$1,500,000		
Duluth	7,000,000	200,000	2,000,000	Whitefield	\$1,065,000		
Minneapolis/St. Paul Sanitary District	100,000,000	100,000,000	200,000,000	Wilton	\$700,000		
Winona		3,100,000		Winchester	\$1,500,000		
Total	110,000,000	104,800,000	202,500,000	Total	168,785,060	0	45,400,000
Total needs, \$417,300,000.				Total needs, \$214,185,600.			
<b>Mississippi:</b>				<b>New Jersey:</b>			
Hattiesburg	500,000			Bloomfield	\$24,000,000	\$40,000,000	1,500,000
Total needs, \$500,000.				Camden	\$80,000,000	8,000,000	60,000,000
<b>Missouri:</b>				Middlesex County	90,000,000		20,000,000
St. Louis M.S.D.	\$86,300,000			Passaic Valley Sewerage Commission	300,000,000		
Columbia	\$5,000,000			Perth Amboy	2,500,000	1,500,000	5,000,000
Cape Girardeau	\$1,000,000			Plainfield			1,655,000
Hannibal	\$4,000,000			Total	496,500,000	49,500,000	88,155,000
Independence	10,316,750	3,077,000	30,524,000	Total needs, \$634,155,000.			
Jackson County	\$100,000,000			<b>New Mexico:</b>			
Jefferson City	1,250,000		250,000	Albuquerque	2,500,000	\$5,000,000	39,000,000
Joplin	2,513,750	1,234,000	2,585,000	Total needs, \$46,500,000.			
Kansas City	\$128,800,000			<b>North Carolina:</b>			
North Kansas City	\$3,000,000			Metropolitan Sewer District of Buncombe County	4,000,000	1,000,000	20,000,000
St. Charles	2,200,000			Durham	(1)	4,000,000	(1)
St. Joseph	\$18,000,000			Fayetteville	18,000,000	2,000,000	15,000,000
Springfield	3,625,000	5,200,000	26,782,000	Greensboro	1,000,000	3,000,000	750,000
Total	366,005,500	9,511,000	60,141,000	Raleigh	38,000,000	15,000,000	
Total needs, \$435,657,500.				Salisbury	1,200,000	2,000,000	850,000
<b>Montana:</b>				Winston-Salem	6,350,000	500,000	875,000
Great Falls	5,100,000		4,640,000	Total	58,550,000	27,500,000	27,475,000
Total needs, \$9,740,000.				Total needs, \$113,525,000.			

Footnotes at end of table.

State	Primary and secondary needs	Tertiary treatment needs	Interceptor and storm sewer needs
<b>North Dakota:</b>			
Fargo		\$750,000	\$10,000,000
Jamestown		100,000	
<b>Total</b>		<b>850,000</b>	<b>10,000,000</b>
<b>Total needs, \$10,850,000.</b>			
<b>New York:</b>			
Auburn	\$4,735,000		7,500,000
Elmira	11,906,200		8,000,000
New York City	1,300,000,000	1,900,000,000	300,000,000
North Tonawanda			15,000,000
Poughkeepsie	9,000,000	2,500,000	4,000,000
Rochester	50,000,000	150,000,000	175,000,000
Rome	5,090,000	2,200,000	3,230,000
Schenectady	21,000,000		16,000,000
Watertown	2,000,000		2,655,000
Yonkers	55,500,000		5,000,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,459,191,200</b>	<b>2,054,700,000</b>	<b>546,385,000</b>
<b>Total needs, \$4,060,276,200.</b>			
<b>Ohio:</b>			
Akron	20,000,000	10,000,000	80,000,000
Metropolitan Sewer District of Greater Cincinnati	\$96,600,000		\$11,500,000
Columbus	\$69,000,000		
Cleveland Heights	(*)	(*)	6,000,000
Cleveland (next 4 years only)	\$217,896,000		\$266,920,000
Dayton	5,750,000		
Elyria	800,000	3,000,000	2,000,000
Euclid	8,000,000		30,000,000
Garfield Heights	150,000	100,000	8,625,000
Hamilton	17,000,000	17,500,000	1,000,000
Marion	6,000,000	1,000,000	4,000,000
Middletown	7,250,000		
Montgomery County	10,000,000	20,000,000	4,582,500
Newark	(*)	500,000	6,280,000
Sandusky	3,400,000	6,000,000	75,000,000
Steubenville	1,000,000		500,000
Toledo	121,000,000	1,500,000	100,000,000
Warren	5,000,000	2,000,000	3,000,000
Youngstown	134,000,000		120,300,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>516,770,000</b>	<b>53,100,000</b>	<b>633,207,500</b>
<b>Total needs, \$1,203,077,500.</b>			
<b>Oklahoma:</b>			
Lawton	500,000	3,500,000	5,000,000
Midwest City	5,500,000	500,000	500,000
Norman	1,000,000	650,000	3,000,000
Oklahoma City	\$58,700,000		2,000,000
Shawnee	576,750	496,553	286,467
Tulsa	9,400,000	9,000,000	7,000,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>75,676,750</b>	<b>14,146,553</b>	<b>17,786,467</b>
<b>Total needs, \$107,609,770.</b>			
<b>Oregon:</b>			
Adrian	\$30,000		
Arch Cape	\$138,000		
Arlington	\$200,000		
Astoria	\$4,908,000		
Aumsville	\$80,000		
Aurora	\$50,000		
Barlow	\$85,000		
Bay City	\$262,000		
Bridal Veil	\$50,000		
Brookings	\$300,000		
Bunker Hill S. D.	\$200,000		
Cannon Beach	\$337,000		
Canyon City-John Day	\$250,000		
Clackamas Co. S.D. No. 1	\$6,685,000		
Clatskanie	\$200,000		
Columbia City	\$100,000		
Coos Bay-Empire	\$700,000		
Coquille	\$250,000		
Eastside	\$150,000		
Echo	\$150,000		
Eugene-Springfield Lane Co.	2,100,000	\$30,000,000	9,740,000
Florence	\$220,000		
Gardiner	\$80,000		
Garibaldi	\$350,000		
Gilchrist	\$150,000		
Gleneden	\$230,000		
Gold Beach	\$300,000		
Grande Ronde	\$60,000		
Grants Pass	\$1,850,000		
Gresham	\$750,000		
Hammond	\$250,000		
Hood River	\$1,000,000		
Island City	\$40,000		
Josephine County (Redwood)	\$914,000		
Klamath Falls	\$915,000	500,000	1,000,000
Lexington	\$100,000		
Long Creek	\$50,000		
Lane County	\$1,300,000		
Madras	\$206,000		
Manzanita	\$90,000		
Mapleton	\$50,000		
McNary	\$150,000		
Mosier	\$47,000		
Mount Vernon	\$148,000		
Myrtle Point	\$350,000		
Netarts-Oceanside SD	\$350,000		
North Bend	\$750,000		

State	Primary and secondary needs	Tertiary treatment needs	Interceptor and storm sewer needs
<b>Nyssa</b>			
Nyssa	\$250,000		
Pacific City	\$125,000		
Pendleton	\$75,000		
Philomath	\$507,000		
Portland	\$24,150,000		\$98,900,000
Port of Portland (Airport)	\$50,000		
Ranier	\$300,000		
Redmond	\$500,000		
Richland	\$50,000		
Rockaway	\$125,000		
Rogue River	\$120,000		
St. Helens	\$2,500,000		
Salem	6,000,000	\$10,000,000	600,000
Sandy	\$350,000		
Scappoose	\$637,000		
Scotts Mills	\$52,000		
Seaside	\$75,000		
Seneca	\$50,000		
Siletz	\$90,000		
The Dalles S.T.P.	\$910,000		
Tri-City S.D.	\$407,000		
Turner	\$65,000		
Umatilla	\$200,000		
Union	\$110,000		
Unified Sewerage Agency (Portland metropolitan area)	41,315,000		
Waldport	\$200,000		
Wasco	\$75,000		
Wheeler	\$170,000		
Wilsonville	\$400,000		
Yachats	\$218,000		
Vernonia	\$160,000		
<b>Total</b>	<b>108,288,000</b>	<b>40,500,000</b>	<b>111,145,000</b>
<b>Total needs, \$259,933,000.</b>			
<b>Pennsylvania:</b>			
Allegheny County, Pittsburgh	\$56,000,000		\$115,000,000
Allentown	10,000,000	30,000,000	15,000,000
Altoona	2,000,000	2,000,000	5,000,000
Arnold			300,000
Bethlehem	4,000,000	2,500,000	1,500,000
Bradford Sanitary Authority	1,270,000		
Chester	5,300,000	2,000,000	3,000,000
Easton	4,200,000		1,650,000
Franklin	\$2,300,000	300,000	3,000,000
Greensburg	1,800,000	200,000	500,000
Harrisburg	4,000,000	1,000,000	1,300,000
Lancaster	11,000,000	\$10,000,000	60,000,000
Monessen and Donora	8,020,000	500,000	
Monongahela	1,000,000	500,000	3,000,000
McKeesport	\$3,600,000	250,000	
Oil City	1,200,000	300,000	3,000,000
Philadelphia and Delaware (River Basin Commission service area)	793,500,000		\$1,150,000,000
Pottsville	6,945,000	750,000	1,680,000
Reading	1,500,000	1,000,000	1,350,000
Shamokin	3,205,000		1,075,095
Sharon	1,000,000		150,000
Sunbury	1,900,000		800,000
Wilkes-Barre	10,000,000		
York	8,000,000	14,500,000	3,000,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>941,740,000</b>	<b>58,560,000</b>	<b>1,370,305,095</b>
<b>Total needs, \$2,370,605,095.</b>			
<b>Rhode Island:</b>			
East Providence	6,000,000		3,000,000
Woonsocket	5,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>11,000,000</b>	<b>3,000,000</b>	<b>6,000,000</b>
<b>Total needs, \$20,000,000.</b>			
<b>South Carolina:</b>			
Charleston	\$35,000,000	\$10,000,000	
Columbia	14,000,000	2,250,000	
Florence	2,250,000	1,800,000	6,300,000
Rock Hill	6,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Spartanburg	1,000,000		
<b>Total</b>	<b>58,250,000</b>	<b>16,050,000</b>	<b>8,300,000</b>
<b>Total needs, \$82,600,000.</b>			
<b>South Dakota:</b>			
Arlington	74,000		
Alcester	25,000		
Ashton	20,000		
Astoria	44,119		
Aurora	18,000		
Blunt	34,000		
Bradley	50,000		
Brookings	300,000	170,000	1,200,000
Carthage	27,000		
Claire City	18,000		
Chamberlain	100,000		
Castlewood	20,000		
Columbia	10,500		
Corona	28,000		
Corson	7,000		
Custer	232,000		
Crooks Sanitary District	21,750		
Dell Rapids	37,000		
DeSmet	69,000		
Dupree	21,000		
Eden	14,000		

Footnotes at end of table.

State	Primary and secondary needs	Tertiary treatment needs	Interceptor and storm sewer needs	State	Primary and secondary needs	Tertiary treatment needs	Interceptor and storm sewer needs
Elkton	\$51,000			Washington:			
Ethan	67,300			Aberdeen	\$1,230,400		
Egan	60,000			Anacortes	267,900		
Gary	34,000			Annapolis S.Dak.	60,000		
Garden City	30,000			Asotin	69,000		
Harrisburg	22,000			Auburn	3,250,000		
Hill City	100,000			Bellingham	11,771,000		
Herreid	37,000			Battleground	5,000		\$11,516,000
Hot Springs	674,000			Blaine	55,000		
Hoven	85,900			Bremerton	1,410,800		
Hudson	61,000			Burlington	150,000		
Iroquois	42,000			Cashmere	5,000		
Kenstone-Mount Rushmore Sanitary District	1,200,000			Centralia	134,900		
Lead-Deadwood Sanitary District	5,000,000			Chelan	5,000		
Lesterville	27,750			Cle Elum	20,000		
Lewis and Clark Sanitary District	116,000			Concrete	414,000		
Menno	41,000			Cosmopolis	43,500		
Midland	16,000			Coupeville	29,800		
Mitchell	139,000			Deer Park	5,000		
Mobridge	120,000			Edmonds	944,500		
Nisland	22,000			Ephrata	10,000		
North Sioux City	124,515			Everett	25,000,000	\$50,000,000	15,000,000
Oacoma	41,000			Gig Harbor	1,700,000		
Olivet	15,600			Goldendale	10,000		
Pierre	301,000			Grandview	153,000		
Platte	82,600			Hoquiam	50,000		
Ramona	24,000			Lakeland Villa	5,000		
Rapid City	500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	Langley	18,750		
Raymond	30,000			Lynden	106,200		
Sioux Falls	600,000	2,100,000	2,700,000	Kitsap County Sanitation District number 6	295,000		
Spearfish	210,000			Kennewick	575,000		
Spearfish Valley S.D.	40,000			Marysville	15,000		
St. Lawrence	31,000			Montesano	974,000		
Timber Lake	31,000			Mount Vernon	252,400		
Trent	25,000			Morton	92,000		
Vivian	34,200			Mulkiteo	51,300		
Volin	17,500			Naches	23,250		
Wakonda	26,400			Okanogan	5,000		
Waubay	60,000			Olympia	940,000		
Wentworth	30,000			Oroville	165,000		
Wolsey	41,000			Palouse	5,000		
Willow Lake	44,000			Pe Ell	270,000		
Wessington	58,000			Poulsbo	86,000		
White	21,000			Prosser	5,000		
Watertown	120,000			Pullman	10,000		
Yankton	400,000			Ranier Vista Sanitation District	1,000,000		
Custer State Park Stockage Camp-ground	25,000			Raymond	69,000		
Custer State Park Legion Lake	10,000			Selah	205,000		
Total	12,056,564	4,300,000	5,400,000	Municipal of Metropolitan Seattle	109,000,000		76,000,000
Total needs, \$21,756,564.				Sedro Wolley	160,000		
Tennessee:				Skagit County, S.D. No. 1	80,000		
Nashville	25,000,000	12,000,000	150,000,000	South Bend	5,000		
Memphis	140,000,000			Snohomish	340,000		
Total	165,000,000	12,000,000	150,000,000	Spokane	6,000,000	5,000,000	50,000,000
Total needs, \$327,000,000. <sup>22</sup>				Stanwood	25,000		
Texas:				Sumas	69,000		
Abilene	3,000,000	2,000,000	4,000,000	Sumner	117,300		
Amarillo	233,000	3,000,000		Suquamish	340,000		
Austin	6,000,000	4,000,000	20,000,000	Sunnyside	250,000		
Corpus Christi	2,500,000	4,125,000	5,169,000	Tacoma	13,000,000	8,000,000	5,000,000
Dallas	146,000,000	13,150,000	10,000,000	Terrace Heights, S.D.	85,000		
Fort Worth	126,500,000	39,000,000	7,000,000	Toledo	5,000		
Galveston	6,350,000	2,000,000		Tonasket	30,000		
Garland	6,300,000	1,200,000		Vader	2,000		
Houston	20,700,000		1,200,000	Vancouver	14,900,000	14,700,000	3,700,000
Midland	2,250,000	2,500,000	250,000	Vashon Island, S.D.	47,000		
Pasadena	2,600,000	2,000,000	4,000,000	White Salmon	115,000		
Texarkana	3,800,000	3,500,000	2,400,000	Wilbur	155,000		
Texas City	3,500,000	3,500,000	2,000,000	Winlock	5,000		
Tyler	2,000,000	5,000,000	1,750,000	Winslow	112,700		
Waco	1,000,000	2,000,000	5,000,000	Total	340,074,900	74,840,000	161,216,000
Wichita Falls	1,000,000	4,000,000	2,500,000	Total needs, \$576,130,900.			
Total	130,733,000	90,975,000	65,269,000	West Virginia:			
Total needs, \$286,977,000.				Huntington	7,500,000		30,000,000
Utah: Provo	1,200,000		4,000,000	Parkersburg	1,000,000		8,500,000
Total needs \$5,200,000.				Total	8,500,000		38,500,000
Total needs, \$5,200,000.				Total needs, 47,000,000.			
Vermont:				Wisconsin:			
Brattleboro	800,000	300,000	1,000,000	Beloit	(*)	834,000	1,702,000
Burlington	3,000,000	3,000,000	12,000,000	Fon du Lac	1,500,000	800,000	2,000,000
Total	3,800,000	3,300,000	13,000,000	Green Bay	31,000,000	1,000,000	4,000,000
Total needs, \$20,100,000.				Kenosha	(*)	600,000	20,000,000
Virginia:				Madison	4,500,000	6,000,000	7,000,000
Hampton Roads Sanitation District	20,000,000		40,000,000	Milwaukee M.S.D.	88,600,000		300,000,000
Roanoke	5,000,000	1,000,000	10,000,000	Rachine	3,000,000	6,000,000	8,000,000
Richmond	5,900,000		8,000,000	Sheboygan	1,870,000		2,250,000
Total	30,900,000	1,000,000	58,000,000	Total	130,470,000	15,234,000	344,952,000
Total needs, \$89,900,000.				Total needs: 490,656,000. <sup>23</sup>			

Footnotes on following page.

- \* Keynote.
- <sup>1</sup> Needs figures where the city reporting indicated that it was reporting needs for an area greater than its city limits.
- <sup>2</sup> 30 years.
- <sup>3</sup> Figures from surveys prepared in 1970 by State governments. Idaho and Wyoming are omitted from the survey as no data were provided from these States.
- <sup>4</sup> (Phoenix).
- <sup>5</sup> Figures gained from the survey prepared for Senator Muskie by the Association of Metropolitan Sewerage Agencies.
- <sup>6</sup> No need.
- <sup>7</sup> Orange County District.
- <sup>8</sup> City of Los Angeles.
- <sup>9</sup> Los Angeles County.
- <sup>10</sup> Under contract.
- <sup>11</sup> The State of Delaware estimates total needs for the next 6 years at \$82,000,000.
- <sup>12</sup> This program not now contemplated because of high expense involved.
- <sup>13</sup> Data provided by the League of Kansas Municipalities indicates that secondary treatment required in 32 communities will cost \$27,000,000.
- <sup>14</sup> Data provided by the State of Maine indicates that costs of approximately \$146,000,000 will be required through 1976 to implement a satisfactory treatment program.
- <sup>15</sup> Available Federal programs must be undertaken with financial support to solve the most

- demanding, technical and financial problem of all; the combined sewer problem which plagues almost every old major metropolitan area in the country. The present problem for the city of Boston and surrounding communities is estimated at \$1½ to \$1 billion to correct with no provisions for Federal aid under current policies and regulations. —Gov. Francis W. Sargent.
- <sup>16</sup> Detroit.
- <sup>17</sup> Construction underway.
- <sup>18</sup> Cleveland needs to 1985 total \$1,602,000,000—Needs listed are for next 4 years only.
- <sup>19</sup> Under construction.
- <sup>20</sup> By 1990.
- <sup>21</sup> Some of these needs extend beyond 1976.
- <sup>22</sup> A study by the Tennessee Municipal League indicated a need of \$530,000,000 for adequate sewage treatment in Tennessee.
- <sup>23</sup> \$9,100,000 more needed 1973-80.
- <sup>24</sup> \$4,800,000 more, 1973-80.
- <sup>25</sup> League of Wisconsin Municipalities provided information from State indicating 5-year needs of:

For primary and secondary treatment.....	\$196,552,000
For tertiary treatment.....	20,000,000
For storm and sanitary sewer separation.....	600,000,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>816,552,000</b>

THE EARTH IS WHAT WE MAKE IT

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, because of the growing emphasis on more effective air, water, and land pollution control, I was pleased and impressed by a statement on environment made by Philip B. Hoffman, chairman of the board, Johnson & Johnson, in which he declared the past, present, and future policy of his firm:

General (Robert Wood) Johnson stood strong for a clean and wholesome environment in every sense of the word. He would never settle for mediocrity—neither will I.

Mr. Speaker, if all of the Nation's industrial firms were as sincere, dedicated, and effective as Johnson & Johnson in attacking pollution, our environment would be much closer to being free of contamination. The record of Johnson & Johnson in combating pollution is one of the best in the Nation. I believe that Mr. Hoffman's statement was an excellent one and I hereby insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with deep pride. Entitled, "The Earth Is What We Make It," it is a tribute to two great industrial leaders and their strong efforts to improve the quality of our environment: The late Gen. Robert W. Johnson, who served as chairman of the board of Johnson & Johnson for many years, and the present board chairman, Philip B. Hoffman.

The statement follows:

THE EARTH IS WHAT WE MAKE IT

Some observations on our environment are particularly in order on this April 22, 1970. These observations far exceed the realm of interested concern, however.

Since Johnson & Johnson was founded on the banks of the Raritan River 84 years ago, we have sterilized so many products essential to the protection of health and life that our desire for clean, wholesome surroundings is a long-standing preoccupation.

General Johnson stood strong for a clean and wholesome environment in every sense of the word. He would never settle for mediocrity—neither will I.

We are all aware of Johnson & Johnson's traditional and unexcelled standards of industrial environmental control. But let's take a close look at our record of participation in protecting three of the most vital elements of this earth of ours—our water, our air, and our land.

WATER QUALITY AND SUPPLY

Johnson & Johnson backed the campaign for the trunk sewer system with leadership, money and the film "River At Your Door." In 1958, after years of endeavor, we saw the system, which serves parts of Union and Somerset Counties and most of Middlesex, built and placed in operation in the lower Raritan River. Today, a Johnson & Johnson executive heads the sewerage authority as well as the current enlargement project for increasing the system's waste treatment capacity and trunk lines. At an estimated cost of \$125 million, this project will be financed by grants from the federal and state governments in addition to local-user charges.

Johnson & Johnson refused to permit the Delaware and Raritan Canal to be abandoned or filled in before World War II, and, together with other forward-looking organizations and individuals, we kept it open as a water supply. The Canal became a facility of the state in 1945 and will long be a vital asset to central New Jersey.

In 1958, Johnson & Johnson gave leadership and money to the Water Bond Referendum, which created among others, the Round Valley and Spruce Run Reservoirs. Last November we filled a similar role of successful leadership in supporting a clean-water bond issue, which won \$242 million for pollution abatement and \$29 million for reservoir sites.

General Johnson always kept a watchful eye on the Delaware River, New Jersey's largest water resource. In 1954 his legal assistants contributed to the protection of the downstream states by stopping New York City from making huge withdrawals of water in New York State without being made to compensate the stream from stored water. Out of this came a four-state federal compact commission to develop the Delaware Basin's water resources. A Johnson & Johnson man has represented the Governor and the State of New Jersey on this commission for the past eight years.

It is particularly interesting to note that the Delaware River may now supply the Delaware and Raritan Canal with 100 million gallons of water daily, as authorized by law.

The Delaware's Tock's Island Reservoir will supply northern and central New Jersey with 300 million gallons of water daily. This can be delivered via the Raritan's Round Valley Reservoir and by open stream in the Raritan River to intake pipes at Manville.

Johnson & Johnson and our family of companies took a strong and adamant position against locating a major international jetport on the Solberg site, at the confluence of the South and North Branches of the Raritan. Some of the reasons for our position are economic, but paramount in our thinking is the damaging effect such a jetport would have on the area's environment—particularly the obvious gross pollution of the drainage area and the streams themselves, as well as the extensive development a jetport would bring into this potable water

area. For, remember, the Raritan River and its reservoirs will not only store and deliver Raritan water, but also 300 million gallons of Tocks Island water daily. We must keep this Solberg area clean . . .

AIR POLLUTION

Our company has fought filth in all its forms since 1886 . . . and this applies to air pollution. Our performance in the prevention of industrial air pollution is generally far ahead of any existing regulations.

Johnson & Johnson companies in the New Brunswick area were among the first to switch to low-sulfur fuel oils in the early 1960's. Fuel-burning controls have constantly been improved, and a number of plants have switched to gas service and installed metering devices to monitor emissions and equipment performance. The corporate program to upgrade air pollution control equipment is constantly reevaluated in the light of new technical developments.

In 1967, Governor Hughes requested that General Johnson have one of our executives set up task forces to revise and modernize the air and water pollution abatement structures in the state government. The basic expertise for this program was supplied by the federal government, and these combined efforts resulted in the establishment of the Division of Clean Air and Water in the New Jersey Department of Health under a strong administrator. This structure has been recognized by federal officials as outstanding among the states.

LAND CONSERVATION

Johnson Park, known so well to so many of you and your families, extends from Highland Park along the Raritan River almost to Bound Brook. In the mid-1930's, this Middlesex County park originated through a land gift from Robert Wood Johnson and his family. The total acreage of the park has since been increased by the Johnson family, by the company, by other generous citizens and, more recently, by the Green Acres Program.

In Somerset County, it was Johnson & Johnson leadership that launched the successful Somerset County Park Commission.

It was a Johnson & Johnson man, on leave of absence from the company, who, as Commissioner of Conservation and Economic Development for the State of New Jersey, helped lead the Green Acres referendum campaign in 1961.

And one has only to eyewitness a plant built by the Johnson & Johnson family of companies in the last quarter century—impressive architecture on expansive landscaped grounds—to agree with General Johnson that "factories can be beautiful." A lot of other manufacturers now think so, too.

All of us in the Johnson & Johnson family may look with unqualified pride on our record to date and may be assured with certainty that our dedication to participating citizenship in the best interests of our environment will remain as firm as it has always been . . .

THE TIDEWATER VETERANS  
ASSOCIATION

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST  
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, 40 million Americans make up a very special group, a group that has been honored with a national holiday in recognition of their services. I refer to the 40 million veterans who have served and are now serving their country honorably and with pride.

Mr. Speaker, Congress granted these veterans and servicemen the right to free burial in a national cemetery. Under the present circumstances, however, many may not have the opportunity to take advantage of this right. There are 98 national cemeteries now in existence. Thirty-seven of them are already closed. Many more are almost completely filled. Yet the national cemetery program is not to be expanded.

As the Honorable OLIN TEAGUE, chairman of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs, has pointed out, there is tremendous expense involved in the purchase, establishment, and perpetual maintenance of new cemeteries. His committee has, therefore, gone on record as favoring payment of a special \$150 cemetery plot allowance to survivors of deceased veterans. In addition to providing a partial defrayment of interment costs, this payment would encourage survivors to bury their veteran dead in their hometowns.

Mr. Speaker, in at least one area, this problem has been met and resolved entirely through local effort. The Tidewater Veterans Association of Virginia, Inc., which now represents over 3,000 members of 39 veterans' organizations, began as the Armistice Day Association in 1948. Its aim at that time was to plan appropriate ceremonies for November 11 each year. From the beginning, it met with great support and interest. In 1965, it became known by its present name, and was granted a State charter on May 29, 1968. Through the years the association has increased the scope of its activities, participating in veterans' legislation and disseminating information on veterans' affairs to all member organizations.

When it became evident that a shortage of burial space in national cemeteries and the resulting restrictions placed on Arlington would make it difficult for Tidewater veterans to take advantage of their legal right to free burial, the Tidewater Veterans Association formed a committee to investigate this problem and recommend action to help alleviate it. In October 1968, the association resolved by majority vote to endorse the Tidewater Veterans Memorial Gardens, which would be located in Rosewood Memorial Park, Virginia Beach, Va. Thirty-five acres were set aside for the exclusive use of veterans and their dependents, and a suitable memorial honoring those veterans was erected.

This action was taken none too soon, because the problem became acute less than 1 year later. Hampton National Cemetery, which has served the Tidewater area, was closed. The closest national cemetery then became the one located in Hopewell, Va.

The Tidewater Veterans Memorial Gardens is now a functioning memorial cemetery, in which the area's veterans receive free burial, just as they would in a national cemetery. This is a good example of what can be accomplished through the cooperation of interested organizations and private enterprise.

In the absence of expansion of our national cemeteries, and even if an additional \$150 is paid toward funeral expenses, we should encourage the setting up of local memorial cemeteries to honor the local veterans. The majority of national cemeteries are east of the Mississippi, which means that many areas are not served. Local veterans' cemeteries would answer this need. And as in the case of Tidewater, a nearby national cemetery may not have sufficient space to serve the community. Here again, local private cemeteries could provide the space.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that the Tidewater Veterans Association has found a satisfactory solution to the problem faced by many of those 40 million Americans: The problem of finding free burial space for veterans.

WE HONOR THESE MEN

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, recently I came across a Memorial Day address given by Col. Nicholas A. Canzona, commanding officer of the 25th Marines, in Worcester, Mass.

Colonel Canzona's words, I believe, can serve as an inspiration to us all in these trying times.

I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY COL. NICHOLAS A. CANZONA

Today is a time set aside to honor the dead, those special dead who in life fought our nation's wars. It makes little difference now whether they fell on the battlefield in the flower of youth or whether they returned home to die in later years. It makes little difference whether they fought in France, Africa, Guadalcanal, Okinawa, Korea or Vietnam, whether they fought on land, at sea, or in the air. Or whether they were generals or privates. Nor does it make any difference whether they were white, black or yellow. Death is a great equalizer. Now all of them rest in peace, away from the ceaseless tumult of the world of the living.

We honor these men, these sacred dead, because they served us well in simple obedience to a nation that they loved and respected. A nation that they supported when the die was cast. Greater love hath no man. These were imperfect men who fought for the imperfect causes of an imperfect republic.

They had enough common sense and faith to realize that the nation at least was headed in the right direction. As a result of their faith, common sense, and sacrifice, many countries and millions of people are free today who might otherwise have been enslaved for centuries.

Because of the simple trust and obedience of these men, our nation has enjoyed unparalleled progress and freedom—so much freedom in fact that conceivably we are free enough today to commit national suicide a thousand years before our time.

We owe a special debt of gratitude to these dead because they conquered fear, self pity and selfishness. They were no more anxious to die than you or I or any other citizen. They must have been haunted occasionally by the same loneliness, doubts, and questions that have assailed every generation of Americans at one time or another. Yet, they had the strength of character to overcome their trepidations and any innate pettiness. They did not demand an exhaustive accounting from the nation each time they crossed the line into battle.

Of these dead that we honor, relatively few in recent times fought on American soil. In furtherance of a higher responsibility, a brighter ideal, they carried the flag to distant islands, jungles, plains, mountains, and deserts. Yet, no foreign nation has ever lived in subservience to the United States as a result of their far-flung campaigns. On the contrary, and in full justification of their faith, their government has extended to friends and enemies alike a degree of compassion and generosity never before exhibited in the annals of war. So, while these honorable men were victors—and they had every right to expect victory in return for their sacrifice—they were not conquerors in the classic sense. Their most vicious enemies of a generation ago are now thriving and respected in the community of nations. This fact is a great tribute to the republic in which these honored dead had such unbounded faith.

UTTER DISMAY

If these men who lie at rest around us could rise up today, they assuredly would look around in utter dismay. No, they would not be shocked by dissent; there was enough dissent in their day too. But they indeed would be appalled at the manifestations of dissent: The defiling of our flag, the frenzied reviling of our president and sacred institutions, the disintegration of a moral code that is 4,000 years old, the almost capricious defiance of law and order.

A typical cross-section of these American dead that we honor were officers and non-commissioned officers. If they could awaken and rejoin us, they would hear themselves taunted and branded publicly as pigs of the establishment. They would be unable to set foot on many campuses without being subjected to the most virulent abuse.

Fellow Americans, if you and I saw this great host rise up from this hallowed ground and approach us, what would we say to them in the light of today's new left philosophy? Would we say that their lives and sacrifices have been a horrible mistake? That the republic has outlived its usefulness? That America indeed has made no significant progress or contribution? That for almost two hundred years the United States has in actuality been a gigantic fraud? That there is no standard of decency, dignity, respect and obedience that a Democracy can expect of its people? That Communist tyranny is right because America is irrevocably wrong? Would we tell the risen dead that this nation's policy is not, after all, inextricably rooted in history and justice but is only an arbitrary, brutal exercise in wealth and power?

If the republic for which these men fought is manifestly so evil and repugnant that we could say such things to the assembled dead,

then perhaps we as a people should continue our breastbeating until we sink into oblivion—or are pushed into it. If, with a clear conscience we could now stand over others and desecrate American flags, if over still others we could unfurl and venerate enemy flags—if indeed the United States is so foul that we could commit such abominations with a clear conscience and not out of sheer idiocy—then we as a nation would have to admit to a complete inversion of values: Which is to say that the evolution of this great republic has been a blight on mankind.

Now, if we do not have the conviction and stomach to so profane the dead, then neither should we profane the living. It is essentially indecent and irrational by any standards to call a man a pig while he lives, then immediately canonize him when he dies. It is grossly inconsistent and unfair to divorce the causes for which these men died from a national policy that was born out of these causes. It is a monumental perversion of justice to expect one generation to die for the flag and allow another to drag it through the gutter.

In years gone by, it was always the custom, when a friend died, to send a remembrance of flowers. In recent years, many bereaved families have requested instead that donations be made to noble institutions such as the Heart Fund, Cancer Fund, hospitals, or cultural centers. Perhaps on the solemn occasion of Memorial Day, 1970, we, as a nation could make a practical request of ourselves. We could remember our dead not merely with flowers and ceremony, but with the visible contribution of a life of selfishness, patriotism, and faith. We could thus vindicate the deaths of these great men and the high purpose of this republic. We can begin today by silently reaffirming our allegiance, so that tomorrow we can move forward once again with traditional unity, pride, and courage. If we owe anything at all to America's dead, we owe them at least this much.

#### TRIBUTE TO DICK HUDSON

### HON. JOHN M. SLACK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, my home State of West Virginia is proud of its athletic heritage. Over the years we have had many heroes to cheer—men such as Jerry West in basketball, Sam Huff in football, and Sam Snead in golf, to name a selective few.

Now, West Virginia is about to lose a man who has written many stories of their achievements for the past 35 years. He is the distinguished sports editor of the Charleston Daily Mail, Dick Hudson.

Dick has served as sports editor of the Daily Mail for 30 years and has brought a perspective of integrity and fairness to his profession that will be impossible to match. He has resigned effective July 15, to accept a position on the Jacksonville, Fla., Journal copy desk.

In making the move to Florida, Dick and his wife, Kitty, will be near their son, Terry, a doctor who will take his residency work at the University of Florida at Gainesville.

I believe my colleagues here will be interested in knowing something about this man of letters.

Hudson began his writing career for the Daily Mail while a student at West

Virginia Wesleyan College, where he helped publicize the great "Gip" Battles. He has written his popular daily sports column, "Warming Up," an estimated 10,000 times, and it has many avid readers. He sought no special recognition for himself, but the national Sportswriters-Sportscasters Association Awards Committee in 1960, 1961, and 1964 named Hudson the outstanding sportswriter of the year in West Virginia.

One mark of a man's contribution to society is how much he will be missed when he is gone. Dick's decision to leave West Virginia truly will be a loss for all West Virginians. Not the least of these will be his coworkers because Dick Hudson was one of the most unselfish of them all. He always was first to take the hardest chore for himself. His workday often began at 4:30 a.m., long before anyone else.

Dick Hudson, the sports editor and the man, was a purist. His penchant for fair play by the rules never wavered. Competitors, spectators, coaches, and the entire State will be the big losers by his departure. I am certain that they, like I, wish him well.

Both the city and county recreation directors recently remarked how fortunate the city of Charleston was to have a man of the caliber of Dick Hudson covering sports.

Bill Smith, who has succeeded Hudson as Daily Mail sports editor, said:

Dick leaves big shoes to fill . . . they won't be.

There was nothing phony about Dick Hudson whether he was writing about a high school hero, a star for West Virginia University, major league baseball or a Little Leaguer. His thousands of readers looked forward each year to his Christmas column devoted exclusively to a message of world peace addressed to his son. Service in the U.S. Navy in World War II helped Dick decide that the Prince of Peace laid down the best set of rules for man to follow, and that he must learn to live with his fellowman in harmony under God or face destruction.

West Virginia is noted as a coal-producing State. But some men of pure gold live there, and Dick Hudson's star outshines most of them. He always has shown an awareness and a rare insight of the personal involvement and pride of the competitive athlete. This is amplified in the following editorial written by J. D. Maurice, editor of the Daily Mail, as he acted as spokesman for all of Dick's colleagues:

Sports editors are replaceable. Our Dick Hudson is not. And on his decision to quit "Warming Up" after all these years and cool off a little in Florida, those of us remaining can do at best only two things.

We can wish him well. Dick will be at home wherever men compete in games. And we can reflect a little on those qualities as a person and as a writer which made him unique.

He believed devoutly in the value of athletics—not as an alternate to education, but as the natural complement.

He relished competition, but only within the framework of fair play. He was fussy about the "rules of the game."

He made no jokes about the worth of sports in building character. Dick had seen

it work time and time again, and he had no doubts about the formula. Men who play well, in the quest of excellence, are better for it.

If he will not think it a little ponderous, we'll say that he brought to his handling of sports news and his daily comment upon it the classical ideal: A sound mind in a sound body.

There are not many of his kind, and those of us who worked with him count ourselves lucky to have had one of the exemplary in our company.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY DR. JOHN A. LOGAN, JR., PRESIDENT, HOLLINS COLLEGE, VIRGINIA

### HON. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, this spring was a particularly difficult time for many of our colleges and universities. Serious questions were raised concerning the role of institutions of higher learning in the political process and in our society as a whole. Serious questions were also raised concerning the ability of some of our institutions to function effectively in the face of widespread divisiveness.

Amid the dissension and polarization which permeated our Nation, many analyses were presented, many suggestions made for resolving extant controversies and disagreements. An excellent commentary on these matters was given by Dr. John A. Logan, Jr., president of Hollins College, in Virginia. Dr. Logan's 1970 commencement address was a forthright, rational, and balanced discussion of the major problems facing our Nation and society. It outlined the basic principles and procedures which must be accepted, honored, and pursued if our Nation is to fulfill its promises of freedom and opportunity for each and every citizen and if our institutions are effectively to perform their functions.

I commend Dr. Logan's address to the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY DR. JOHN A. LOGAN, JR.

Members of the Graduating Class, these traditional ceremonies mark the culmination of your years at Hollins. Your college careers have spanned a turbulent time in this nation's history, and the events of recent weeks have provided an explosive punctuation for your experience. For many of you there must have been times when you doubted that this peaceful moment would arrive.

Yet, here we are together for a last moment, and I want to take this opportunity to make some brief observations about these recent experiences which may help put them into perspective.

First, let me say that however disturbing and divisive these happenings seemed at the time—setting, as they did, students against their classmates, professors against their colleagues, and parents against their children or against their children's colleges—I think all of us would have been ashamed of

this college had it not been affected by the great issues that have galvanized thought and action across this nation's campuses. The expansion of the military action in Southeast Asia, and the killing of students at Kent State University touched deep wellsprings of feeling and opinion, and raised questions which had to be confronted.

I am proud that the Hollins community did confront these issues, but I am prouder still of the way in which we responded. By acting with moderation and great corporate responsibility, in the midst of high emotion, we agreed on a course which left individuals free to follow their consciences without imposing one group's opinions on another, in a spirit of mutual tolerance and respect.

At the same time, everyone found it necessary to define and defend his own views, and the result was, I feel strongly, an educational experience of the highest order.

What lessons are to be drawn from this vast national upheaval? In the first place, it should be clear, if it was not clear before, that the peace movement is a serious and permanent phenomenon which runs broadly and deeply through the entire younger generation. It is by no means confined to the young, but its main strength is there. If recent events have shown nothing else, they have demonstrated that every decision made by our nation's leaders must take this fact into serious account.

The disturbances on our campuses which followed the announcement that military operations had been extended into Cambodia will not be properly understood if they are viewed lightly on the one hand as an especially virulent outbreak of spring fever, or darkly on the other as a sinister manifestation of Communist infiltration into our colleges. These interpretations invite either serious under-reaction or over-reaction.

It is not a small minority, but an overwhelming number of our college students who want an early end to the war in Vietnam. It affects their lives immediately, and they are convinced that it is immoral as well as hopeless. This war is, furthermore, a cancer gnawing at the vitals of our body politic, distorting our image abroad and at home, and preventing a reordering of our national priorities to deal with the pressing domestic issues of social justice, pollution, poverty, and urban redevelopment. Our young people believe fervently in the need to address ourselves promptly and energetically to these problems.

I am prepared to believe that President Nixon also sincerely wants to end the involvement in Vietnam which he inherited, and is moving to accomplish it. The foray into Cambodia was a great political gamble, and it will remain to be seen whether the short-run military advantages outweigh the long-run political and diplomatic effects. But one fact already emerges clearly: that unless and until the credibility of our government's desire for peace is established among the young, a serious and perhaps permanent alienation of our future leaders from our present form of government could result. Nothing would be more tragic or more ominous. Extensive lines of communication must be established and maintained. An important start has been made, and it must be expanded and effectively exercised at every level of government.

Unless this is done, dissent will not only grow, but will inevitably become less responsible. If it is forced outside the framework of the established political system, the incidence of violence will increase in proportion to the frustrations of helplessness, and the angry divisions which already imperil our society will grow apace.

Let me digress just a moment to say a word about the right of dissent. It is central to our form of government that citizens be free to express their opinions and to assemble peaceably to petition for redress of grievances. But it is equally important that any such demonstrations be non-violent, that

there be no destruction of property, nor interference with the rights of others. Freedom from disorder is as essential a component of an open society as freedom of dissent. Nothing is more pernicious than the conviction of some political activists that only violent confrontation will gain attention and bring about social change. We learn afresh with every resort to physical coercion that these methods are destructive and counterproductive, inviting the use of repressive force by private groups and by police and military agencies. The tragic deaths at Kent State University and Jackson State College are cases in point.

What, then, are appropriate ways to express concern about these great political and social issues? One method, which I do not think is appropriate, has been broadly advocated by students and some faculty across the nation in the present crisis. I am referring to the attempt to use the college or university itself as a symbol of protest by voting to strike, to close down the institution in order to dramatize opposition to national policies at home and abroad.

A few colleges and universities did suspend entirely their regular academic programs in response to majority opinion. Many others which closed, however, did so not for ideological reasons, but to prevent the destruction of property and possible loss of lives. There were those at Hollins who urged the suspension of all classes and examinations and argued that the institution as such should take a public stand on the war and the Kent State shootings. Our faculty voted against any such action, and they were joined by the vast majority of students. We agreed on a formula which opened the way for individual action, without placing the institution itself on record.

I strongly believe that this decision is the only one which is compatible with the fundamental goals and purposes of a college. There is, of course, in the first place a legal matter of the contractual obligation to those who have paid for an education and are entitled to receive it. If a single student wishes to attend class or take examinations, the college owes him that right. But there is a moral obligation beyond this legal one.

Of all the institutions in a pluralistic society, our colleges and universities, dedicated as they are to freedom of expression and of inquiry, should shelter and sustain every shade of opinion. No individual should be compelled by majority vote to be represented by an institutional position that he does not adhere to personally.

There is still a further dimension to this problem that deserves consideration. As an institution devoted to the transmission of knowledge and the search for truth, the university is a mighty engine for social change and amelioration of the human condition. Its great power lies in the generation of ideas which lead to constructive change, and not in action itself. Furthermore, its effectiveness rests on the autonomy which society has granted it out of respect for its objectivity in the search for truth. Once the university as a corporate body ceases to be a forum and becomes a self-conscious instrument of policy, once it becomes avowedly partisan, then it abandons its historic claim to freedom from political interference. The current rash of threats from state legislatures to cut off funds for higher education is a predictable reaction to the politicizing of some of our campuses.

No observer of our society can fail to be disturbed by the widening chasm of anger and distrust which is opening up between the so-called silent majority and the academic world. This nation is a house divided, not as in 1860 along regional lines, but in terms of age, of educational levels, and of occupation. The attack on student demonstrators by construction workers in New York City is symptomatic of a growing blue collar revolt against dissenters, and the responses of policemen and National Guardsmen are

conditioned by the same attitudes. Most of this has been brought on by the excesses of student radicals, both in their rhetoric and in their behavior. The moderate majority of students must not fall into the error of adopting these methods, because there is real danger that all dissent will soon automatically be classified by a large part of our population as disloyalty, or treason, or anarchism. In a recent poll, a majority of respondents voted against the provisions of the Bill of Rights, which were paraphrased and presented as proposed legislation. This is a genuine threat to the maintenance of our free society.

I cannot close without saying that I see very hopeful signs that good sense and good order will prevail. In spite of the sensational incidents of mob violence which have made headlines in the past few days, the fact is that a great many campus demonstrations were peaceful and orderly. This was true also of such potentially inflammatory gatherings as the May Day demonstration on behalf of justice for the Black Panthers in New Haven, and the mass meeting in Washington two weeks ago. Most significant, perhaps, was the work of student marshals, who on both occasions moved quickly and effectively to quell scattered outbreaks of violence. Here is overt evidence of a growing realization by young leaders that unruly confrontations hurt rather than help their cause.

Equally significant are the newly-formed student organizations being set up to bring about desired social changes by working within established political institutions and the electoral process. Such responsible participation by students in government should be welcomed and encouraged. Hollins has been among the first colleges to do so by eliminating the traditional Thanksgiving holiday, and substituting a mid-term break in the fall, which includes Election Day, to facilitate political activity by students on behalf of candidates of their choice. None of this activity will be compulsory, of course, but it is to be hoped that many young people will learn in this way that their opinions will be listened to, and that the ballot box is a more effective route to reform than the barricades.

No one who works with young people nowadays can help being optimistic about the future. It may well be that a revolution is in the making, but it will be a peaceful and constructive one, and not the kind proclaimed by the prophets of the New Left. I am confident that the changes which lie ahead will bring us closer to a realization of the ideals upon which this nation was founded.

I urge each of you who is graduating today to nourish your passion for peace and justice, and carry it forward into the life you will lead henceforth.

You are embarking on a great adventure, and I wish you Godspeed.

#### HOW THE NEWS MEDIA DISTORTS FACTUAL REPORTS TO DISCREDIT OUR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, a story appearing in yesterday's Washington Post and the summary of a report by the General Accounting Office inserted in yesterday's RECORD by the gentleman from Iowa gave fresh substance to the mounting body of evidence as to how news media and others intent upon discredit-

ing the activities of our Federal Government so often stretch and distort factual reports, magnifying each grain of unfavorable data until it looms through the lens of the news media as a glaring example of Government inefficiency.

Some weeks ago, a field team of the General Accounting Office conducted a 9-day study relating to the congressionally sanctioned policy of building pavement overlays on certain interstate highways so as to preserve the longevity of these segments of our arterial highway system where the volume of traffic has been greater than that initially anticipated when that system was first designed in 1956.

The Congress in 1967 authorized this program of protective overlays so as to guarantee that the structural integrity of the Interstate Highway System would endure and be serviceable without major reconstruction for at least 20 years. It was, in my judgment, and in that of most members of the authorizing committee, a wise decision. It was the kind of a decision Congress makes when it looks to the future and tries to plan intelligently for the needs of the next generation.

During the entire life of this program which began with congressional enactment in 1956, the Public Works Committee of the House has kept a very close and careful eye on all developments relating to our interstate highways. We have had a special highway investigating committee with a highly skilled professional staff. This subcommittee has maintained constant surveillance over the state of our Nation's highway system. On occasion, as a result of its investigations, indictments have been brought against individuals who have failed to provide honest and adequate standards of highway construction and maintenance.

All in all, when viewed in any sense of perspective, the interstate highway program has been an exemplary undertaking from which the American Nation and the American economy have derived truly enormous benefits.

Now, as result of a relatively innocuous GAO report directed at a policy question concerning whether these overlays should be regarded as construction or as maintenance, certain headline hungry people in the news media have seized upon the report and twisted it completely out of context for the purpose of fabricating a sensational news story. The article which appeared in the Washington Post on yesterday began with the following lead sentence:

The nation's interstate highways are cracking up from heavy truck traffic that may force many hundreds of millions of dollars in repairs, government investigators reported yesterday.

The thousands of Americans who read the news story and never read the factual report on which the story purported to be based thus naturally would draw a thoroughly unwarranted and erroneous conclusion.

Significantly, in the summary of the GAO report appearing in the RECORD yesterday, the word "truck" does not appear. It does not even appear as a significant item in the more lengthy report itself.

Nor does the report conclude that the interstate highways are "cracking up." There is no evidence that they are "cracking up." The overlay program authorized by Congress and selectively applied by the Department of Transportation is a wise preventive measure to insure that they shall not "crack up." That is all there is to it.

But the news treatment would make it appear that the Congress and the Department of Transportation both are engaged in some terrible boondoggle, and this, of course, is not the case at all.

Since it is well known in the House and in the Committee on Public Works that the gentleman from Iowa has been engaged for some years in a personal vendetta against the trucking industry of the country, it is understandable that he would have inserted this news story in the RECORD of yesterday. But it is fortunate that he inserted beside it a copy of the summary of the General Accounting Office report, since this gives us such an interesting example of how an official report can be twisted out of shape by the time it reaches the public through the news columns.

The question raised by the GAO report is whether or not the pavement overlay program of the Department of Transportation should be considered as construction or as maintenance. The Department of Transportation regards it as construction. I agree with that interpretation, and I think it accurately reflects the congressional intent.

THE LAMP OF REASON—COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AT ALBION COLLEGE, MICHIGAN

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a commencement address delivered recently at Albion College, Michigan, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE LAMP OF REASON

(By Senator ROBERT P. GRIFFIN)

President Norris, members of the Board of Trustees and the faculty, distinguished guests, members of this graduating class of 1970, ladies and gentlemen:

I am most grateful for the generous introduction—and for the high honor accorded me by the invitation to participate in your commencement.

Let me assure you that I am keenly aware of the distinction which automatically accompanies membership in the Albion College community. I am impressed that in the Nation's Capital—and far beyond—everyone seems to know about Albion College—and to recognize that it is one of the very best liberal arts colleges in the nation.

Incidentally, I am also impressed by the unusual combination here of academic excellence and athletic power. There just aren't many colleges around anymore that can boast of an undefeated football team and such an active chapter of Phi Beta Kappa.

I am very pleased—and relieved—to note that—so far, at least—all 320 members of this graduating class are still in their seats. No one has walked out—yet; no one is even carrying a sign.

As brand new members of the alumni association, perhaps there has already been some slight adjustment in your outlook—even without realizing it.

While the generation gap that we hear so much about is real, I am convinced, not only that there is nothing new about it—but also that the distance to be bridged is not really as wide as some would assume.

It is his day Mark Twain wrote in Harper's magazine:

"When I was a boy of 14, my father was so ignorant I could hardly stand to have the old man around; but when I got to be 21, I was astonished at how much he had learned in 7 years."

In a speech last weekend, at Northern Michigan University I suggested that this transition point in the life of a college graduate is a good time for you to be re-introduced to, and to be come re-acquainted with, your parents and grandparents—the members of the last two generations, who are here because they are so proud of you.

Despite the protests, the demonstrations and all the rest, I submit that they are very remarkable people—those of the last two generations who sit to the right and left and behind you—those who have been in charge of things during the past fifty years.

With an assist from Professor Burgen Evans of Northwestern University, let me recount a few facts:

During the period from 1920 to 1970, these people—the members of the last two generations—increased your life expectancy by fifty per cent.

While cutting the workday by one-third—they have more than doubled per capita output in this country.

They have given you a much healthier world than they inherited. Today you have no fear of smallpox, or diphtheria and many other diseases. Polio is not a medical factor, and TB is rapidly becoming unknown.

Those remarkable people—your parents and grandparents—lived through the worst depression in modern history. Most of them know what it's really like to be poor—and to be hungry and cold.

Because of this, they determined that it would not happen to you—that you would have a better life—a better education and a better opportunity to succeed.

Because they gave you the best, you are the healthiest, the best looking, the tallest and the most intelligent generation ever to inhabit the land.

They fought the nation's gristliest war; and after defeating the tyranny of Hitler, they had the compassion to spend billions to help their former enemies.

These are the people who had the sense to establish the United Nations.

They've built thousands and thousands of schools and colleges.

And they made a start, though a late one, toward giving real meaning to the word "conservation"—toward healing the scars of the earth and fighting pollution.

All this, while they were moving the nation forward from the tin lizzie model T Ford era into the age of space travel.

As impressive as is the performance record of your parents and grandparents, they have fallen short of your hopes—and theirs—in some respects.

For example, they have not found an acceptable alternative for war. They have not eliminated all racial prejudice and bigotry.

Perhaps you will be able to perfect our social mechanisms and make such dreams come true.

But they—those two generations—have made more progress—in terms of human values—than in any previous era in history.

Frankly, I hope your generation can do as well.

But it won't be easy. And I am sure of one thing—it won't be done by tearing down what they have built with such effort and care.

On Monday of this past week, a distinguished colleague of mine, Senator Margaret Chase Smith, delivered an important speech on the Senate floor. The date was June 1—20 years to the day after her Declaration of Conscience speech in 1950—a speech that marked the beginning of the end of the (Sen. Joseph) McCarthy era.

Twenty years ago, she said:  
"Those of us who shout the loudest about Americanism . . . are all too frequently those who, by our own words and acts, ignore some of the basic principles of Americanism—

"The right to criticize;  
"The right to hold unpopular beliefs; (and)  
"The right to protest (peacefully)."

Last Monday, she told the Senate:  
"I spoke as I did 20 years ago because of what I considered to be the great threat from the radical right—the threat of a government of repression.

"I speak today because of what I consider to be a great threat: from the radical left that advocates and practices violence and defiance of the law—and again, the threat of the ultimate result a reaction of repression. . . .

"Extremism bent upon polarization is increasingly forcing upon the American people a narrow choice between anarchy and repression.

"And, make no mistake about it, if that narrow choice has to be made, the American people even if with reluctance and misgiving, will choose repression.

"For the overwhelming majority of Americans believe that:

"Trespass is trespass—whether on the campus or off.

"Violence is violence—whether on the campus or off.

"Arson is arson—whether on the campus or off.

"Killing is killing—whether on the campus or off.

She continued—

"The campus cannot degenerate into a privileged sanctuary for obscenity, trespass, violence, arson and killing with special immunity for participants in such acts."

It is time, she said, that the great center of our people, those who reject the violence and unreasonableness of both the extreme right and the extreme left, searched their souls, mustered their moral and physical courage, shed their intimidated silence, and declared their consciences.

Those who cannot understand the impatience of young people on American campuses today might do well to read a report by a student advisory committee submitted recently to the Illinois Board of Higher Education. At one point, it summarized by saying that:

"Students see a widening distance between what our nation preaches and what it practices, between the American dream and America's reality. . . ."

Unfortunately, that criticism is altogether justified and deserved, in too many respects.

But as Congressman John Anderson of Illinois told a graduating class recently:

"If those who are most highly trained, and presumably most highly skilled, in the use of rational argument to achieve desirable ends—if they submit to the temptation of over-simplification, emotional argument, intellectual shortcuts, sloganeering in place of debate, the walk-out instead of the talk-out—if they reach for the violent weapons of the street in their frustration over the slow pace of change, then their epitaph will be written in the debris of a once civilized society."

In our society, the extent of division and violence has grown to the point where there is reason for deep concern.

As John Gardner put it recently:

"We all become a little readier to grow angry, a little readier to identify villains, a little readier to resort to violence ourselves . . . The moderate conservative does not explicitly approve of police brutality, but something in him is not displeased when the billy club comes down on the head of the long-haired student. The liberal does not endorse violence by the extreme left; but he may take secret pleasure in such action when it discomferts those in authority. In short, extremists often enjoy tacit support from the moderates nearest to them. Thus does a society tear itself apart."

If we would heal the divisions among us, we must address ourselves as a society to the causes which give rise to violence and discord. To be sure, the government has a special responsibility. For example, only the government can end our involvement in the Vietnam war.

But private citizens have important responsibilities too—and I wish to emphasize the point that a special responsibility falls to the educated man and woman during periods of discord and violence.

For, if the educated do not, who will hold the center when society begins to divide against itself? "Who will light the lamp of reason again if others like you were to allow it to flicker and die? Where is the last line of defense against the forces of unreason, prejudice and fear—if not in the academy?"

Believe it or not, I can understand the frustration of young people with the processes of government.

You have a right to be impatient. Frankly, I have been impatient for many more years than you.

When one knows he is right—but can't get the majority to agree with him—it is frustrating.

As the President of Venezuela reminded us recently in an appearance before Congress, in four more years, the Congress of the United States will be 200 years old. It met for the first time in Philadelphia in 1774—two years before the Declaration of Independence.

The office of Speaker of the House of Representatives is older than the office of the Presidency.

During this period of nearly 200 years, our nation has undergone profound transformations; it has suffered through periods of intense anguish, and it has felt justifiable pride in extraordinary achievements.

It has proven its capacity not only to survive in the vicissitudes of time—but also its capacity to adapt to new needs and new ideas—though not always with the speed that is sometimes demanded.

During my 14 years of service in Washington, I have found that the overwhelming majority of my colleagues in Congress—of both parties—are extremely able, conscientious, honest men and women—dedicated to the nation and its best interests.

When one considers the unfortunate image of Congress that is often projected across the country—because of the disproportionate publicity focused from time to time on a few bad actors—(and students can appreciate this problem)—frankly, it is somewhat surprising—and encouraging, that there are, nevertheless, so many able and well motivated men and women who are willing to run for office and serve.

Times change and we change with them. But I hope the idealism and impatience of your youth will not fade too rapidly—for such qualities provide the nation with a very necessary and powerful driving force.

But at the same time, I hope you will be patient enough to recognize the wisdom of Winston Churchill's familiar words of cau-

tion, "Democracy," he said, "is the worst form of government—except all the other kinds that have been tried."

In closing, let me express the hope that you will bring to your idealism, to the impatience of your youth—a measured commitment to persevere for the whole truth, to balance vision with a tolerance for the shortcomings of others—and to protect and preserve the values you have learned here in this fine temple of higher education—this mighty guardian of the lamp of reason. Thank you.

## AMERICA IS ALIVE

### HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, usually when we read something in our newspapers or magazines or hear over the air anything about the condition of America we get a very bad report. We hear only the negative, not the positive.

According to most of these reports, everything is wrong and nothing right with our country.

We know, of course, that this is not a true appraisal. There is very much right with America. With all of our problems we still have the greatest Nation the world has ever known.

I was gratified to see one of our Minnesota Sixth District newspaper editors, Gene Kronberg of the Olivia Times-Journal have an editorial on this subject.

We need more editorials of this kind to remind our people of what a wonderful country America really is.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to share this editorial with my colleagues and all of the other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial follows:

#### AMERICA IS ALIVE

Pick up almost any newspaper of consequence, or any national magazine for that matter, and you find an overwhelming abundance of articles on the ills of America. If the focus isn't on racial strife, it's on the campus dissent over the war in Viet Nam, the spiraling crime rate, violence in the streets, poverty, welfare, or staggering taxation.

In fact, if we were to think only in terms of the headlines, one could readily conclude that America is teetering on the brink of social, economic and moral disaster. Is this great experiment we call a Democracy about to come crashing down around us?

We think not.

We do have problems—some very real problems that require the very best of our thinking and technology to solve. It is not the intent of this editorial to "whitewash" our problems, but there's another story behind the headlines that we believe also needs to be told.

Never before in the history of the world has a society offered so much prosperity to so many. American scientific and technological achievements have thrilled the human race, and, in the development of this great technology, our system of creative free enterprise has made an unequalled prosperity, for both the owners of the new machines and the skilled workers who operate them.

The American worker—white collar and blue—has played an important role in the

development of our economic strength. And, the American worker has shared, like no other in history, in the rewards of our prosperity. He or she is, without question, the highest paid of the world's workers, receiving innumerable fringe benefits; works fewer hours a day, and enjoys a standard of living unequalled in the world today.

The American worker is part of that vast majority of Americans who are proving themselves to be strong and morally responsible by spending billions to erase the problems of poverty at home—and additional billions to help other lesser developed nations throughout the free world . . . a responsibility we cannot shirk.

We are making progress toward the solution of some of our major problems. During the last nine years, for example, more than 13 million Americans left poverty behind them. Median family income has increased to \$8,000 a year, 5 million more Americans became owners of their own homes, and "two cars in every garage" became a reality for over 15 million Americans.

To be sure, in our free enterprise society the rich sometimes do get richer, and the big sometimes do get bigger, but through our free enterprise process the poor make more money too, and the little guy has a way of getting bigger. This doesn't always make the headlines. It's the story behind the headlines—these positive factors—which make America great.

#### HOUSE SECRECY

### HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, mid-way through this month, the House is expected to take up consideration of the proposed Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 and, as it does, avail itself of the first opportunity in more than 20 years to make major changes in House rules and procedures.

The measure (H.R. 17654) will come to the House floor under a rule permitting amendments relative to all aspects of House operations except committee jurisdiction, and numerous amendments are anticipated—including some aimed at opening up the proceedings of this body to greater public scrutiny.

Three articles have recently appeared in the national media which treat such antisecrecy proposals sympathetically, intelligently, and, I think, objectively; I insert these for the general information of my colleagues in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The first, entitled "What You Don't Know," appears in the July 11 issue of the New Republic magazine; the second, entitled "A Secret Society," is the product of the distinguished Washington journalist, Donald R. Larrabee, of the Griffin-Larrabee Washington News Bureau, and has appeared in a number of New England newspapers; and the third, "Decisions Made Anonymously," is the work of Les Gapay of the Congressional Quarterly.

The articles follow:

#### WHAT YOU DON'T KNOW

The House of Representatives is a semi-secret society. Thirty-seven percent of its committee meetings are closed to press and public; committee votes in such proceedings are part of the record, but not the public record. There's the *Congressional Record*, of

course, but it doesn't necessarily record what a senator or representative said on the floor; the member may revise his remarks for publication. Nonrecord votes on the House floor are tallied in such a way that nobody knows how his or anybody else's congressman voted.

When the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 comes up for consideration the middle of this month, some of this secrecy will be challenged. But whether amendments to the rules intended to open up the public business to greater public scrutiny come to a record vote, may itself be decided in court.

The principal challenge to House rules permitting the House to work in the dark is coming from the House Democratic Study Group, 120 to 140 modern members who balance the informal coalition of Republicans and Dixiecrats that often dominates House business. The challenge will be based on an 11-page DSG report made public June 24. Some of the Study Group's findings:

The Appropriations Committee holds about 300 meetings each year, all behind closed doors, and beyond the view of taxpayers, whose money is being allocated.

A 1946 act required committees to maintain a record of all votes on which a record is demanded, but there is no rule which says it must be released to the public.

Appropriations Committee reports and hearings are generally not available to House members until the day bills are reported. The record of Armed Services Committee hearings is normally not available until the day before floor consideration of a bill from that committee.

When the whole House acts, votes on amendments are usually not recorded. Votes are taken either by voice or a division of the House (in which members stand to be counted), or by teller (members file up an aisle between tellers who count them). The public doesn't know how, or even if, a congressman voted. Reporters in the press gallery see only the backs of heads. Since no one will know anyway, only a third of the members bother to vote in many instances.

All House-Senate conferences, which iron out differences in the bills passed by the two houses are secret; votes aren't recorded. A conference report is sometimes filed at the end of one day, the vote taken the beginning of the next, before members have time to read the report carefully.

Secrecy would be curtailed by DSG-recommended amendments to the House rules. They would allow clerks to record the names of members as they pass through teller lines. Committee votes would have to be made public. Committee meetings could be closed only on a two-thirds vote of the committee, and in each such case the reason would itself have to be disclosed. Committee reports on appropriations bills would have to be delivered to congressmen at least a week before House action.

The House has company. The Pentagon keeps secret from Congress the amounts of military aid going to specific countries. Taiwan got \$144 million, a probe disclosed, when Congress had thought it got \$341,000. Secrecy shrouds the Laos operation. What does it cost? \$50 million a year? \$400 million? Somebody knows but isn't telling.

#### A SECRET SOCIETY

(By Donald R. Larrabee)

WASHINGTON.—America may have an "open society," compared to Communist countries, but Congress remains largely a "secret society." Most Americans actually do not know what their congressman is doing much of the time, despite the extensive press coverage of the House and Senate.

#### SECRECY RULES

This is because the real work of Congress is done in committees, behind closed doors, and not on the floor in open view. Congressmen defend the practice as being in the interest of either national security or a smoother legislative process. The press and

some other outside groups have challenged the secrecy rules to little avail.

Now, for the first time in anyone's memory, a group of concerned House members has come forth with a serious critique on the secrecy problem and some proposed solutions. The Democratic Study Group (DSG), a band of liberal Democrats seeking House reforms, worries that public confidence in the House may be destroyed unless something is done to expose the deliberations of Congress at their roots.

The DSG points out that secrecy takes many forms. It is closed committee meetings; it is refusal to disclose record votes taken in committee; it is the unavailability of reports and other information about the contents and effects of bills.

Beyond this, on the floor itself, there are scores of non-record votes on major amendments in the House (but not the Senate). And all House-Senate conference committees, where the final bargaining is done are closed tight.

"Whatever the form," the committee says, "the effect of such procedures is to deny the public and members of congress themselves basic information they need to participate effectively in the democratic process."

#### CLOSED MEETINGS

It is probably true that the secrecy pervading the legislative process has helped to make the House incomprehensible to the average citizen and, in its special way, has contributed to the unfavorable public image of a congressman as one not to be trusted.

Since most congressmen are hard-working, respectable people who deserve public trust, it would be in the interest of Congress to invite greater public scrutiny. A good argument can be made that secrecy prevents members of Congress from doing their jobs effectively.

Nearly half of the hearings and meetings of the House committees are currently closed to the press and public. Most of these sessions involve major committees such as Ways and Means, Armed Services, Foreign Affairs and appropriations.

Indeed, the DSG found that the powerful appropriations panels—the ones that examine the budget in detail—hold all of their more than 300 annual meetings and hearings behind closed doors, "out of sight of the taxpayers who foot the bills for its actions."

The House appropriations committee releases the transcript of its hearings in due course but they are heavily censored. It should be noted that the companion Senate committee manages to hold about three-fourths of its meetings in public.

Although the legislative reorganization act of 1946 requires all committees to keep a record of the votes on any question on which a record is demanded, the information is never released by the committees, with one exception in the House, the Education and Labor Committee.

#### MORE RECORD VOTES

A new attempt at legislative reorganization will be before the House in a few weeks. The DSG is suggesting that the measure be amended to open House proceedings to more public scrutiny.

Perhaps the most significant move will be an effort to require record votes—not now permitted—when the House is considering amendments. If a lawmaker had to take a stand in public, he might make it a point to be present and voting. Currently, the participation is less than one-third of the House membership.

There will be a proposal to require a two-thirds roll call vote to close a meeting or hearing, plus disclosure of the reason for doing so. And the DSG wants every member's vote on committee roll calls to be made public.

The efforts at procedural reform will be closely watched but could suffer at the hands

of the present system. Ironically, whether the House is to change its ways and get "on the record" will be decided by "non-record" votes under the ingrained procedures of the past.

#### DECISIONS MADE ANONYMOUSLY

(By Les Gapay)

WASHINGTON.—Bells ring throughout the House of Representatives and its environs—from the ornate chamber to the handball court in the basement of the Rayburn Office Building—to summon representatives to vote on a piece of legislation or to answer a call for a quorum.

#### DINNER BELL RING

Capitol Hill area restaurant and bar hideaways of members of Congress announce the number of rings and one clangs a dinner bell, thanks to quick phone calls from obliging doorkeepers in the House halls.

Often, one ring of the bells won't budge a House member from his leather chair in the restaurant or from poolside or the handball court in the Rayburn gym, even though the vote may be on a vital issue like the anti-ballistic missile system or American troops in Cambodia.

For two or three bells, though, the same members may vote for the same or lesser issues on an empty stomach or wearing tennis shoes.

The difference is one bell means only total numbers, and not names of representatives, will be recorded. For two or three bells, members' names become a matter of record for constituents to see.

Representatives voted in anonymity so far this year on issues ranging from desegregation to American troops in Cambodia.

The votes came by voice (eyes and nays aloud), division (members stand and are counted) and teller (representatives file past designated tellers who count their number but do not record names).

#### NONROLLCALL VOTES

An analysis by Congressional Quarterly shows legislation upon which the House made decisions this year without the scrutiny of name-recorded votes included:

Eight amendments concerning the use of funds for American forces in Cambodia, Laos and Thailand.

Attempts to cut funds for the anti-ballistic missile system (ABM), multiple-warhead missiles (MIRV), the proposed B-1 bomber, the F-14 fighter plane and other military projects.

Amendments to change or cut language in the Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Department's appropriations bills limiting the ability of the federal government to seek further school desegregation.

Twenty-two amendments to the District of Columbia crime bill covering such areas as pre-trial detention, "no-knock" search warrants, wiretapping and mandatory jail sentences.

An attempt to delete funds for the development of the controversial Supersonic Transport (SST).

The system of frequent non-record votes in the House on vital issues is now under attack from reform-minded members.

Rep. Charles S. Gubser, R-Calif., and 50 other representatives from both parties have introduced resolutions to modify the House rules to allow more record votes.

In an attempt to speed action on the proposal, leaders of the Democratic Study Group, an organization of House liberals, plan to tack a revision of the chamber's voting system to a congressional reorganization bill expected to come to the House floor for action in July.

The House's non-record voting practice was patterned after a centuries-old English system whereby members of Parliament could hide their individual votes from the king.

In 1832, the English system was reformed

to provide for a public record of votes. The House effort comes 138 years later.

The U.S. Constitution requires record votes (called roll-call or yea-and-nay votes) be taken in either chamber of Congress whenever one-fifth of the members present ask for it.

However, the Constitution also provides each chamber can determine the rules of its own proceedings. Under Senate rules, any member can force a roll-call vote on any issue.

But the House takes most of its votes while sitting as a committee comprised of all its members (called the Committee of the Whole). Roll call votes are prohibited in the Committee of the Whole and it is allowed to conduct its business with a minimum of 100 members present. This compares to a majority of the 435 members required in the House itself (218 representatives).

#### RECORDING DIFFICULTIES

Votes in the Committee of the Whole are taken by voice, division or teller.

On teller votes it is difficult to record the names of representatives from press galleries since members have their backs to reporters and the vote moves quickly. Anti-war lobbyists recently published non-roll call votes of members on key amendments offered by doves to a defense bill, but some representatives claimed the lists contained errors.

In addition, it is against the rules of the House to take notes from the public galleries and attempting to spot members and write down their votes can be cumbersome.

The rules state that only amendments or legislation passed by the Committee of the Whole can be voted on by the full House where roll call votes can be demanded.

Under the procedures, members can remain anonymous on politically-sensitive issues. In some cases, members have noted, they have helped to kill or pass measures they would have voted the opposite on had their names been recorded.

The Democratic Study Group claims only about one-third of the House's members participate in the non-record votes taken in the Committee of the Whole, while 80 per cent to 90 per cent turn out for roll call votes and routine quorum calls where names are recorded.

On the non-record SST amendment, for example, only 188 members voted. On non-controversial roll call votes this year which were passed unanimously (there have been seven) as many as 300 members turned out.

#### LETTER TO PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES BY STUDENT YOUTH LEADER AT KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

#### HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the latest issue of the Young Republican, official publication of the 50,000-member Young Republican National Federation, there appeared a letter, addressed to President Nixon, from a student leader at Kent State University.

The letter was written by Mr. Stephen E. Hagerman, chairman of the Kent State University Young Republican Club.

In his letter, Mr. Hagerman points out that a small group of Kent State students had been radicalized by nonstudent militants during the 2 years prior to the incident of May 4, 1970, when four students were killed there. According to Mr. Hagerman, in the days prior to May 4:

Student and nonstudent militants vowed to close the school, and now they have.

They set out to defy authority—any authority. As for the deaths it is hard to justify the loss of life. Those students died for nothing. I was going to the library and, unfortunately, in a position to see the rioting and the Guardsmen shoot. They were taking a lot of abuse in the way of rocks and other objects. They were prepared. There were no rocks of that size on the campus. They had them prior to the incident.

None of the students shot were coming from class. They were in the middle of sessions at that time. Nobody would walk between the rioters and the National Guard. All who viewed the riots said the Guard was taking a beating and in fear of their lives.

Expressing an opinion echoed by concerned students on other campuses wracked by minority provoked unrest, Mr. Hagerman points out that he is:

Tired of hearing my country defiled and my flag desecrated by a few radicals. . . . I am frustrated at seeing people duped by these people, at seeing naive idealists who follow without knowing, at seeing people exploit what happened at Kent for their own purpose. I am tired of hearing about "the students" when this only represents a few of us and when I know that those who lead these "students" are not sincere. I'm frustrated at having my school closed and all I have worked for lost.

It is encouraging that Mr. Hagerman has sought to inform the President of what he feels to be the opinion of the majority of concerned students at Kent State University. It is encouraging that there are students on our campuses today who are more concerned with building a better society than with tearing down the one that now exists.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

WILLARD, OHIO.

DEAR PRESIDENT NIXON: As president of the Kent State Young Republicans, I believe I have a responsibility to express my views and I believe too, views of a lot of other students. I cannot speak for the club members because I have not talked with most of them since the tragic events of the 4th; although, before my hasty departure, I talked with other students.

We want our university open. I do not know where to begin but the first thing is, Frustration. I feel frustrated with the news media and with the fact that we cannot go back to school this quarter. The majority of students at Kent want an education. Out of 20,000 maybe 1500 at the most were involved. It is the story of those students that I would like to convey. It is something that the press seldom shows, especially now.

Ever since last year I have had an interest in the radical students and have attended their meetings, collected their literature and talked endlessly in an effort to understand and find out what they stood for. At one such meeting I heard Mark Rudd, KSU, SDS leaders talk about radicalizing students. They did not care about any issues; they only thought of issues they could exploit. They talked of confronting the students and this is what they have done. They vowed to close the school and now they have.

I have one of their training manuals where they talk about getting the student to go along with a cause. Your decision to send troops into Cambodia was not the reason for the KSU riots. Cambodia was just an issue with which this group (not called SDS any

more) could arouse the students. Some of the students are sincere in their beliefs—but very naive. As the riot progressed the same three SDS demands of last year were issued.

As for the burning of the ROTC building and destruction downtown—there was no excuse. The National Guard was necessary to safeguard lives and property. When they came there were posters put on every door on campus and passed out to everyone saying "No rallies, peaceful or otherwise and no throwing rocks or other objects". These students had no respect for authority. I talked with some at length Sunday night and they said that the Revolution was here. They also knew that they were breaking the law and they planned to break it on Monday the 4th.

They set out to defy authority—any authority. As for the deaths it is hard to justify the loss of life. Those students died for nothing. I was going to the library and, unfortunately, in a position to see the rioting and the Guardsmen shoot. They were taking a lot of abuse in the way of rocks and other objects. They were prepared. There were no rocks of that size on the campus. They had them prior to the incident.

None of the students shot were coming from class. They were in the middle of sessions at that time. Nobody would walk between the rioters and the National Guard. All who viewed the riots said the Guard was taking a beating and in fear of their lives.

I am tired of hearing my country defiled and my flag desecrated by a few radicals. . . . I am frustrated at seeing people duped by these people, at seeing naive idealists who follow without knowing, at seeing people exploit what happened at Kent for their own purpose. I am tired of hearing about "the students" when this only represents a few of us and when I know that those who lead these "students" are not sincere. I'm frustrated at having my school closed and all I have worked for lost. I am tired of fighting a losing battle for what I believe.

I believe in this country. We have what no other people have, yet this very freedom invites the crisis we now have. Democracy is a delicate mechanism and a few have been able to exploit this. Now they are winning. WHY?

It is time that a few stop tyrannizing the majority. The school must and I am sure will open. Those who use violence should be severely punished. The schools must start expelling those who do not want to learn. The majority of students want to learn.

I just wanted to give my views and opinions for what they are worth. It is time others of us made our views known. We all want peace, the only difference is how to achieve it. Good luck to you in your attempts to bring peace in Vietnam and at home.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN E. HAGERMAN.

**CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY SETS RECORD STRAIGHT ON ERRONEOUS IMPRESSIONS GIVEN ON S. 30, THE "ORGANIZED CRIME CONTROL ACT OF 1969"**

**HON. SAM STEIGER**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on June 29, 1970, I rose to bring to the House's attention certain aspects of a campaign apparently being conducted by some to undermine items in President Nixon's anticrime legislative program.

CXVI—1471—Part 17

See the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 116, part 16, page 21889. One aspect of that campaign was the erroneous impressions being conveyed of what provisions were actually contained in specific pieces of legislation.

A central thrust of my remarks was that several liberal commentators and editorial writers had apparently derived erroneous impressions of S. 30, the "Organized Crime Control Act of 1969," from an article which appeared in the June 5, 1970, edition of Congressional Quarterly at page 1499.

I now rise to draw the attention of my colleagues to an article in the July 3, 1970, edition of Congressional Quarterly at page 1709, which sets the record straight in this regard. This article attributes the erroneous information in the June 5 article to a report of the New York City Bar Association of May 12, 1970. What it demonstrates is that Congressional Quarterly was the victim and not the perpetrator of inaccurate reporting. I am pleased that Congressional Quarterly has now placed this matter in proper context.

I insert the Congressional Quarterly article at this point:

**STEIGER DISPUTES CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY REPORT ON ORGANIZED CRIME BILL**

Rep. Sam Steiger (R. Ariz.) in a June 29 House speech charged Congressional Quarterly with "inaccurate and misleading" coverage of the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970 (S. 30).

Steiger criticized four paragraphs of a June 5 Congressional Quarterly report on opposition to major crime-control bills. (Weekly Report p. 1496)

The section of the Congressional Quarterly report dealing with S. 30 was based on an analysis of the bill by the committee on Federal legislation of the Bar Association of the City of New York.

In the speech, titled "Is the Congressional Quarterly Working for Organized Crime?" Steiger quoted the following paragraphs and described them as "the pertinent parts" of Congressional Quarterly's report:

"Grand juries could publicly accuse an official of misconduct without filing an indictment or furnishing an opportunity for the official to refute the charges."

"A grand jury witness refusing to testify could be imprisoned for contempt for as long as three years without trial or bail."

"All illegally obtained evidence (by illegal electronic surveillance, compelled testimony or illegal searches) no longer would be disclosed to a defendant challenging its use, as the Supreme Court ruled in 1969. Instead, after enactment of S. 30, a court could disclose only that part of the evidence which it adjudged relevant and 'in the interest of justice'."

"A judge could impose a 30-year special offender sentence upon a man convicted of a felony with a maximum two-year penalty as well as upon a convicted bank robber who could receive a 25-year sentence." (Weekly Report p. 1499)

Context of Statements. Steiger did not indicate the context from which he took the statements he quoted from Congressional Quarterly. Preceding the statements was a list of references to previous Congressional Quarterly coverage of S. 30 and a paragraph stating:

"As the House Judiciary Committee began hearings May 20 on S. 30, the Bar Association of the City of New York issued a 106-page analysis of the bill. The report urged complete revision of the measure; 'Taken as a whole, while S. 30 demonstrates commendable effort and attention to a terribly serious

problem, in its present form, it contains the seeds of official repression'."

Congressional Quarterly then listed, in summary statements, the provisions of S. 30 which the Bar Association committee on Federal legislation and other groups most strongly opposed, reporting them as the Bar Association report described them.

**GRAND JURY ACCUSATIONS**

Steiger Statement. Steiger labeled as inaccurate and misleading Congressional Quarterly's statement that S. 30 had been criticized as allowing grand juries to accuse officials of misconduct without providing for reply.

Bar Association. The bar group's report said:

"A public official could be publicly condemned on the basis of accusations of the grand jury which he had no opportunity to rebut at a trial."

Additional Steiger Comments. Steiger said that an official so accused would have "ample opportunity" to refute any charges by naming witnesses to testify before the grand jury before the report was filed and that he could appeal and refute in writing a court order authorizing publication of the grand jury report.

**CONTEMPT**

Steiger Statement. Steiger labeled as inaccurate and misleading Congressional Quarterly's statement that S. 30 had been criticized as providing that an uncooperative grand jury witness could be imprisoned for contempt for as long as three years without trial or bail.

Bar Association Report. The Bar Association report stated that "a grand jury witness could be imprisoned for three years for civil contempt without trial or bail."

Additional Steiger Comments. Steiger said, "a witness, after being held in contempt, could be incarcerated for the term of the grand jury if he persists in his refusal to comply with the court order which, in some cases, could amount to 3 years."

**ILLEGALLY OBTAINED EVIDENCE**

Steiger Statement. Steiger labeled as inaccurate and misleading Congressional Quarterly's statement that S. 30 had been criticized as providing that only that part of illegally obtained evidence which a court found relevant and "in the interest of justice" would have to be disclosed to a defendant who challenged its use against him. Steiger said the phrase "may be relevant" is S. 30's standard of relevance for disclosure.

CQ Correction. On June 26, three days before Steiger's statement, Congressional Quarterly published a correction inserting the words "may be" before "relevant." (Weekly Report p. 1657)

Bar Association Report. The Bar report cited the Senate committee report (S Rept 91-617) on S. 30 which said that "the phrase 'may be relevant' . . . is intended to act as an absolute floor preventing disclosure except where a reasonable likelihood of relevance appears."

**SPECIAL SENTENCES**

Steiger Statement. Steiger labeled as inaccurate and misleading Congressional Quarterly's statement that S. 30 had been criticized as providing that a judge could impose a special 30-year sentence upon a person convicted of a minor felony as well as upon one convicted of a major crime.

Bar Association Report. The Bar Association report said: "A judge could give the same 30-year sentence to an offender guilty of a minor felony, for which the maximum punishment was only two years, as to a person convicted of bank robbery, who could otherwise receive 25 years."

Additional Steiger Comments. Steiger said that before an individual was sentenced as a "special" offender it must be proved that he was in one of a set of categories defined by law, and he must additionally be ruled "dangerous."

A "SILENT MAJORITY" OF FINE  
YOUNG PEOPLE

**HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, we are viewing a false image of the youth of America. There is a "silent majority" of fine young people who are diligently preparing themselves to assume leadership positions so that they may achieve effective solutions to the multiple problems that they will take over when they reach full maturity.

Their thoughts turn to the constructive rather than the destructive. They would resolve our problems rather than seek to defame. Unfortunately their quiet voices have been drowned out by the raucous screams of the so-called dissidents.

On the Fourth of July, hundreds of thousands of good citizens gathered in Washington to honor their Nation. There were others who blatantly announced their determination to gather a larger group that would then shout down those who were assembled to pay their respects to their Nation.

To give their group the courage to make this confrontation, they announced that they would supply marijuana to all who participated in their revolutionary practice.

Only a possible 200 hard-core dissidents turned out. They had nothing to add to the occasion but obscenities, rocks, and bottles. They had completely failed in attracting our youth to their side.

The quiet voices of the majority of the students are increasingly becoming heard. No longer will the strident voice become the symbol of truth. No longer will they listen to the voices of those who have led them to catastrophe. The "big lie" is being disavowed.

It is to these quiet voices to which we as legislators should turn for the true feelings of the students.

Thousands upon thousands of students are almost daily coming to the Capitol. They traverse our halls on guided tours. They respect our laws of conduct. They look with reverence upon our national monuments. They are truly fine people.

I would not have you believe that they are satisfied with the status quo. They join with us in the search for programs that will bring an ever-improving life for all of our citizens.

Recently, I spent time with a group who came the 400 miles from my district to see their Capitol. I was impressed by their knowledge of national affairs and particularly their interest in the National Timber Supply Act.

These teenage girls from Cadette Girl Scout Troop 671, from Akron, Ohio, had been earning money over a 2-year period so that they might visit their Nation's Capital and actually see their Government in action.

When they returned home, they promptly sat down to write me of their impressions of the Flag Day ceremonies that they had viewed with me in the Chamber of the House of Representatives.

I enclose some excerpts from their letters. As I read them, I could not but feel that we were raising some dedicated Americans. The excerpts follow:

GIRL SCOUT LETTERS

My co-leader and I wish to express our very deep appreciation for your kindness in speaking to the girls, arranging for them to be shown around and attending this program. They also like the little key pins!

It greatly clarified to them how each of us is truly a part of our Government, when they could meet a man from their own city who represents them, their needs and interests in Congress, as well as taking an active part in running the affairs of the entire nation.

Our trip was a great success and we were impressed with the friendliness with which we were received by everyone we met in Washington—from Government officials to bus drivers, hotel clerks, and people on the street. It is truly a great city.—Mrs. Glenn Weigand, Co-leader, Girl Scout Troop 671.

The Flag Day program in the U.S. House of Representatives was indeed an impressive ceremony. Though our country is sometimes criticized and looked down upon, this ceremony revived a feeling of national patriotism that is absent in many Americans. The American flag, which symbolizes the immortal history of this country, has a lasting character and existence by which it is recognized by the world.—Karen Hunt.

On June 15, 1970, my Girl Scout Troop 671, had the pleasure of seeing the House of Representatives' Flag Day program. I had never seen such an impressive ceremony. It sent chills down my back when I saw our flag come in and when we sang the National Anthem.

I felt proud because here were people from all over the country joined together under one flag. I thought it was great.—Ellen Barresi.

The Flag Day ceremony which was presented in the House of Representatives on June 15, was very inspiring to me. When the flag of the United States was brought before the Members and the audience, it brought tears to my eyes and tickled my spine. How I wish everyone in our country could see this and be as honored as I.—Ann Weigand.

As I sat on the steps watching the Flag Day ceremony I couldn't help thinking of the song "Milk and Honey" from the play of the same name. It goes: "This, the land of milk and honey, this is the land of sun and song, this is the world of good and plenty, humble and proud and strong. This is the place where the hopes of the homeless and the dreams of the lost combine. This is the land that heaven blessed and this lovely land is mine!" When I see the flag I think of America, and when I think of America I think of "the land of milk and honey".

Then singing the Star Spangled Banner, really put the life of our great country into the hearts of all the people present.

It was the most beautiful ceremony I have ever taken part in or have witnessed.—Sue Mueller.

AMENDMENT TO WHOLESOME  
MEAT ACT

**HON. J. J. PICKLE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the House on Monday passed S. 3592, a bill to amend the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967. The amendment was urgently needed to aid those engaged in custom slaughtering as well as the smaller slaughtering business and locker plants. The 1967 act

was itself a landmark in consumer legislation, but it is good the House passed this amendment. This corrective action needed to be taken so that the small processor would not be unduly penalized. The 1967 act contained a provision permitting custom slaughtering for private customers for nonbusiness purposes, but also contained a restriction prohibiting those engaging in custom slaughtering from engaging in the sale of any meat or meat products. Under the provisions of the bill as passed, a locker plant operator will be able to engage in custom processing and slaughtering and also engage in regular locker plant operations and meat processing business—so long as he keeps the two acts clearly separate, the custom processed meat clearly marked, and meets sanitary standards in both operations.

In my part of the State, there are many splendid meat processors who need this kind of corrective legislation in order to continue in business. Otherwise, the cost of complying with the original act would be prohibitive.

I am glad that this bill provides for the right of a small processor to prepare wild game such as deer. Deer hunting and the processing of deer meat is a very extensive operation in central Texas, but unless this legislation had passed there would have been severe question whether a small meat processor could risk handling deer meat.

It is my hope that this bill goes a long way in righting the restrictions against the small meat processor. I am happy it has passed both Houses of Congress and hope that it will soon be made law by the President. This amendment corrects a situation which needed attention, continues protection of the consumer of inspected meat, and provides for safe, sanitary slaughtering of farm and game animals.

There is still further help needed for the small processor under the Meat Inspection Act. The little operator is still being asked to comply with the present law that is applicable to the big meat packers of this country. Hopefully, we can consider further amendments of the law as we gain more experience in this area.

Meanwhile, this bill today will help the small operator in custom slaughtering.

VIEWS OF THE CITIZENS OF LOUISIANA'S SIXTH DISTRICT

**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I recently conducted my 1970 legislative opinion poll, and am happy to have the views of more than 32,000 citizens who took the time to let me know their thinking on the important issues facing our country today.

Believing that my colleagues will find the results of interest, I insert in the RECORD my latest newsletter, which includes the tabulated results of this poll:

JUNE 1970.

DEAR FRIEND: Thank you for your cooperation in responding to my 1970 legislative opinion poll. As of June 15th, some 32,318 replies were received—and returns are still trickling in. I feel the enthusiastic response is a healthy indication that citizens of the Sixth District are vitally interested in good government, and rightfully concerned with the many affairs facing our country and your representation in our Nation's Capital.

The large numbers of returns have kept me and members of my staff working overtime tabulating them. This is a sizeable increase over the last legislative opinion poll. I had sincerely hoped to personally answer each reply, but I found that just tabulating was quite a job in itself! Each return, whether signed or unsigned, was counted.

It was interesting to note the large number of young people who expressed a concern in government. One high school civics teacher wrote requesting extra forms to permit a civics class to participate.

While a full breakdown of the returns is listed on the back page of this report, I would like to make a few comments on the answers. It is *only* by having *your* views, individually and collectively, that I can continue to *accurately represent you* here in Washington and let your voice continue to be heard.

I have entered the results of the 1970 legislative opinion poll in the Congressional Record for all my colleagues here in Congress to know how you feel on important legislation. Also, I have sent a copy of the results to the President, because I feel it is imperative that he know your thinking on national issues.

The school crisis, inflation, crime and drugs, and the war seem to be the biggest items facing the nation today, according to your answers. Some 93 percent of our people do not favor bussing of school children. With 3 percent undecided, only 4 percent indicated they wanted bussing. Inflation has affected 94 percent of you either seriously or moderately. And, on the war issue, 81 percent favor either victory or Vietnamization.

The closest return involved the question on the Electoral College—with 50 percent favoring retention of the present system, while 35 percent opposed the college, and 15 percent were undecided. There were some inquiries as to why I phrased the question as I did—"to permit a minority of 40 percent of American voters to elect a U.S. President." The bill currently pending would provide that as few as 40 percent of the voters could elect a President. The out-cry we hear over the need to change the Electoral College because of the fear of a minority-elected President conveniently overlooks the fact that such a change would do just that. It is for this reason that I phrased the question as I did.

Thank you once again for helping me continue to reflect your views here in Washington. The results are tabulated on the back. I know you will find them interesting, as I did.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. RARICK,  
Member of Congress.

HERE ARE YOUR RESULTS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN RARICK'S 1970 LEGISLATIVE POLL

[Answers in percent]

1. What do you regard as the three most important issues facing us today?

School crisis.....	22.7
Inflation.....	18.4
Crime and drugs.....	17.0
Vietnam War.....	15.1
Communism.....	13.8
Pollution of air and water.....	7.9
Hunger and poverty.....	2.7
Other.....	2.4

2. How has the rising cost of living affected you?

Slightly.....	5.7
Moderately.....	48.1
Seriously.....	46.2

3. Many suggestions have been made for curbing inflation. Which, if any, do you suggest as a solution?

Curtail federal spending.....	43.5
Wage and price controls.....	28.4
Credit control.....	16.5
Other.....	6.9
Increase interest rates.....	2.4
Raise taxes.....	2.3

4. What is your opinion of the Administration's bussing of school children and transfer of teachers to achieve a "unitary school system"?

For.....	4.4
Against.....	92.5
Undecided.....	3.1

5. What is your opinion of selected groups receiving special quotas in membership and "compensatory" seniority in labor unions, such as provided by the so-called "Philadelphia Plan"?

For.....	4.3
Against.....	75.6
Undecided.....	20.1

6. What is your opinion of the proposed guaranteed minimum income to all citizens as a substitute for the present welfare programs?

For.....	18.0
Against.....	69.2
Undecided.....	12.8

7. Do you favor abolishing the Electoral College to permit a minority of 40% of American voters to elect a U.S. President?

For.....	34.8
Against.....	50.0
Undecided.....	15.2

8. What is your opinion of the President's recommendation for additional U.S. funding of the United Nations Organization?

For.....	10.2
Against.....	76.7
Undecided.....	13.1

9. How do you feel we should end the Vietnam War?

Unilateral withdrawal.....	12.2
Negotiated gradual withdrawal (Vietnamization).....	34.9
Victory by conventional military pressure on enemy.....	46.8
Other.....	5.7
Undecided.....	0.4

10. What should be the position of the United States in the Middle East?

Pro-Arab.....	1.2
Pro-Israel.....	29.8
Strict Neutrality.....	63.9
Undecided.....	5.1

A COMMUNIST VIETNAM?

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, when a U.S. Senator has the demonstrated inability to recommend that Vietnam be unified under Communist control I begin to wonder what is going on in this Nation? To urge an immediate pullout in Vietnam, even if it may lead to Communist control should the South Vietnamese prove unable to handle their own defense

is one thing. At least this can be explained—if not justified—in the context of stopping U.S. casualties. But to state that "our national interest would best be served by a unified Vietnam even if under Communist rule" is to suggest an end result in Vietnam that would make 45,000 tragic American deaths and 200,000 American casualties an exercise in futility.

Mr. Speaker, we are in Vietnam because of communism's continuing aggression against the forces of independence and freedom. Basically, we are there to prevent the whole of Southeast Asia from being overrun by Communist forces supplied by the Soviet Union and to some extent by Red China.

My colleagues just back from Vietnam report that we are making progress in the Vietnamization program and that it appears probable that President Nixon is going to be able to get us out of the tragic overcommitment of manpower to land combat on the continent of Asia, stage-set by former President Kennedy, who sent 12,000 advisers to Vietnam, and President Johnson, who sent over a half-million Americans to fight in Vietnam, all without any declaration of war by Congress.

If President Nixon can turn the conduct of this war over to a South Vietnamese force capable of defending South Vietnam against Communist aggression we will not only withdraw honorably but we will have kept our commitment to South Vietnam that was the occasion for our being there in the first place.

To urge a unified Vietnam under Communist rule, in these circumstances, might be overlooked as a pathetic gesture of political appeasement if its source did not involve a Member of the U.S. Senate.

In this connection, I commend the reading of a recent column by the Honorable David Lawrence somewhat misleadingly referring to isolationism but discussing the disastrous consequences that would follow the adoption of such a policy.

The article follows:

"ISOLATIONISTS" IN SENATE CAUSE HARM  
(By David Lawrence)

American combat troops got out of Cambodia a day ahead of schedule, though during seven weeks of debate in the Senate expressions of doubt were frequently heard that President Nixon would keep his word. The harm done to the prestige of the United States abroad and to the conduct of foreign policy by such political opposition tactics will be felt for a long time to come. Indeed, one Democrat already has had the temerity to make the following statement in the Senate:

"I submit that our national interest would best be served by a unified Vietnam even if under Communist rule, as it would then serve as a relatively firm barrier to Chinese expansion."

This is hardly good news to certain members of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization—Australia, New Zealand, the Philippine Republic and Thailand. They have regarded the pledges of the United States as obligations that would be honored in the event that communism endeavored again to impair the right of self-determination of peoples covered by the treaty.

The speech is reminiscent of what used to be heard prior to World War II and prior to World War I, when "isolationists" in the Senate were giving foreign governments the

impression that they need not fear opposition from the United States if free countries were invaded and their independence threatened.

America's participation in World War I began 53 years ago, and in World War II nearly 29 years ago. After each war period new generations grow up, and history is not re-examined even by lots of members of the American Congress. Yet, both World Wars were in part the direct result of a belief by autocratic governments in Europe that the United States would not give military aid to the countries attacked.

Today some members of the United States are, in effect, telling the world once more that the United States, because of a costly experience in Vietnam, isn't going to help the small nations in Asia—or perhaps even in Europe—and that communism is free to take over wherever it chooses on the continent of Asia.

This means there could be an outbreak of a major war within a few years—and a catastrophe for the whole world could ensue—unless the policies of the United States are enunciated with such resoluteness that there could be no mistaking the intention of our government to uphold its treaty commitments.

Those members of the Senate, of course, who preach "isolationism" think this is popular at home. Certainly it would seem that everybody would applaud a speech which is against war. But the conflict in Vietnam is a small affair compared to a world war, and the casualties insignificant in number as against the millions of deaths in a world war, particularly nowadays when nuclear weapons are likely to be used. The foreign policy of the United States needs, therefore, to be made unequivocally clear.

The Senate has a Foreign Relations Committee which has the right to discuss foreign policy, but not to make it. Comments are supposed to be advisory and not obstructive. Now that the whole Cambodian expedition has been finished, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is still inclined to meddle. But very little objection can be raised, as the American effort has been completed and South Vietnam has taken over the task.

To declare, however, that it would be better policy for the United States to favor a "unified Vietnam even if under Communist rule" is to undermine the strength of the South Vietnamese government and to invite more trouble in Indochina by indicating that the supporting arm of the United States is weakening.

There are senators who recognize the dangers and want to continue to supply financial and military assistance not only to South Vietnam but to other countries which may wish to help Cambodia.

The President has not the slightest intention to turn to "isolationism" and let the Communists grab whatever countries they wish. Such a course might be less expensive, but it would be a discreditable policy for the free nation which leads the world in its help for humane causes. But will the Communists risk a big war and bet on what they mistakenly believe is "public opinion" in America?

#### SUPPLEMENTAL AIR CARRIERS: THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD SERVE THE PUBLIC INTEREST

**HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in recent months Ralph Nader and others have dramatized the fact that many regula-

tory agencies, originally established to protect the public, have come instead to represent the interests of the industry they were supposed to regulate.

Mr. Nader has not yet turned his attention to the Civil Aeronautics Board. But there is probably not a single person in the United States who doubts that the CAB is ripe for a Nader-style exposé.

Instead of representing the air travel consumer, the CAB's primary concern seems to lie in actively preventing the pressures of the market from giving the consumer better or cheaper service.

One of the major sources of low-cost modern-equipment service has been the charter, or supplemental airline. Charter flights have enabled millions of Americans to enjoy air travel with the latest safest equipment and crews at sharply reduced prices.

But now the CAB, in its efforts to protect the scheduled air carriers, appears to be moving to greatly restrict the availability, convenience, and practicality of charter flights.

Under unanimous consent agreement, I insert an explanatory statement by the National Air Carrier Association in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The NACA is the trade association of the charter airlines. Generally, I take a rather dim view of insertions of statements by special interest groups in the RECORD. But in this case, the special interest seems to me clearly to coincide with the public interest.

The statement follows:

#### THE CONSUMER'S STAKE IN LOW-COST AIR TRAVEL

Thanks to low-cost charter air travel, millions of low and middle-income Americans took advantage of the opportunity last year to visit foreign countries, enjoy far-away vacation spots in the United States, improve their education, or broaden their cultural horizons at about one-half of the cost of an individual ticket on a scheduled flight.

On May 8, 1970, the Civil Aeronautics Board proposed new regulations covering charter services offered on both scheduled and charter airlines. These proposals, if adopted, would sharply curtail the availability of low-cost charter air travel to the members of many American organizations that now sponsor such trips.

The following information has been prepared in response to requests for more facts on this important consumer policy issue.

#### THE ISSUE: THE PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO INEXPENSIVE GROUP AIR TRAVEL

The Federal Aviation Act calls for "the promotion of adequate, economical, and efficient service by air carriers at reasonable charges, without unjust discrimination, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices."

Despite this, one segment of the aviation industry—the charter specialists who offer low cost transportation—is threatened with proposed CAB rules and regulations that would sharply curtail the popular low-cost charter concept that was authorized by an Act of Congress. Many well-known American voluntary organizations—such as cooperatives, fraternal groups, trade unions, senior citizens, study groups of students and teachers, etc.—that now provide inexpensive travel programs for their members, would also be severely restricted under the proposed CAB rules.

The right to travel is a strongly-held American belief. And charter airlines—known as "supplementals"—have brought transportation to Americans at lower costs than have ever before been available.

America's airline industry has two classes of travel—individually-ticketed, regularly-scheduled service over set routes, and group charters. Under the charter rules, each flight operates under a separate agreement in which a group hires the plane for a trip to a destination of its own choosing. Thousands of fraternal groups, employee organizations, professional societies, consumer organizations, unions, and social clubs have enabled their members to enjoy such vacation wonders as Europe, the Caribbean, Hawaii and the Far East because charter travel brought the cost within range of modest budgets.

#### CONGRESS RECOGNIZED THE NEED

Charter specialist airlines were granted permanent operating authority by Congress in 1962. Ever since, these airlines—flying the same planes as scheduled airlines under the same federal safety regulations—have offered a new dimension in air transportation, bringing the world's exotic and popular vacation spots within the reach of moderate-income Americans for the first time.

In 1968, Congress recognized that the supplemental airlines had "become solid, responsible, safe and profitable business entities." It extended their authority to include a completely new type of charter, the inclusive tour (ITC). At that time the Assistant Secretary of Transportation said: "The supplemental carriers have provided the benefits and experience of air transportation to people who otherwise might not have traveled by air. The supplementals have provided a new degree of competitive endeavor which the scheduled airlines have been unwilling or unable to initiate despite encouragement by the (Civil Aeronautics) Board."

Supplemental airlines now offer a variety of passenger charter services:

**Single Entity:** A contracting party pays the entire cost of a plane-load charter. Examples include athletic teams, "incentive" travel for company sales personnel, etc.

**Affinity:** An organization charters the plane and the cost is prorated among the members making the trip. This type of charter is governed by the numerous regulations that limit eligibility to individuals (and their immediate families) who are bona fide members of social, religious, fraternal, education or employee associations, not organized primarily for the purpose of travel.

**Inclusive Tour (ITC):** Full or split-load charters to a tour operator who organizes and promotes the tour and arranges the charter. Clients pay the tour operator. CAB must approve the tour, which must have three stopping points and last at least seven days. The cost to the client must include all hotel accommodations and surface transportation and be at least 110 percent of the lowest available individually-ticketed scheduled fare over the route.

#### THE DEMAND FOR LOW-COST AIR TRAVEL

Last year, members of the National Air Carrier Association (NACA)—the supplemental industry's trade association—petitioned the Civil Aeronautics Board to revise and update its charter regulations. They proposed to broaden low cost jet air travel and bring it within reach of many more Americans who cannot now afford to fly.

Charter fares average 50 percent lower than individually-ticketed coach fares on scheduled airlines. This proposal would make it possible for many more people to plan vacations and study tours to different parts of the world by giving them access to charter travel.

In its desire to simplify the rules and to make low cost travel available to even more Americans, the supplemental airlines suggested a number of changes in the now 11-year-old affinity group rules. Key points are summarized here:

Expand the definition of "immediate family" of a charter passenger to include all his dependents, all members of his household, and close relatives.

Permit "special event" charters for groups, such as to the annual Rose Bowl.

Allow stockholders in a company to have charter privileges similar to those now enjoyed by their employees.

Open up all charters to depositors in savings and loan associations for whom thrift, credit, and travel would go hand-in-hand.

Allow charters to members of automobile associations, who are already knowledgeable about safe, insured, and low-cost land travel.

Permit the sale of up to 20 percent of the seats on a charter flight to friends of members of the chartering group.

Permit married students on a charter study tour to take members of their immediate families along with them.

#### CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD TURNS BACK THE CLOCK

But the Civil Aeronautics Board, rather than clarifying and simplifying its rules to broaden the opportunities for low cost charter air travel, now proposes to restrict it even further. Its proposal would eliminate many presently eligible groups from chartering trips for their members. The suggested regulations threaten the very existence of the Congressionally-authorized charter airlines.

If the proposed rules are adopted, many clubs and organizations will find that they have taken their last modestly-priced vacation tour. And once the travel market has been given entirely over to the scheduled airlines on this silver platter, it would not be long before their international price-fixing cartel—the International Air Transport Association (IATA)—would push international air fares upward. It has been demonstrated that only the availability of low cost fares through the charter airlines brings IATA-set fares down.

The public has long demanded low cost travel. But only when the supplemental airlines answered this demand did IATA come up with new group fares of its own. Some of these fares were designed only to deter groups from flying the charter airlines. Last year, at the very time they were announcing new lower-priced group fares, the IATA airlines also raised individual ticket prices by eliminating the traditional five percent discount on round-trip tickets. A CAB examiner recommended rejection. He was overruled by the Board.

Instead of clarifying its rules, CAB has proposed arbitrary standards to determine who may use affinity group charters. A large percentage of chartering organizations would automatically be ineligible for charter travel. Such prestigious and reputable groups as the American Bar Association, the National Education Association, the Knights of Columbus, and B'nai B'rith would not be allowed to plan vacation charter trips for their members.

#### ORGANIZATIONS WITH MORE THAN 20,000 MEMBERS EXCLUDED

They would be denied this right because they have more than 20,000 members. In trying to screen out groups whose only purpose is to offer low cost travel (and which already are ineligible), the CAB has selected an arbitrary size to determine whether or not an organization is a bona fide "affinity group." A large organization that accepts a few too many members—no matter how well qualified—would find itself disqualified. Thus the government wishes to regulate voluntary organizations rather than airlines.

IATA, which never has encouraged low cost group travel, tried to limit group sizes back in 1963. At that time the CAB refused to accept an identical membership size restriction on the grounds that it was adverse to the public interest.

In its stated desire to assure that only bona fide groups take advantage of charter travel, the CAB now proposes a number of other

rule changes that would curtail the public's right to low cost travel. These changes are couched in phrases that suggest a belief that many persons who "should be" traveling as individuals are members of large organizations for the sole purpose of obtaining cheap fares.

Chartering organizations, under the planned rules, would also be limited to a total of only 2,000 seats in a calendar year. This is equal to eight charters on a modern plane such as a stretch DC-8, and fewer on the new jumbo jets. It would not matter whether the trips were for college students planning to study abroad, for football fans with tickets to a Bowl game, or for vacationers wishing to attend EXPO '70. A large group simply could not charter more than 2,000 seats in any one year.

It should be noted that waivers may be sought for any of the charter rules. But since there are no clear-cut, objective standards covering such requests, members of charter groups would be allowing CAB staff members—who are elected by no one—to determine which of them may exercise their Constitutional right to travel.

Some of the other ways in which the CAB proposes to identify those groups which are qualified to charter seem equally strange, if not capricious. Groups which have more than one class of member with different dues rates would automatically be disqualified. Thus, the National Press Club would no longer be allowed to plan its annual members' charter to Europe. Organizations that elect officers and directors every three or four years instead of every two years, or whose officers are elected by the directors rather than directly by the members, would also be barred, no matter how reputable these groups might be. Agricultural and marketing cooperatives would no longer be allowed to schedule charter trips for their members because of the nature of their business.

#### RULES DESIGNED TO PRESENT OBSTACLES TO CHARTER TRAVEL

Most intelligent persons, before embarking on a major trip, would expect to know not only where the airplane was going, but also where they would stay and what they would see and do while on their vacation. One of the proposed new rules would bar an assisting travel agent from sending descriptions of available land tours to organization members until after they have signed up for the charter flight. The consumer would have to put his money on the line for the flight without knowing what the full costs would be for the tour.

Nor would travel agents be allowed to help small and inexperienced groups in preparing their required passenger lists. Organizing a charter trip would be made much more difficult, even when a group is clearly qualified. In the face of rising costs of printing, postage and office work, the CAB intends to place a limit of \$4.00 per passenger on the amount of administrative expense allowed for organizing a trip. Present rules do not limit these expenses, but do require that receipts be filed if they are over \$750 per plane load.

Under another planned rule, financial risk for acceptable groups would be greatly increased because they would not be allowed to solicit their own members until after a charter contract has been signed. Making it more difficult for organizations to provide charters for their members, another rule would ban solicitation across chapter lines. This would eliminate many small chapters of "charter-worthy" organizations now able to fill a plane with their own chapter's members and those of the same organization in nearby chapters. Thus, CAB would restrict the very small as well as the very large groups.

With larger jets already in service, it is more difficult for chartering groups to fill a plane. When jets replaced smaller piston planes, the CAB recognized the problem and

allowed up to three separate affinity groups—with at least 40 passengers each—to charter a single plane. The three group limit in a 400-seat jumbo jet would require the average group to have more than 125 members traveling together. In its proposed regulations, the CAB indicates it is willing to consider a relaxation of the three group limit, but does not clearly say it will.

During the heavy tourist season, one out of every five transatlantic travelers flies by charter. The present rules invite evasion, and are virtually impossible to police effectively because of the legitimate desire of people with modest means to seek the lowest fare.

The charter airlines believe that their proposed changes in "affinity" rules would enable the CAB and the airlines to enforce the revised regulation more effectively, and at the same time, satisfy the growing public demand for low cost air transportation.

#### COMPETITION BENEFITS THE CONSUMER

The acceptance of charter travel has clearly established the public demand for additional low cost air transportation. Since 1963, the supplemental airlines have been the fastest growing segment of the aviation industry.

Where foreign airlines once dominated the transatlantic charter market, U.S. supplementals have contributed to a dramatic reversal in the trend. Their share of the charter market has climbed from 17 percent in 1963 to 50 percent last year, part of America's successful attempt to stop the gold flow from leaving our shores. During the same period, the total U.S. airlines' share of this market rose from 20 percent to 65 percent. The scheduled airlines have benefited from the growth of chartering, increasing their share from 5 percent in 1962 to 15 percent in 1969, a three-fold increase.

Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe last year cited competition by the supplementals as being "largely responsible" for transatlantic air fare reductions which were announced in November, 1969 by IATA member airlines.

Secretary Volpe said: "It seems certain that they (the supplementals) have demonstrated a clear public need for their services. In the past they have accommodated a lower income market of people who would not otherwise be traveling abroad. And now, threatened with more widespread supplemental operations, the scheduled IATA carriers have been compelled to lower their group fares to a competitive level."

The Senate Commerce Committee, in a 1968 report, said the supplementals are "a permanent and integral part of the national air transportation system. They have actively promoted the airline charter business to the point where it is a growing means of travel for American citizens who otherwise would have been denied the opportunity to take low cost vacations by air."

#### SCHEDULED AIRLINES WAGE WAR AGAINST COMPETITION

Only six percent of Americans have ever been abroad and only 50 percent have ever traveled by air. Despite the vast untapped millions of potential passengers anxious to travel, the world's scheduled airlines and the foreign governments who control them have not been content to compete openly in the marketplace. They have consistently tried to eliminate low cost charter travel through restrictions of landing rights at foreign airports, predatory and often discriminatory pricing, and archaic rules governing who may charter a plane.

Scheduled airlines are now using new low group rates (subsidized by increased regular fares) in a concerted effort to drive U.S. charter airlines from the skies. If they are allowed to succeed, they will have eliminated the only challenge to their monopolistic rate-setting system.

The president of one foreign scheduled

airline said of the supplementals: "They cater to the cheapest possible traveler and thus lower the yields of the domestic tourist industry." There is a strong suspicion that if IATA succeeds in eliminating the supplementals, scheduled carriers would find it "necessary" to considerably increase their excursion and group fares and turn up their noses at the "cheapest possible traveler."

With most members of IATA government-owned, it has been easy to make the drive political as well as economic. Some European carriers have been successful in pressuring their governments to restrict landing rights for supplementals.

But who really suffers by this economic warfare? First, of course, the traveling public, which either pays more or is limited in its choice of destination.

#### CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON AVIATION POLICY

The consumer clearly has a stake in low-cost air travel. This right must be assured by Congressional enactment of a national aviation policy. This policy must recognize the concept of a total U.S. air transportation system that includes both the scheduled airlines, which specialize in individually-ticketed service, and supplemental carriers, which specialize in group transportation—charter flights at low fares. Such a policy, backed by U.S. government support for charter airline rights abroad, would broaden the base of the market to include millions of moderate income travelers who fly infrequently or not at all.

At the same time, what is urgently needed is a *simplified, easily understood set of rules which would make low cost charter travel available to as many Americans as possible.* Simplified, fair and easily enforceable rules would discourage cheating by the public. Group travel is in itself a restriction that is clearly distinguishable from individually-ticketed fares. This simple criteria would preserve the distinction between charter or group services, on the one hand, and individually-ticketed scheduled services, on the other.

Instead of proposing rules that deprive millions of Americans of charter flight opportunities, the government should adopt a policy and rules that make charter transportation more widely available, and on a more equitable basis for all Americans. In a nation where equality of opportunity is a national goal, the right to travel should not be abridged by arbitrary and irrelevant standards such as the size of an organization, or the date on which it elects its officers.

*The entire aviation industry will be ill-served if a government regulatory agency adopts rules that turn air travel back to the exclusive preserve of the very rich, the expense-account business traveller, and the jet-setter.*

#### NEW SECRETARY OF LABOR IS CHAMPION OF WOMEN'S RIGHTS

### HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of great comfort and encouragement, in these days of dramatic change, to know that the new Secretary of Labor is James D. Hodgson who will carry on after the fine work of his predecessor, George Shultz.

Mr. Hodgson is no stranger to the Washington scene. He has been Under Secretary of Labor from the beginning of the Nixon administration.

In that post, he has not only been a strong right arm to outgoing Secretary George Shultz, he has been a creative force in his own right during one of the Labor Department's most creative periods.

Through Secretary Hodgson, therefore, the Department of Labor is passing through a smoother transition of authority than has been the case in some former years when the new authority has come, untried, from outside.

In welcoming Secretary Hodgson to his new position, I am gratified to be able to single out for special commendation his particular support for the principle of equal rights for women.

He made this clear in one of his first appearances as Secretary-designate, when he addressed the 50th anniversary celebration of the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor on June 12. I take pleasure in offering the Secretary's remarks on that occasion at this point in the RECORD. They will stand as a reaffirmation of the Nixon administration's commitment to achieve equal rights for all Americans, including the abolition of unjust discrimination based on sex.

The text follows:

SPEECH OF HON. JAMES D. HODGSON AT 50TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF WOMEN'S BUREAU, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The male of the species is not exactly known for his sensitivity. He frequently evidences this fact by making small jests on the subject of women and women's rights. There is, of course, perhaps no more serious subject around. And if you don't believe it women's organizations abound who are delighted to remind you of the fact. I know I never choose to jest on this subject, particularly in the presence of Libby Koontz. I know when it is wise to be properly intimidated.

So excuse this discourse if it fails to deal lightly with what were once regarded as the foibles and frailties of the fair sex. Perhaps I shouldn't use the term "fair". It might be interpreted by some as questionable value judgment.

Arnie Weber, the instant genius of the Labor Department, is quite a word fancier. In our early period in office, he often referred to the term "interregnum", which is roughly defined as that interlude between the rule of one and the rule of another. Perhaps "interregnum" is the best term to describe current conditions in the Labor Department. Confusions result.

This morning you expected George Shultz—you got Jim Hodgson. But Hodgson is not yet Secretary and Shultz has not yet departed. Perhaps, however, I will feel freer to speak on this subject in my role as Under Secretary than I would some weeks hence.

#### "PEOPLE" PROBLEMS

The acknowledged principal characteristic of American society in the second half of the 20th century is that it has an endless array of problems. Society is complex, the world is insecure. Many of our problems are what might be called "people" problems. And it is "people" problems with which the Labor Department is concerned.

Secretary Shultz categorizes our "people" problems three ways: Those of the labor market, the bargaining table and the work place. These three cover a lot of territory. And it's interesting that the contemporary problems of sex cuts across them all. In the labor market, the nation ponders how it may assure equal availability of jobs to both sexes. At the bargaining table, labor and management stew over where to differentiate and

where not to differentiate in labor contract provisions as they affect the sexes. In the workplace, we find ourselves moving from a time of dual standards to a time of single standards. In each of these three areas, then, problems of sex are present. And if you could visit our staff meetings on Tuesday morning, you would understand me when I say, Libby Koontz never lets us forget it.

Today I find special satisfaction in being a part of this conference, not only because it marks the 50th anniversary of the Women's Bureau but because it may well turn out to be an historic event, drawing together for concerted effort as it does the widely divergent forces that make up what we think of as the women's movement.

#### WOMEN TREATED UNEQUALLY

Many consider the status of modern American woman a contradiction in our society—a contradiction hard to explain and therefore often ignored or denied. But the fact remains that we cannot reconcile some contemporary remarkable inequalities affecting women with our stated national principle of equality for all citizens.

The Labor Department has a special responsibility in the matter of discrimination in employment. We are concerned on two counts.

In the first place, we must recognize that every person in America has the natural desire to feel useful and needed. For those to whom the route to self-fulfillment is through work, we must help open job opportunities free of discrimination.

Secondly, we are concerned about the conservation and wise use of human resources. As a nation, we have not yet devoted attention to the utilization of our "people" resources nearly as widely as we have our natural resources. A nation devoted to high living standards can ill afford to waste its skills and talents.

The waste of human resources is particularly unfortunate because it is not always discernible for what it is. It is disturbing to realize that society may be denied another Dr. Frances Kelsey or a Rachel Carson because some young woman was dissuaded from a career in medicine or science simply because of her sex. Yet this kind of thing is still not unknown in our schools and colleges.

There are some things that we in the Labor Department can do about the situation. We can see that the federal laws prohibiting sex discrimination are enforced, where we bear that responsibility.

We have not been idle in this respect. Since the Equal Pay Act of 1963 became effective, the Labor Department's investigations have found over 15 million dollars due more than 46,000 employees, most of them women—this because of underpayment in violation of the law.

#### SEX DISCRIMINATION GUIDELINES

The Office of Federal Contract Compliance, which administers the Executive Order that prohibits sex discrimination in employment under federal contracts has just issued guidelines to spell out what employers are expected to do in order to remain not only within the letter of the law but consistent with its spirit as well. Libby Koontz made the front pages with this story.

We also endorse and support the Equal Rights Amendment.

We are cooperating, too, with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The Commission is responsible for the administration of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act which includes a prohibition against sex discrimination in employment.

In these ways the Labor Department endeavors to be a force for progress.

We must understand that though the need for change in women's rights is manifestly evident, the exact direction for pursuit of

that change is less evident. In working together for a worthy goal—the goal of equal rights for women—it ill serves either ourselves or our objective to proceed with more certainty than circumstances dictate.

Fortunately ours is a pluralistic society. Different sectors can go forward in somewhat different directions at the same time. Any loss through lack of uniformity is more than made up for by the opportunity this arrangement provides for experimentation. To experiment locally, and then apply successful results broadly is a traditional American process. The unanswered questions of women's rights can profit, and I believe are profiting, from this process.

This brings to mind what we in the Administration have come to call the New Federalism.

#### NEW FEDERALISM

In essence, the New Federalism calls upon us to act as one nation in developing national standards and then to act as a congeries of communities in carrying out those standards. In other words we are seeking to decentralize government so that the detailed administration of government programs will be a local affair while the role of the Federal Government will be one of stewardship to insure that national standards are ultimately attained. National equity, but local control.

The Family Assistance Plan is a good example. It establishes a national minimum on Family Assistance, as the President puts it, "no child is worth more in one state than in another" as far as the Federal Government is concerned. At the same time, we have local participation in administration and local decisions on what more should be done.

The same theory is applicable to the problem of day care. The President has asked for a federal program to provide child care for the children of welfare mothers who choose to work, but operational details and experiments in form would be up to the community. The Federal Government may not be able to provide child care for all the children who need it, but local experimentation and initiative can contribute much.

I hope as I have spoken of the New Federalism you may have been able to see your own role in it. Actually, what is being done in many instances, is shifting the responsibility for the creation of ideas and program suggestions to the local community, to state, county and city officials.

Many of you are members of state commissions on the status of women. You have access to your governor and legislators. Others of you are members of influential organizations. You have the ear of your elected officials. All of you are private citizens with the power of creative action.

What I am really saying is that the New Federalism touches each one of us. It provides a basis for creative effort among all the major forces in America—public sector, private sector, management, labor, and volunteers.

Now in these brief remarks this morning I have deliberately avoided trying to lecture this audience on what it should do, or how it should think about this subject. I have tried to leave the impression that the Labor Department is actively pursuing its responsibilities in this area. I have specifically suggested that in a period of transition from one plateau of values to another, experimentation and diversity is a desirable condition. And I have observed that the Administration's New Federalism concept provides exactly the kind of conceptual framework needed for such widespread creative endeavor. It is my hope then, that this conference will stimulate the desire for such endeavor. May I wish you every success in your deliberations.

### THE MEASURED VOICE OF A LEADER—PRESIDENT NIXON

#### HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, most Americans were deeply impressed by President Nixon's performance on the program, "Conversation With the President," broadcast by radio and television live to the American people.

Never before has a President permitted an in-depth interview to be carried live, without prior editing, directly to the Nation. President Nixon showed confidence in himself and in his foreign policy, and further demonstrated that the administration has no more capable or articulate advocate than the President himself.

The Kansas Topeka State Journal printed an editorial on Friday, July 3, which commented on the President's performance. I share the views expressed in the State Journal's editorial, and am confident that most Americans would agree that our President has inaugurated a new and profoundly important method of communication with the American people.

Under leave to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, I insert the editorial, entitled "The Measured Voice of a Leader," as follows:

#### THE MEASURED VOICE OF A LEADER

Whatever the political persuasions of listeners to a "Conversation With the President," on major networks this week, few could be critical of the virtuoso performance of the principal. President Nixon embodied the character of a dedicated and educated leader whose nation must have a steady hand on its foreign policy helm.

The program was billed to coincide with a withdrawal of U.S. troops from Cambodia, culminating a bold foray which occasioned unparalleled and unexpected demonstrations on the home front. The explanation offered by the President was owing his constituents. It will reaffirm the broad and generally unrecognized support the maneuver had among a dominant body of Americans but will go no great way toward persuading violent dissidents to endorse an undertaking which was demonstrably successful.

The President again proved himself to be a master of informal extemporaneous discussion in his conversation with Eric Sevareid of the Columbia Broadcasting System, John Chancellor of the National Broadcasting Company and Howard K. Smith of the American Broadcasting Company. Whatever their differences with the chief executive—if they exist beyond the Agnew purlieu—representatives of these three systems are bound to respect the findings of an articulate expert whose telecasting professionalism is comparable to theirs.

While analysts found little in his reports and observations which had not been stated before, he met questions squarely and, to a television viewer in his own living room, supplied as apt a summation of the U.S. position in Southeast Asia as we will be privileged to hear. It defined again the President's pledge to clear Vietnam of U.S. troops which, even critics must concede, he had no part in assigning there. He provided reinforcement for optimism in resolving a crisis plaguing the U.S. more than any other in contemporary times.

Near the start and in the late minutes of the conversation, the President referred to problems created in the Middle East by renewal of the Israeli-Arab conflict, seeking to interject them into persistent questioning on Vietnam and Cambodia.

The chief executive made it abundantly clear this spasmodic war must be considered as grave as any world emergency, comparing this belligerent sector to the Balkans and the incipient strife which precipitated World War I. He was surprisingly frank in reviewing the explosive possibilities, demonstrating a confidence in the temper of listeners and their willingness to face up to unpleasant realities.

For most, the President demonstrated the qualities of an able politician and statesman meeting responsibilities irrevocably his and ours. The method he chose for reporting to his countrymen must, in answering questions made relevant by the immediate news, be one which will contribute to a broad understanding of our problems abroad.

### CANCER PIONEER, 76, STRUGGLING TO REACH "IMPOSSIBLE DREAM"

#### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 15, 1970, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD remarks by Mr. Harold Keen of KFMB television in San Diego which were incorrectly attributed to me. His commentary concerned the cancer research of Dr. Leonell C. Strong. Mr. Keen is one of the citizens in the San Diego area trying to bring about more support for the cancer research of Dr. Strong.

In the meantime, a more recent article in the Los Angeles Times by Mr. Lee Dye tells further about the importance of Dr. Strong's research. I would like to share this report, which follows, with my colleagues:

#### CANCER PIONEER, 76, STRUGGLING TO REACH "IMPOSSIBLE DREAM"

(By Lee Dye)

With his wife of more than half a century at his side, a pioneer in cancer research struggles these days to do what many have said he cannot do.

In an austere laboratory in a small industrial complex in Sorrento Valley, just north of San Diego, Dr. Leonell C. Strong is finishing a project he began in a tarpaper shack in New York nearly 50 years ago.

The years have been rewarding but difficult for Strong, who at 76 finds himself cut off from many of the leaders of his own field, and left without financial support as he struggles toward what he thinks will be a major breakthrough in cancer research.

The woman he married in 1919 still works at his side. The thousands of exacting charts she has labored over have dimmed her eyesight, and a bitter trial between Strong and Jonas Salk, polio research giant, has destroyed her health, Strong said.

#### LIVER EXTRACT UTILIZED

But she continues to work with her husband, because neither can quit now.

Strong is experimenting with a liver extract, which prevents cancer when injected into a mouse that is genetically predisposed toward developing cancer.

But skeptics—and there are many—point out that mice are different from men. They doubt that Strong's present work will have much impact on man's fight against cancer.

Many experts say Strong is living in the past, struggling to complete an impossible dream, not compatible with modern science.

Nevertheless, scientists at Roswell Park Memorial Institute, Buffalo, N.Y., a highly reputable cancer research center where Strong once was research director, vouch for the validity of Strong's experiments.

#### LONG TIME YET

"Because a man in his 70s doesn't mean that he is senile," said Dr. E. A. Mirand, associate director at Roswell, in a telephone interview. "His work does have merit. We must give him a chance."

Another Roswell scientist, Dr. Arnold Mittelman, is currently engaged in a project to identify the chemical nature of the substance in the liver extract responsible for preventing the mouse tumors.

But, Mittelman cautions, it is a "long, long time away before this sort of thing could be used on humans. In the meantime, we're willing to do anything we can to lend him a hand."

Strong began inbreeding mice in a tarpaper shack in 1921. He was a young scientist then, working on his doctorate degree at Columbia University.

Strong believed then—as he does now—that cancer is influenced by genetics. He argued that while cancer itself may not be inherited, the susceptibility to cancer tends to be passed from one generation to the next.

With that hypothesis before him, Strong set out to breed strains of mice in which the susceptibility to cancer seemed more dominant. By restricting matings to brothers and sisters, he produced many strains, including the now-famous C3H strain, in which 90% of the females develop cancer.

Strong thus gave fellow researchers a priceless tool. The discovery insured a ready flow of subjects for laboratory evaluation. During a recent 17-month period, about 840 medical publications appeared using mice for research. Of those papers, 43% depended on the use of one or more strains first developed by Strong.

Prior to Strong's discovery, cancerous mice were extremely rare, and thus extremely costly, selling for around \$300 each. Now, the market value is 75 cents.

#### GENETIC LINK

Strong's discovery also provided the first sound evidence of a genetic link in the origin of a cancer.

During the succeeding years, Strong labored under the conviction that success in the fight against cancer rested in isolating the host's deficiency which permits a cancer to develop. He served in various teaching and researching positions, and in 1933 joined Yale University's cancer research program. He stayed at Yale for 20 years, finally taking charge of the program.

Strong left Yale in 1953 to become director of the biological station at Roswell Park Memorial Institute, Roswell, at Springville, N.Y., is the largest and oldest cancer research institute in the world, Strong said.

About 12 years ago, while directing Roswell's cancer research program, Strong embarked on a project which has become an obsession in the twilight years of his life. He began injecting liver extract into cancerous mice.

"I chose liver because it controls so many equilibrium processes," Strong said recently in his laboratory at 10457-I Roselle St., San Diego. He said cancer is partly the result of the loss of the body's equilibrium, i.e., the body's ability to resist the tumor.

#### "INHIBITOR" EFFECT

The injection—which he calls an "inhibitor" because it inhibits the growth of the tumor—resulted in regression of a tumor. Extending his line of thought, Strong initiated a series of experiments aimed at determining the effect of the injection on succeeding generations.

He found that in each generation the tumor was smaller, and began regressing earlier, even if no mouse beyond the first generation was injected. By the time he reached the ninth generation, he said, the tumor began regressing almost immediately after it appeared, leaving only a small scar.

His overall batting average is 83.6%, although in certain pilot experiments he has achieved 100% regression.

However, Strong concedes that an inhibitor that works for mice may not work for humans.

He was especially troubled by a serious shortcoming in his findings—he did not know why his inhibitor worked, or what in the liver extract enabled the mice to control the tumors.

To answer that, he needed time . . . but time was running out.

In 1964, Strong turned 70, the mandatory retirement age at Roswell Park. He had a number of offers to continue his work elsewhere. After examining them all, he decided to join Jonas E. Salk at the Salk Institute for Biological Studies in La Jolla. Salk agreed to back Strong for five years, the time the elder scientist believed he needed to finish his work.

Six years ago Strong moved to San Diego, carrying with him thousands of mice and scores of file cabinets filled with papers from a lifetime of research.

There were problems from the beginning—especially with the loss of some of Strong's valuable records during the move to San Diego—and in 1967 Salk informed Strong he would have to leave.

Strong felt that to move on at that point would have been disastrous to his experiments, so he decided to fight. He sued Salk in an effort to make him stick to his five-year agreement, and on Dec. 11, 1967, won a partial victory. The court ordered Salk to pay Strong his salary for the remaining two years of his contract, plus \$13,000 for the lost data.

It was a bitter six-month ordeal for Strong and his wife. She has never fully recovered her health, and Strong soon learned that the Salk incident would have more significant effects than he had first realized.

When Strong joined Salk, he gave up his priority on research grants, and as he applied for help he found all doors securely closed. The American Cancer Society, the federal government and various funding agencies have rejected his pleas for aid.

But using his life savings, and the salary he won through the trial, he struck out on his own. Friends formed the L. C. Strong Research Foundation, and a few contributions trickled in.

But the funds lagged far behind the expenses—it costs \$250 a month just for food for the 13,000 mice Strong is using—and it is not certain at this point whether he will be able to finish his work.

Strong estimates he needs about four more months to complete his experiments. That will cost about \$20,000.

He has helped meet some of his expenses by selling some of his mice.

For Strong, the financial predicament means he has come full circle.

#### PAID OWN WAY

When he first began his experiments nearly a half century ago, he paid his own way. Later, he used more than \$2 million in re-

search grants at Roswell Park. Now, he is on his own again.

He won a major victory recently when Roswell Park agreed to work on the analysis of the extract and to sum up the results of his experiment, when it is completed.

Strong believes if his experiment can be translated into human terms, a mass inoculation could lead eventually to victory over cancer.

That is scoffed at by many members of Strong's profession who believe cancer cannot be treated in this way.

But Strong argues that the problem in combating tumors of any kind is the same—the inability of the host to control the tumor. Strong believes that if his inhibitor corrects that situation in humans, then it could be used as a vaccine.

Today, he works toward that end, with a private goal in mind.

"I have seen so many mice with tumors," he said, "that I hope someday it will be possible to destroy what I created as a young man."

He keeps a graph tacked on the wall beside his desk. When it is completed, Strong hopes it will show what he set out to prove so long ago.

"When you see that published," the scientist said as he slumped behind his metal desk, "then you will know I have retired."

#### DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the outstanding work being done by the distributive education program at East Orange High School.

Under distributive education, high school students in their junior and senior years attend regular classes in the morning and spend their afternoons on the job in the fields of retailing, warehousing, and related service work. The entire program is under the supervision of the high school.

At East Orange High School, 25 students were enrolled in the distributive education program during the last academic year. In addition to the work study program, the students devote 1 day each week to planning and conducting community service projects. For example, just recently the East Orange Distributive Education group honored members of that city's police force for their work in protecting and serving the community.

At this point in the RECORD I insert three news articles which enlarge upon the latest community service project of the distributive education program:

[From the East Orange (N.J.) Record, Apr. 16, 1970]

DECA MEMBERS SPONSOR SALUTE TO MEN IN BLUE

The Distributive Education Program, a branch of the Business department of East Orange High School, will present a "Salute To Our Men In Blue" at the Hotel Suburban Crystal Ballroom on May 24 at 9 a.m.

The project, a breakfast honoring city po-

lice and firemen, was the idea of five DECA students, members of DECA, who wanted to recognize the esteem felt by themselves and many of their contemporaries for the men who protect the public safety.

According to the program's chairman, Patti Pleas, too many voting age citizens of East Orange take their protection agencies for granted.

"In a time when there is so much adverse publicity given out about crime and disorder in our cities, the DECA students decided that they, as junior citizens, wanted to bring to the attention of the community how they truly feel about their enforcement agencies."

"We always hear the bad," said Patti, "and we just want the critics to know that they aren't the only ones who can speak out."

At the breakfast, which will be attended by Mayor Hart and to which Governor Cahill has been invited, four awards will be presented to police and firemen whose service to the community has been outstanding.

Other members of the committee working on the project are John Battle, Phyllis Smith, Pam Taylor and Charles Neals. The youngsters are being assisted by members of the Community Relations Committee including Mrs. Lois Vreeland and Mrs. Terry DuPre.

One thousand tickets for the event are on sale at six dollars each. Proceeds will go into the DECA treasury.

The Distributive Education class at East Orange High School consists of 25 seniors who were selected from a group of 135 students. Each student is required to take four major subjects during school hours and is released at noon each day to gain experience in the business world. Students are employed in East Orange and surrounding communities. Every student presently employed through the Distributive Education Program is virtually assured a job after he or she completes high school.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News]

#### TEENS TO HONOR EAST ORANGE COPS

A breakfast honoring East Orange police and firemen has been scheduled for May 24 by the East Orange chapter, Classroom Distributive Education Clubs of America.

The 9 a.m. breakfast, titled "A Salute to Our Men in Blue," will be held in the Hotel Suburban, East Orange.

Patricia Pleas a senior at East Orange High School and student chairman of the group's liaison committee, said it was their feeling "it was about time we as teen-agers should recognize them for a job well done."

#### BEHIND POLICE

"The police have received a lot of bad publicity lately, and have been accused of harassing teen-agers and needlessly getting down on us. We feel honoring them could be the greatest tribute paid to municipal law enforcers," she said.

"We always hear the bad," Patricia pointed out, "and we just want to show that the police and firemen have our respect for all the good they do."

"This breakfast could bring more unity between future leaders and current leaders," Patricia said, "and let the police know we are behind them—not against them."

The other members of the committee are Charles Neals, John Battle, Phyllis Smith and Pamela Taylor, all seniors at East Orange High. Other members of the distributive education club will act as ushers and usherettes at the breakfast.

Patricia said the breakfast was the club's idea, and is designed to show police critics "we are bigger than they are and know the police have more good than bad points."

East Orange Mayor William S. Hart Sr. is to be the guest speaker.

[From the East Orange (N.J.) Record, May 28, 1970]

#### STUDENTS EFFORTS REWARDED IN "SALUTE TO MEN IN BLUE"

Over 300 persons attended the testimonial breakfast "A Salute to Our Men in Blue" held at the Hotel Suburban last Sunday. The breakfast was the idea and project of the East Orange High Distributive Education Clubs of America. These young students decided to show their law enforcement officers that their efforts at citizen protection were appreciated by the young as well as the old.

The guests were greeted by Patricia Pleas, who chaired the DECA committee handling the affair. The invocation and blessing were given by Rev. N. Spencer Glover Sr. and Rev. Addison Groff, respectively.

Miss Pleas then introduced the speakers who included Mayor William S. Hart who spoke on the theme of the breakfast and Harry F. Veal Jr., principal of East Orange High School who spoke on the Distributive Education Program. Captain G. R. Quinn of the New Jersey State Police also spoke on the Community Relations Bureau and the appropriateness of the testimonial breakfast.

Awards were presented to police and firemen who had distinguished themselves in the line of duty. The awards were presented by DECA students. Policemen Stephen Paskell and Charles Grimes were honored with awards presented by Colleen Corum. A special award was presented to Auxiliary Policeman William Stoss by John Battle.

Fire department awards went to James D. McBride and Raymond G. Meyers for outstanding rescues. These awards were presented by Phyllis Smith. A Special Posthumous Award was presented to Capt. Carmine Evangelista, who lost his life on November 30, 1969 in the line of duty. Mrs. Evangelista accepted the award, presented by all the members of the DECA planning committee.

Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Russell Jackson made the closing remarks.

The entire event was planned and executed by members of East Orange's DECA chapter, under the direction of teacher-co-ordinator Luther Bowen and Jerome Gordon.

#### NATIONAL CHAIRMAN O'BRIEN SETS THE RECORD STRAIGHT

#### HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, last night the American public heard National Democratic Chairman Lawrence F. O'Brien set the record straight on a number of major issues.

In a 25-minute presentation over facilities of the Columbia Broadcasting System, the Democratic chairman made effective use of a series of film clips featuring the remarks and pledges of President Nixon during the past 3 years.

The Nixon pledges on economic policy, crime, pollution control, full employment, and other questions are best understood in the exact words used by the President in commenting directly on these questions. These are the words used by Chairman O'Brien in his presentation last night.

The public can judge for itself, on the record, as to the level of performance by

the Republican administration on these pledges.

The complete transcript of last night's telecast follows:

#### THE DEMOCRATS RESPOND: PART ONE

WASHINGTON, D.C., July 7.—Following is the transcript of "The Democrats Respond: Part One," a 25-minute broadcast-telecast presented by the Democratic National Committee over the Columbia Broadcasting System, which granted the time free to the Democratic Party:

President Nixon: "In these difficult years, America has suffered from a fever of words; from inflated rhetoric that promises more than it can deliver; from angry rhetoric that fans discontents into hatreds; from bombastic rhetoric that postures instead of persuading.

"We cannot learn from one another until we stop shouting at one another—until we speak quietly enough so that our words can be heard as well as our voices." (Inaugural Address, Jan. 20, 1969)

Democratic National Chairman LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN: Like most of you, I applauded the appeal for lowered voices and national unity when Richard Nixon assumed the Presidency 18 months ago.

Good evening, I'm Larry O'Brien, national Chairman of the Democratic Party. I managed the Democratic campaign for President in 1968. And I recognized after the election that we all had to turn away from the narrow confines of partisanship and work in the active pursuits of national reconciliation.

But today the divisions within our society are far greater than they were 18 months ago.

I don't have any easy answers. But the American people are not afraid to face problems squarely, and I know you want facts.

In this spirit, then, the loyal opposition has the responsibility to ask: How, in fact, are we being governed? What progress are we making as a nation? How can we do better? How can the nation and our two-party system meet the challenge of the '70s? How can we achieve the goals the new President set forth in his Inaugural Address 18 months ago?

NIXON: In pursuing our goals of full employment, better housing, excellence in education; in rebuilding our cities and improving our rural areas; in protecting our environment and enhancing the quality of life—in all these and more, we will and must press urgently forward. (Inaugural Address, Jan. 20, 1969)

O'BRIEN: Those were the promises, no less urgent today than when the President spoke them on the Capitol steps 18 months ago. In a few areas—such as reform of the outdated welfare system and the antiquated postal system—the Nixon Administration has come forward with proposals that could make a lasting contribution to the fabric of American life.

But unfortunately, in most areas we see little or no progress; we share the concern of all Americans with the decline in our economy. Every housewife, every wage earner, every stock holder, every farmer, every small businessman—yes and many big businessmen know that our economy is lagging far behind its potential.

A reporter asked the President about this at a news conference earlier this year, one year after Mr. Nixon's Inaugural Address.

REPORTER: The question is, how, sir, do you assess the possibility that we may be in for perhaps the worst possible sort of economic conditions—inflation and recession?

NIXON: Well, Mr. Cornell, the major purpose of our economic policy since we came into office a year ago has been to stop the

inflation which had been going on for 5 years without doing it so quickly that it brought on a recession.

Now, as a result, we are now in a position, the critical position, in which the decisions made in the next month or two will determine whether we win this battle.

I would simply say that I do not expect a recession to occur." (News Conference, Jan. 30, 1970)

O'BRIEN: Regrettably, the President's expectations have not materialized, and, as so many of you are painfully aware, we have inflation and recession at the same time.

We call it Nixonomics: everything that is supposed to go up—your income, productivity, housing construction, profits, the stock market—is going down. Everything that is supposed to go down—unemployment, interest rates, the cost of living—is rising.

Every housewife is alarmed over the constant rises in food prices—hot dogs up 14 cents a pound, hamburger up 12 cents a pound, potatoes up a third—you know your grocery bill and how much it has gone up in the last year.

Do you know of a family earning less than \$13,000 annually that has been able to buy a home this past year? And even those able to borrow money for a new home know that a \$20,000 house costs an additional \$35,000 for interest charges alone—the highest interest rates in 100 years.

In recent weeks Democrats and Republicans alike have been pleading with President Nixon to use the great powers of his office to stop this recession and inflation now, before more damage is done.

The President must use his great personal influence to roll back inflationary wage and price decisions, just as President Kennedy and President Johnson did on many occasions.

Right now—tonight—Mr. Nixon could direct the lowering of interest rates on home mortgages, car loans, and the clothes you buy on credit from a department store.

A Democratic Congress gave him this power last year, but unfortunately, he has refused to use it.

I urge the President to act immediately. Please don't wait any longer for our economy to decline even further.

There is probably nothing of greater worry to the American family than the threat of unemployment. At a news conference two months ago a reporter asked the President about this problem.

REPORTER: "On a domestic subject, the economy, sir. Unemployment is up, the stock market is down, things look generally discouraging. Do you have any views on that, and do you have any plans?"

NIXON: "Yes. Unemployment reached the point of 4.8, I noticed, this last month. In order to keep it in perspective, it should be noted that in 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, and 1965 the average unemployment was 5.7. 5.7 is too high. 4.8, I think, is also too high. But the unemployment we presently have is the result of the cooling of the economy and our fight against inflation." (News Conference, May 8, 1970)

O'BRIEN: As the President said, it is partly a matter of perspective that 5.7 percent unemployment rate mentioned in the early 1960s reflected a steadily declining rate of unemployment, a decline from the high of 7 percent which President Kennedy inherited from the Eisenhower-Nixon Administration of the 1950s.

The fact is that unemployment fell during the 1960s and it was down to 3.3 percent in December, 1968. It has climbed steadily since President Nixon took office. Since last December, we have experienced in the fastest five-month rise in unemployment since the recession in the late 1950s. But beyond this, instead of talking statistics and

percentages, let's remember that more than four million seven hundred thousand Americans are out of work tonight.

Let's look at another major concern and see what candidate Nixon promised—and what has happened since he took office.

NIXON: "And if we are to restore order and respect for law in this country, there's one place we're going to begin. We're going to have a new Attorney General of the United States of America . . .

"The wave of crime is not going to be the wave of the future in the United States of America." (Nomination Acceptance Speech, August 8, 1968)

O'BRIEN: Of course every new President has the power to appoint his own Attorney General, but what has been the record of the Attorney General President Nixon appointed?

Eighteen months have passed. The crime rate in this country has not gone down. In the first three months of this year it rose 15 percent over the same period last year. And it is especially alarming that the fastest rates of increase are now in the suburbs and in rural areas of our country.

The way to stop rising crime is not to blame others, such as Congress. The way to stop the rising crime rate is to help local and state law enforcement agencies who carry the major burden.

NIXON: "While it is true that State and local law enforcement agencies are the cutting edge in the effort to eliminate street crime, burglaries, murder, my proposals to you have embodied my belief that the Federal Government should play a greater role in working in partnership with these agencies.

"That is why 1971 Federal spending for local law enforcement will double that budgeted for 1971." (State of the Union Message, Jan. 23, 1970)

O'BRIEN: That's how the President addressed the crime problem in his State of the Union Message last January. What action has followed those farsighted words?

The facts are that the Nixon Administration budget requires one thousand dollars from every one of you—every American—to run the government. Of that one thousand dollars, the Administration has earmarked only \$2.40 to assist state and local governments in the fight against crime—cutting the Democratic program in half.

And, while I am sure the President and the Attorney General want to reduce crime, I cannot understand why they have refused to support further improvements in the Safe Streets Act advocated by a Democratic President and enacted by a Democratic Congress in 1968—our major federal anticrime program. They are improvements that would give cities with the greatest crime problems the most help.

I regret that so many of the top law enforcement experts brought to Washington by the Nixon Administration last year have now resigned, because, as they said, Attorney General Mitchell has refused to do what must be done to control the growing crime rate in America.

President Nixon's own anti-crime proposals have not been primarily directed at the national crime problem, but rather at Washington, D.C., and many people believe that some of these proposals are unconstitutional.

For the past generation both major political parties have stood together in the struggle for equal rights and opportunities for all of our citizens. In his acceptance speech, Mr. Nixon seemed to recognize the human stakes involved in the next urgent steps that must be taken in this continuing struggle.

NIXON: "They want the pride and the self-respect and the dignity that can only come if they have an equal chance to own their own homes, to own their own busi-

nesses, to be managers and executives as well as workers, to have a piece of the action in the exciting ventures of private enterprise.

"I pledge to you tonight that we shall have new programs which will provide the equal chance. . ." (Nomination Acceptance Speech, August 8, 1968)

"Now I know all the words. I know all the gimmicks and the phrases that would win the applause of black audiences and professional civil rights leaders. I am not going to use them. I am interested in deeds. I am interested in closing the performance gap." (News Conference, Jan. 30, 1970)

O'BRIEN: One of the biggest disappointments of the first 18 months of the Nixon Administration has been precisely this failure to match its words with deeds—to provide new opportunities for minority citizens, opportunities that must ultimately benefit all Americans.

Again, a number of experts brought to Washington by the Nixon Administration have resigned. They recognized this performance gap.

The failure to define clearly the policy for school desegregation has led to confusion in local school systems, and growing resentment and discouragement by families seeking equal educational opportunities for their children.

Above all, in the past 18 months we have been denied the strong moral leadership on this issue which only the White House can provide—that is *must* provide. We have lacked a President speaking forthrightly about the moral rightness of making the guarantees of the Constitution a reality for every American.

Again, Congress has had to take the lead—in overcoming the Administration's obstacles to renewing the Voting Rights Act, a law that provides all Americans with the most basic of democratic rights as well as extending the right to vote to 18-year-olds.

The times call for a new vision of our priorities. The President seemed to understand this when he addressed the nation last month.

NIXON: For the first time in 20 years, the Federal Government is spending more on human resource program than on national defense.

"This year we are spending \$1.7 billion less on defense than we were a year ago; in the next year, we plan to spend \$5.2 billion less. This is more than a redirection of resources. This is an historic reordering of our national priorities." (Address to the Nation, June 17, 1970)

O'BRIEN: The President says he favors this change in our priorities. But it was Congress, not the President, that cut five-and-a-half billion dollars from the Pentagon budget. And when Congress tried to channel less than a quarter of that money into educational and health programs—libraries, books, student loans—the President responded with a nationally televised veto message.

NIXON: "Now, if I approved the increased spending contained in this bill, I would win the approval of many fine people who are demanding more spending by the Federal Government for education and health. But I would be surrendering in the battle to stop the rise in the cost of living, a battle we must fight and win for the benefit of every family in this Nation." (HEW Veto Message, Jan. 26, 1970)

O'BRIEN: In that same week when Mr. Nixon vetoed the education and health bill as inflationary, he announced a new multi-billion dollar spiral in the nuclear arms race. Why wasn't this just as inflationary, if not more so?

Only a few days ago Congress overrode another Nixon veto and so restored funds to

build desperately needed hospitals and mental health facilities for the nation's sick people. The President turned down this bill because he said it was inflationary. But more than two-thirds of Congress—including a majority of the members of the Republican Party—voted to allocate for hospitals some of the money cut from the budget.

National priorities? Let's consider again each American's thousand dollar share of the nation's budget: \$4.50 for air and water pollution; \$5.00 for urban renewal for our cities; \$7.50 for elementary and secondary education; 50 cents for training the handicapped—and \$375.00 for the military.

Once again, we must look to Congress for leadership.

It was Congress that more than doubled President Nixon's initial request for an increase in social security providing a badly needed 15 percent increase. And just this week, your paychecks will be larger because a Democratic Congress voted to increase personal tax exemptions and eliminated the 5 percent surtax.

So I ask you tonight: Who is really engaged in a "historic reordering of our national priorities"—the Congress or the President?

One of our most urgent priorities for this decade is cleaning up our environment. Most of you heard the President speaking to this problem in his State of the Union Message this past January.

NIXON. "The program I shall propose to Congress will be the most comprehensive and costly program in this field in America's history.

"It is not a program for just one year. A year's plan in this field is no plan at all. This is a time to look ahead not a year, but 5 years or 10 years—whatever time is required to do the job.

"I shall propose to this Congress a \$10 billion nationwide clean waters program to put modern municipal waste treatment plants in every place in America where they are needed to make our waters clean again, and do it now." (State of the Union Message, Jan. 22, 1970)

O'BRIEN. That is what President Nixon said he would propose, and to many it seemed an impressive call for action. But the fact is that the 10 billion dollar program he promised calls for federal spending of only four billion dollars. The amount Mr. Nixon proposed for the first year of his new program to fight water pollution turned out to be less than Congress had already authorized.

And so, 18 months later, the pattern of the Nixon Administration's domestic program is abundantly clear—ringing calls for action, but few results, except when Congress takes the initiative and calls the shots.

But our attention to our critical domestic priorities continues to be diverted by the seemingly endless struggle in Indochina, about which the President addressed the nation on April 30.

NIXON. "Tonight, American and South Vietnamese units will attack the headquarters for the entire Communist military operation in South Vietnam. This key control center has been occupied by the North Vietnamese and Vietcong for 5 years in blatant violation of Cambodia's neutrality." (Address to Nation, April 30, 1970)

O'BRIEN. I have no intention of "taking on" the President in difficult decisions about military strategy, but I do want the President to level with all of us.

I share the relief of all Americans that our troops have crossed back into South Vietnam, but I also share the confusion of most Americans who wonder what Cambodia is really all about.

The President never consulted with his

Cabinet or with Congress before he expanded the Indochina war. He has never told the American people that the Communist headquarters he said would be attacked was never attacked and apparently never even located.

Instead Mr. Nixon now has given other reasons to justify his surprise move of American troops into a neutral country, among them the preservation of a new Cambodian government.

And now we have become involved, whether or not we like it, in that new government. Now—although our ground troops are out—our bombers and our artillery continue to bomb the Cambodian nation. Now the South Vietnamese army continues to sustain a full scale military operation in Cambodia.

Before our military incursion, as this map shows, Communist activity in Cambodia was primarily limited to border sanctuaries.

But now, just two months later, Communist control has expanded to half the land area of Cambodia and Communists have infiltrated over a large part of the rest of that beleaguered country.

The question must be asked: Has our action actually saved Cambodia, or put its survival in greater jeopardy?

To be patriotic American is to question and probe the activities of those who govern us. That is our duty and our right.

The newly elected President promised to "bring us together again." But the opposite of that is occurring, polarization, unfortunately encouraged by Vice President Agnew in speech after speech across the country.

AGNEW. "You can't bring 200 million people together. Let's stop talking in technicalities and look at the President's figure of speech—was a plea for national unity to bring the responsible elements of our society together. But let's never overlook the fact that there are also irresponsible elements of our society and instead of attempting to dignify and condone what they're doing, let's polarize—let's get rid of these undesirable people by recognizing that they cannot participate in our legitimate processes of government unless they play the rules." (Washington Window, UPI Interview, November, 16, 1969)

O'BRIEN: The words and thoughts of Vice President Agnew leave me saddened and disheartened. While I realize there are many who support Mr. Agnew, I deeply believe his road can only lead to further division and mistrust among our people.

In attacking the loyalty of millions who sincerely question the course of the present Administration, the Vice President is himself questioning and jeopardizing the very democratic tradition that has made us strong.

Is *this* the way we are to be brought together again? Is *this* the lowered voice President Nixon urged upon all of us eighteen months ago?

This is a time for healing, not for wounding, for trust and understanding, not for hatred and suspicion.

For 14 years, I was a friend and close associate of a man who could express these feelings far better than I. One bright, wintry day the world seemed full of promise as he reached out to us and summoned forth the best we Americans had to offer.

KENNEDY: "All of this will not be finished in the first one hundred days. Nor will it be finished in the first one thousand days, nor in the life of this Administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin. . ." (Kennedy Inaugural Address, Jan. 20, 1961)

O'BRIEN: The Democratic Party, and the Democrats in Congress accepted that challenge a decade ago—and we rededicate ourselves today.

MINSHALL OPINION POLL RESULTS

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD my latest Washington Report which contains the results of my opinion poll:

MINSHALL OPINION POLL RESULTS

More than 35,000 completed questionnaires have been received in an avalanche response unprecedented in all my years in Congress, an indication that there is a genuine and intense concern about the critical issues facing our nation. All returns have been carefully tabulated and I personally have noted the many thoughtful and helpful comments accompanying them. Thank you for your enthusiastic participation. Results follow:

[Answer in percent]

1. Do you approve of President Nixon sending U.S. troops in Cambodia?
  - Yes ----- 60.3
  - No ----- 35.5
  - No opinion ----- 4.2
2. Should the United States
  - (a) Continue Vietnamizing the war while gradually withdrawing our troops?
    - Yes ----- 60.0
  - (b) Step up efforts for an all-out military victory?
    - Yes ----- 16.0
  - (c) Pull out all U.S. military forces at once?
    - Yes ----- 15.3
  - (d) Other suggestions:
    - Yes ----- 5.5
  - (e) No opinion:
    - No opinion ----- 3.2
3. Should the U.S. increase arms aid to Israel?
  - Yes ----- 33.5
  - No ----- 58.7
  - No opinion ----- 7.8
4. Do you support the Safeguard Anti-Ballistic Missile program?
  - Yes ----- 57.7
  - No ----- 34.0
  - No opinion ----- 8.3
5. Are you in favor of an all-volunteer Army?
  - Yes ----- 55.0
  - No ----- 39.0
  - No opinion ----- 6.0
6. Should college draft deferments be phased out so that all men of eligible age are selected by lottery?
  - Yes ----- 69.5
  - No ----- 22.8
  - No opinion ----- 7.7
7. Do you think 18-year-olds should have the right to vote?
  - Yes ----- 31.0
  - No ----- 59.8
  - No opinion ----- 9.2
8. Should the House of Representatives bring impeachment proceedings against Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas?
  - Yes ----- 41.4
  - No ----- 39.8
  - No opinion ----- 18.8
9. To control inflation, do you favor:
  - (a) Wage and price controls?

Yes .....	60.5
No .....	18.0
No opinion.....	21.5

## (b) Credit controls?

Yes .....	49.4
No .....	15.2
No opinion.....	35.4

## (c) Reduced government spending?

Yes .....	72.8
No .....	9.9
No opinion.....	17.3

10. In the fight against environmental pollution would you support:

## (a) Higher taxes at all governmental levels for an all-out crash program?

Yes .....	24.7
No .....	41.0
No opinion.....	34.3

## (b) The President's Great Lakes Clean-Up proposals?

Yes .....	60.8
No .....	5.8
No opinion.....	33.4

(c) Strong local enforcement of more strict regulations governing municipal and industrial pollution?

Yes .....	93.1
No .....	1.1
No opinion.....	5.8

(d) Strong enforcement of more strict regulations governing motor vehicle and airplane pollution?

Yes .....	78.1
No .....	5.8
No opinion.....	16.1

11. Should the U.S. proceed with more exploration of the moon and deeper probes of outer space?

Yes .....	42.8
No .....	51.2
No opinion.....	6.0

12 To halt student violence, what policies should be adopted in riot situations on campus?

(a) Expell students who are disorderly or refuse to obey regulations.....	39.8
(b) Strict law enforcement, but no use of deadly force.....	14.5
(c) Strict law enforcement, use deadly force if absolutely necessary.....	13.1
(d) Firmer control by college administrators.....	8.4
(e) Keep outside agitators off campuses.....	5.0
(f) Miscellaneous suggestions.....	13.7
(g) No opinion.....	5.5

The July Washington Report will bring you up to date on the status of major legislation, as well as my activities representing you in Congress.

## MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

### HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 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?

## TECHNOLOGY, DEVELOPMENT, AND POPULATION GROWTH

### HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, this March I had the privilege to chair part of an important series of hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development of the Science and Astronautics Committee dealing with the overall topic of "Technology Assessment and the Environment."

Of the two sessions I chaired in San Francisco, one afternoon was devoted to analyzing both the severe problems caused by increasing population growth rates and possible remedies to offset these ever-growing resource demands.

Today, I would like to insert in the RECORD, the statement made at that hearing by Dr. Eugene V. Coan, the director of Political Activity for Zero Population Growth.

Dr. Coan stresses the need for broadening this country's foreign aid program to emphasize population control and family planning projects, a position I strongly agree with.

His statement follows:

#### TESTIMONY OF EUGENE V. COAN

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: I am Eugene Coan, Director of Political Activity for Zero Population Growth, a nationwide educational and political action organization concerned with the rapid growth of population, both in the United States and in the world.

We appreciate this opportunity to appear before you to discuss the relationship of our capacity for properly assessing the impact of new technology to our policies with respect to population growth.

In the first place, we applaud the concept of "Technology Assessment." After reviewing the articles on this topic which were suggested to us, Mr. Chairman, we conclude that "Technology Assessment" is a technologist's word for ecology, and we certainly need more ecological concern. Ecology is a field that has to do with the relationships, with the multiplicity of interactions within and involving the living world. This may sound all-encompassing, and, indeed, it is, but it is not that aspect of ecology which makes it new and especially significant for us. There is a qualitative feature of ecology that is of far greater importance. An ecological point of view is a new way of looking at the world. It is in the broadest possible perception and in the recognition of the many consequences of what we do and what is happening to us that we have a completely fresh approach to our problems. This approach is difficult for us, because throughout most of western civilization it has been man against nature, rather than part of it.

There is no better demonstration of the application of ecological principles and the complexity of relationships than with regard to population growth. Every social and environmental problem in our society is adversely influenced by population growth. Air and water pollution worsen. The land becomes covered with refuse. Crowding aggravates life in our cities. Resources and open space decrease. Facilities and services are taxed to capacity, as are citizens. The subtle qualities of life have all but vanished—space for hiking and thinking, quiet, wilderness, and individuality.

Each population-related problem can be solved—by itself. An expert on air pollu-

tion is full of ideas about how to decrease the amount of smog. An expert on education has many ideas on how to improve our school system to meet increased demands. Sociologists have theories on how to lower the amount of crime and violence in our cities. Housing experts list programs to meet our housing shortage. Politicians, especially this season, have notions about decreasing taxes.

But there is a catch. We are losing on all fronts at once. Why? If you look into these plans presented by each of these experts, you will find that they have two things in common. First, every one of them costs a great deal of money. We could only afford to provide adequate solutions for one or two problems, but there is not enough money and resources to solve all of them by a piecemeal approach. At a time when man's survival is threatened from several directions, solving only one or two problems will not be sufficient.

Secondly, it is entirely inappropriate to attack each problem as an individual entity because everything is interrelated. Crime is related to poverty and poverty to employment. Employment is related to transportation and transportation to pollution. Pollution is related to the amount of medical care we need and this care is related to professional training. We now have to force ourselves to look at the whole picture at once.

Our analysis of this picture indicates that we are in trouble and will have to move quickly. In the United States, population threatens the quality of our lives, but the greatest danger we face as a result of the enormous and rapidly increasing numbers of individuals is the political consequences of overpopulation in the so-called "under developed" nations. None of us can predict what will happen. Population-created conflicts may cause rapid break-downs in the governability of large areas, rendering relief or long-range solutions difficult or impossible. The underlying imbalances among population, resources, and disease have already become apparent in some areas of the world, such as in Nigeria, India, and El Salvador. As examples of what we may face in the future, the populations of both Nigeria and India will double in 28 years, that of El Salvador in 21 years.

The concept of overpopulation is a relative one. For instance, America is not only one of the most overpopulated countries on the planet by virtue of her high per capita use of energy and raw materials, but she is also one of the greatest consumers of the resources belonging to other areas and peoples of the world. Such artificial affluence cannot last.

The second greatest danger we face is the result of the global nature of pollution. Already, we have begun to tip balances we have discovered only after we upset them. Birds become extinct because farmers thousands of miles away spray their crops with chlorinated hydrocarbons. Trees become sick in Arizona because people drive to work in Los Angeles. Changes in the weather occur because we are using too much fossil fuel. This is probably only the beginning of the things that will happen to the oceans and the atmosphere of our planet as the world's population doubles. Some biologists believe we will soon be faced by a series of global ecological catastrophes for which we need a whole new kind of national preparedness.

What we require for this preparedness are institutions which enable us to see the full page of factors which may be involved in our planning, whether the pending decisions are technological or not. Our greatest needs at the present time are for biological and sociological considerations to enter into major technological decisions. However, the mere presence of new boards, committees, councils, and agencies is not enough. They must, in addition, have the necessary breadth and

quality of membership and staff to carry out the task, and, more importantly, they must be given the political power both to halt bad technology and to suggest better approaches to problems.

With regard to specific measures, Zero Population Growth has already announced its support for Representative Foley's bill, House Joint Resolution 1071 (co-authored by the chairman of this subcommittee, among others), to establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Environmental Quality and Population Policy. To consider population in terms of absolute numbers of individuals has little meaning. To make statements about environmental quality without considering population growth is equally useless.

We supported the recently passed, administration-sponsored legislation to create a "Commission on Population Growth and the American Future," only after its duties had been amended to include study of ways to achieve population stability. We initiated and are backing legislation to establish an even more comprehensive Commission on Population and Environment in California (State Senate Bill 186, introduced by Senator John Nejedly).

In the fields of population and environment, there are several immediate needs at the Federal level. Let us consider ways for Congress to examine broader-than-traditional relationships.

First, we need to obtain and widely publicize information on what technology can really promise in the way of solutions to the population problem. In the opinion of ecologists and demographers with whom I am acquainted, there are no real technological solutions to overpopulation. Nevertheless, the belief that there are such solutions continues to be widespread among the general public. A set of Congressional hearings, perhaps by the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, would be a good idea.

Secondly, there is little in the way of common knowledge about the relationship of population growth to urbanization and to the social ills of cities. While people are rapidly becoming aware that population growth adversely affects environmental quality, the relationship of that growth to the lives of most Americans has not been made clear. As a beginning, a set of hearings on this subject would prove useful.

As a first step toward what is required for man's survival in the whole world, we must take measures to stabilize the population of the United States as soon as possible. We must do this in order to set a credible example for countries which can still save themselves by stopping their population growth. Stability will enable us to realistically face the political situations that will arise in other areas as a result of overpopulation. We must also achieve this stability, or preferably a reduction of our population, in order to conserve our own diminishing resources and to have time to solve our own population related problems.

This brings us, then, to the topic of governmental re-organization to achieve more encompassing and balanced policies. This area must be approached with caution, for governmental re-organization is no panacea. We must weigh carefully the political balances which would be achieved by proposed changes.

Zero Population Growth supports the legislation by Senator Joseph Tydings, Senate Bill 2108, which would, among other things, give the population programs of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare a better balance and position within the department.

We would support a measure to bring the relevance of population into the Department of the Interior, either by the establishment of a Bureau of Population or by moving the Bureau of the Census to Interior. More

sweeping changes in this Department will require careful consideration.

Finally, and I believe most importantly, we need some major changes in our State Department. We need an entirely new, ecologically-oriented foreign policy which places its greatest emphasis on areas of rapid population growth and environmental danger rather than on ideological relationships between nations. Differing ideologies now threaten man less than bad ecology. For instance, we need a new way of providing foreign aid by bilateral and multilateral means. Aid agencies should be made up of teams from the countries involved and should have a degree of autonomy from their respective countries. Our contribution should be ecologists and sociologists, rather than politicians and paramilitary personnel. Funds would be raised on matching formula basis. The aid provided would be a complete package that made long-term ecological sense for the particular area, not just short-term political sense.

We might also consider the establishment of a new, massive educational program by our country for foreign students. This could be in the form of crash courses in the needs of their areas of the world and potential solutions to their problems. These should be given in the students' native languages and should be designed so as not to contribute to the "brain drain" from other countries to ours.

I would like to conclude on an encouraging note. In just a few months of activity, Zero Population Growth has gained substantially in membership and in number of chapters. Many of the chapters are on college campuses. I believe that what is necessary, and what has already begun, is a major movement, especially among young people in organizations such as ours. We hope that this will carry over to other countries. The time is past when concerned citizens can feel they are doing enough by protesting the ineffectiveness and wrongness of our government's policies. What we need now are bold new approaches to meet man's needs, approaches which continually assess the impact of technology on the entire biosphere, of which man is only a part.

#### INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I emphasize to the Members the tremendous resurgence of spirits which I witnessed on Independence Day in visits to numerous communities throughout the Fourth Illinois District.

A positive contribution to this spirit was an editorial in the Chicago Heights Star, Saturday, July 4, which reemphasized the historic message of the Declaration of Independence.

The editorial follows:

AS WE SEE IT: INDEPENDENCE DAY

Today is Independence day, the red, white and blue-letter day on the American calendar. It marks the 194th anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, one of the world's great testaments to the rights of man.

When delegates to the Second Continental Congress adopted the Declaration in 1776, they were agreed on the reasons for the revolutionary proclamation and on the ideas expressed in it. But times change, of course, and over the years other interpretations of this historic manifesto have been offered.

What, in fact, is the "message" of the Declaration of Independence?

Perhaps the best expression of the political philosophy that inspired it is set forth in the "American's Creed," which resulted from a nation-wide contest conducted in 1917.

The winner, William Tyler Page, said the Creed was "a summary of the fundamental principles of American political faith as set forth in its great documents, its worthiest traditions, and by its great leaders."

The text of the Creed is as follows:

"I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people, whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic, a sovereign nation of many sovereign states; a perfect union, one and inseparable, established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and their fortunes.

"I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag and to defend it against all enemies."

Stirring words on a timeless subject, as meaningful today as when they were written.

#### U.S. LAND LAW REVIEW: VITAL TO UTAH

### HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the long-awaited report of the Public Land Law Review Commission, on which I was privileged to serve, was submitted to the President and to the Congress on June 23, 1970. It represented 5 years of intensive study and contained several hundred specific recommendations for updating the laws that govern our public lands. The Ogden, Utah, Standard-Examiner carried a lead editorial on the report the date of its issuance, and I believe these comments might be of interest to some of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

U.S. LAND LAW REVIEW: VITAL TO UTAH

The 289-page report issued today by the Public Land Law Review Commission after five years of careful study contains 387 specific recommendations, most of them vital to the future of Utah and neighboring western states.

Uncle Sam is our state's largest land owner. Of the 52.7 million acres in Utah, more than 35 million—or 66.5 per cent—are owned by the federal government, including 34.5 million acres still listed as public domain.

This makes Utah the third state, behind Alaska 95.3 per cent and Nevada's 86.4 per cent, in federal land ownership. Idaho is fourth at 63.9 per cent, Oregon fifth at 52.2 per cent and Wyoming sixth at 48.2 per cent.

Those figures show why the Public Land Law Review Commission's study is so important to the future of our area—particularly as Congress, in months and years to come takes up the recommendations and decides if they should be made into law.

On a national basis, the most sweeping change would be affected if the present Department of the Interior was changed to the Department of Natural Resources and the Forest Service, so much a part of the West, changed to the new department from its present berth in the Department of Agriculture.

The Standard-Examiner has long felt that such a change would be helpful in eliminating overlaps in agency jurisdiction, especially if the commission's further recommendation is followed to concentrate all congressional activity into single committees in the House and Senate.

Utah had two members on the commission—Rep. Laurence J. Burton and Salt Lake City attorney Byron Mock, former Bureau of Land Management director for our state. Like the five other "public" members named by President Johnson, Mr. Mock is a Democrat—but President Nixon was wise enough not to change the membership in the middle of the study to preserve continuity.

We agree with Rep. Burton that the most important single recommendation, so far as Utah is concerned, calls for the federal government to make payments to states "in lieu of taxes" for the land it owns, subject to a "public benefits discount of at least 10 per cent but not more than 40 per cent."

This carries out the practical concept that residents of other states, who enjoy the use of public lands in the West, should help pay for the maintenance of services so necessary to their maintenance.

Federal "in lieu" payments on public lands would be a major step in correcting the current financial problems of Utah and its sister states.

Also important is the commission recommendation that grazing fees on public lands be determined by the quality of the land involved. As Rep. Burton pointed out, it is unfair to ask the same fees for land "so poorly vegetated that grasshoppers have to pack their lunch to cross it" as is charged for other land "where the cows are belly-high in grass."

Over the long haul, the suggestions that the leasing of oil shale lands be rearranged to expedite the unlocking of the trillions of barrels of oil that they contain could mean more to our state than any federal legislation since passage of the Colorado River Storage Project.

Rep. Burton, Mr. Mock, Chairman Wayne Aspinall and their colleagues and staff can be proud of the task they have performed for the nation on the Public Land Law Review Commission. Now, if Congress will act, instead of placing the report in a pigeon hole, these long-overdue changes can become an actuality instead of a dream.

**BARBARA M. WATSON, ADMINISTRATOR, BUREAU OF SECURITY AND CONSULAR AFFAIRS**

### HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to acquaint my colleagues in the House with some of the good deeds of the Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the Department of State, the Honorable Barbara M. Watson. Miss Watson has served the Department with distinction since 1966 when she was appointed special assistant to the Deputy Under Secretary for Administration. She was successively appointed Deputy Administrator, Acting Administrator, and finally Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, the first woman with the rank of Assistant Secretary of State. Her excellent record was to be predicted.

She is the daughter of the late Judge James S. Watson and Mrs. Violet L. Watson and was born and reared in New York City. Her father was a man of eminence, the first Negro to be elected to a Judgeship in the State of New York, who served faithfully in that capacity for 20 years.

She is a graduate of Barnard College of Columbia University and of New York University Law School where she received a prize as the "most outstanding law student in the city of New York," based on the selection of a committee of eminent jurists.

From 1962 to July 1966 Miss Watson served as attorney on the New York City Board of Statutory Consolidation, as assistant attorney in the law department of New York City and as executive director of the New York City Commission to the United Nations, which commission is the official liaison between the New York City government and United Nations personnel.

Of continuing interest to the Congress and to the Judiciary Committee, is the excellent leadership she displays as Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs. Her ability to work harmoniously with others and to coordinate and make available the facilities of the Bureau to the Congress, to the committee, and to private organizations and individuals is a tribute in itself. The smooth changeover in the implementation of the 1965 amendments to the immigration law was a direct result of Miss Watson's superior ability. She personally conducted a successful series of consular conferences abroad to insure a uniform interpretation and understanding of the features of the new law and regulations. Personnel resources were effectively redirected under her leadership and, in the first year of operation under the new law, 99.97 percent of all available visa numbers were used, a record that speaks for itself.

It is gratifying that Miss Watson has infused the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs with new life and has exerted firm direction to, and renewed the concept of, the consular career idea necessary to the high caliber of consular activities.

Her untiring efforts have been evident from the beginning. She has been available at all times to Members of Congress, to specialized agencies of the United Nations, to voluntary agencies and to individuals. During the aftermath of the Mideast war, Miss Watson, her staff, and foreign service posts literally worked around the clock to insure the safety of some 20,000 Americans stranded in that area. She has been similarly involved in the safe repatriation of Americans from Cuba, a continuing project.

The excellence of her contribution to America has been recognized by the Department of State in retaining her as Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, and by numerous non-governmental organizations who have singularly honored her for her service. The Hadassah has bestowed the Myrth Wreath Achievement Award, "in recognition of her outstanding work in behalf of social welfare and in appreciation for her

enhancement of the image of women in Government"; the American Caribbean Scholarship Fund, Inc. Special Award of Merit "in recognition of the extraordinary and remarkable intellectual and academic qualifications reflected in her devotion to duty in the field of human relations and the affairs of state;" the United Seamen's Service Humanity Award for her "humanity and sympathy, vision, and understanding of the isolation and dangers that confront our ships and seamen of the great waters of the world."

Little more need be said in her behalf other than a statement that the Government is that much richer for the able and unselfish leadership of the Honorable Barbara M. Watson, Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs.

THE SENECA NATION OF INDIANS  
IROQUOIA PROJECT

### HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am most proud to have as constituents of my district the Seneca Nation of Indians. Their contributions to my area, New York State, and the United States have been substantial since the birth of this Nation. Their history goes back much farther than most people realize. This year, 1970, is the 400th anniversary of the Iroquois Confederacy, founded in 1570, before non-Indians thought of forming a separate government on this continent.

The Iroquois Confederacy, comprising initially five nations and eventually of six different tribes, was and is one of the strongest unions of Indians ever established. The Senecas played a very important role in the development of our country.

Today the Seneca Nation of Indians is fighting for Federal assistance for all Indian tribes in the United States to help reduce unemployment and improve the economy on Indian reservations. They have a \$10 million recreation/tourism project planned for their own area to make the best of a situation whereby the U.S. Government flooded 10,000 acres of reservation land. Recently, Mr. William Seneca, the president of the Seneca Nation of Indians, Mrs. Ladonna Harris, director, Americans for Indian Opportunity Action Council, and Mr. Bruce A. Wilkie, executive director, National Congress of American Indians, testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee indicating the specific nature of the problem the Seneca Nation of Indians have encountered and emphasizing that the Appropriations Committee increase funds in the Economic Development Administration for projects undertaken by American Indians to reduce unemployment and to improve the economy of the American Indian. Because national attention should be brought to bear on this important problem, I insert in the RECORD the state-

ments of the above representatives of American Indians for the benefit of my colleagues:

STATEMENT BY WILLIAM SENECA, PRESIDENT, SENECA NATION OF INDIANS, BEFORE THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, JUNE 25, 1970

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: It is with a sense of gratitude that I am permitted the opportunity to appear before this Committee to discuss the Fiscal Year 1971 Commerce Appropriations Bill, and specifically as it relates to the Economic Development Administration.

The Council of the Seneca Nation of Indians by unanimous resolution directed me, as President of the Seneca Nation of Indians, to appear before this Committee to:

1. "Seek a larger and reasonable amount (in the EDA appropriations for 1971) for Indian projects."

2. "Do everything possible to exert the Nation's thoughts and influence to increase the funding of public works in federal programs for all Indians."

At a meeting with American Indians in Albuquerque, New Mexico, President Nixon, Vice President Agnew, and Senator Kennedy gave recognition to the legal and moral right of American Indians to continued federal support. Vice President Agnew, in his speech to the National Congress of American Indians, emphasized that the Administration was proposing programs to fit Indian requirements and needs. Secretary Hickel stated: "Let's start thinking in terms of jobs. For those reservations that don't want industry, we must make other plans." Similar and more direct encouragement was given to Indians to participate in federal programs for the alleviation of unemployment and the building of the economy of Indian areas throughout the country.

The Seneca Nation of Indians, upon continued encouragement and suggestions from the Economic Development Administration, took positive steps necessary to accomplish the goals announced by those speakers at that meeting. Today, the Seneca Nation of Indians finds itself, after putting forth considerable financial and other efforts, facing a situation where its work appears that it might be in vain. I am submitting with this testimony a copy of the Seneca Nation of Indians resolution pertaining to our proposed \$10 million recreation-tourism project which serves as a good case study of what can happen when insufficient funds exist in federal programs. That document will outline our particular situation.

My main purpose for appearing before this Committee is to seek an expression and an indication by this Committee for increased Economic Development Administration funds for Indian reservations throughout the United States. Although I personally can speak only for the Seneca Nation of Indians, I submit a statement from the National Congress of American Indians in support of this testimony and a statement from Mrs. Ladonna Harris, Director, Americans for Indian Opportunity Council, who has been and is continuing to work for better conditions for all American Indians.

We are seeking the consensus of this Committee for increasing the EDA appropriation with the thought of enlarging the Indian allotment for Fiscal Year 1971. Although allotment procedures are administrative in nature, we feel that it is important that Congress express its concern over the small allotment and the handling of that allotment in EDA for American Indians.

Specifically, we are asking this Committee to increase the appropriation in EDA by \$60 million with the idea that the major thrust of such an increase be used primarily for In-

dian projects to reduce unemployment and to improve the economy of reservation areas.

This distinguished Committee needs no rhetoric expressing the need of the American Indian for economic development. There is no question that Indians rank last in all statistics concerning health, education, housing, employment, and income. There is no need to expand on the fact that the average American Indian has a life expectancy of 44 years, an infant mortality rate three times as high as among non-Indians, and an unemployment rate as high as ten times the national average.

The Task Force on Economic Growth and Opportunity of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, in its report in 1969, stated succinctly what the Indian wants today:

"Indian spokesmen have stated Indian wants. They want to retain their culture. They want to be consulted and to have a real vote in decisions relating to themselves. They want to retain their reservation lands. And, Indians want to enter modern economic life and enjoy its advantages."

The Indian today wants to develop the education and business acumen characteristic of the successful economic progress demonstrated in this country over the years. He wants to earn a salary which will enable him and his family to live a happier life. He wants to keep the values he holds dear while developing the means for improving his economic status. At the root of many of the problems on Indian reservations is the constant cloud of unemployment, or the threat of unemployment. The economy of the individual and of the Indian Tribe is affected greatly.

To alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in Indian areas, the most pertinent federal agency is the Economic Development Administration established by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. Since this is the case, and since the Indians throughout the United States must rely upon funds in this Agency for assistance in public works projects and development facilities and other financial assistance for planning and business loans, we felt it was most practical to ask this Committee to increase the appropriation for EDA to assist Indians throughout the country.

The whittling away of the Indian Public Works Allotment in EDA places continued burdens on Indians throughout the United States. For example, according to the Office of Budget and Program Analysis of the United States Department of Commerce, in a letter of March 18th of this year, it was pointed out that the public works program for Indians in EDA was trimmed as follows: Original Allotment, \$23.1 million.

After overall budget cut by the Administration, \$19.0 million.

Second and final reduction, \$13.5 million.

The original \$23.1 million for all Indian public works projects in EDA in the United States was too low even in the beginning when viewed in the light of the comparative needs of Indian reservations throughout the country. But, to cut that amount by almost half to \$13.5 million for all Indian reservations in the United States is to cause continued hardships and to discourage efforts of economic development in the most depressed areas of the country.

Because of the current economic situation in the country, and because of inflationary cost increases in the construction industry, the allotment for Indians in the past fiscal year in the whole United States would have allowed approximately only 12 average-sized buildings to have been erected. This could have accounted for the whole allotment to Indians.

Such an allotment for Indians in the whole United States is merely a token of assistance when compared to the expenditures in other

categories in other areas not related to development of the social and economic well-being of the citizens of this country.

The Seneca Nation of Indians supports the total request for Fiscal Year 1971 for EDA in the amount of \$263 million plus an additional \$48,300,000 for a total suggested appropriation of \$311,300,000 dollars. This is a total of \$60 million more than the House recommended in its bill, \$48,300,000 more than the total request for Fiscal Year 1971, and only \$40,300,000 more than was appropriated in Fiscal Year 1970.

Why the increase in funds for EDA?

First, it should be noted below that the total funds appropriated for EDA have been reduced steadily each year since the agency was instituted. The figures given below indicate the amount of reductions which have taken place:

Fiscal year	EDA total appropriated funds	Reduction in appropriation
1966	\$332,425,000	
1967	296,100,000	\$36,325,000
1968	275,000,000	21,100,000
1969	274,740,000	260,000
1970	271,000,000	3,740,000
1971 <sup>1</sup>	251,300,000	19,700,000
Total		81,125,000

<sup>1</sup> House proposal.

Second, instead of the appropriation for EDA being reduced, it would seem that such an appropriation which is used primarily to reduce unemployment and improve the economy of afflicted areas should increase proportionately with the increase in unemployment in the country. For example, the increase in unemployment from May of 1969 to May of 1970 amounted to 1.5%—from 3.5% unemployment to 5%. In December of 1969, the total number of unemployed was approximately 2,800,000 people. If we were to divide the total number of unemployed people into the \$271 million appropriated for EDA in Fiscal Year 1970, the appropriation would amount to approximately \$100 per unemployed person. If we use this same standard and multiply the 4,106,000 people unemployed as of May of this year by \$100, the appropriation in EDA for Fiscal Year 1971 should be \$410,600,000 dollars. This would be an increased appropriation of approximately \$160,000,000 over what the House has suggested.

Since such an increase is probably unattainable, we are suggesting that this Committee at least do the following:

1. Move to increase the appropriation to at least the Fiscal Year 1970 level—an increase of almost \$20 million.

2. Increase the appropriation further because of the increased rate in unemployment, not to mention the potential increase in unemployment during the year. The amount to be increased is calculated at 25% of the increased funds (\$160 million) calculated above . . . \$40 million.

3. Total increase suggested in numbers one and two above equals \$60 million.

Third, the majority of the increase in these funds should go to the lowest income groups and the unemployed since they are hit the hardest in periods of unemployment. Furthermore, the dollar amounts of projects are increasing monthly because of the increase in construction costs which today amount to approximately a 25% increase each year. Since this is the case, fewer projects can be approved in EDA, more applications will not be able to be funded, and continued unemployment in some areas will result.

There must be a backlog of projects in EDA, including Indian projects such as ours, which cannot be funded because of the lack of appropriations. With insufficient appropriations, the unemployment problem is

compounded when federal assistance is not forthcoming. Some projects in EDA are broken into several phases, as was suggested to us, which only tends to increase the amount of money the Federal Government puts into the project as well as the amount of money which must be raised locally for matching funds. The 25% increase in construction costs in a sizeable project such as ours can amount to millions of dollars in one year's time.

In addition to these factors, the projected labor force for 1975 is 93.6 million, an increase of 19.5%—as projected by the Upjohn Institute for Employment Research. With this increase in labor force and with the current trends of dramatic increases in unemployment, it is inconceivable that funds for EDA should be reduced rather than increased substantially. When such a reduction takes place in view of the factors mentioned above, the Indians of America can only be hurt by a reduction in funds instead of a substantial increase.

In the request for Fiscal Year 1971 for the Economic Development Administration, as passed by the House, it should be noted that the House Committee recommended \$21,100,000 for the operation and administration of EDA—an amount which exceeded total funds for all Indians in the United States last year by almost \$8 million. This is not to say that \$21,100,000 is not needed to operate and administer the program. However, it is to say that the amount which should be made available for Indians throughout the country—600,000 in number—should at least be increased since construction costs in public works are increasing steadily, and since business loans will probably be in greater demand. In other words, the substance of the program for the most poverty-stricken group in the United States should at least be funded in a manner and in an amount in proportion to what it takes to administer the whole EDA program.

The original intent of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as shown in the authorization, was that an amount up to \$760 million for each fiscal year could be expended. The House Committee has recommended a total appropriation of \$251,300,000 for Fiscal Year 1971. The addition of the \$60 million we are advocating here would bring the total request for next fiscal year to approximately \$310 million—still almost \$450 million under the limit.

With the economy in the Nation the way it is today, and with the unemployment rate reaching 5%, a greater number of areas in the United States will become eligible for EDA assistance. This increase in high unemployment areas will create a greater demand for funds from the Economic Development Administration. If the increase in the number of areas eligible for assistance is not met in direct proportion by an increase in funds for the agency, this will produce even greater competition in the agency for the money available. Our project is a good example of what can happen when sufficient funds are not available.

Furthermore, when projects are undertaken by those applying for EDA assistance, a one to two per cent increase in construction costs per month passes with each month that it takes to get a grant offer from the agency. Such costs are very difficult for even professionals to project.

What has been the pattern of total EDA expenditures as related to expenditures on Indian reservations? Out of the total amount of EDA appropriated funds from Fiscal Year 1966 through Fiscal Year 1970 of approximately \$1.5 billion, Indians have received approximately \$75 million—a mere 5% of the total funds provided for EDA has gone to the most poverty-stricken group in the Nation. These statistics are taken from EDA's own statements to the Joint Economic Com-

mittee of Congress in 1969 and the House Report of the bill under discussion.

Again, in EDA's own publication, the 1968 Progress Report of the Economic Development Administration, it is stated that 600,000 Indians in the United States have "an average unemployment rate of 40% (10 times the national average), a median family income of \$1,700 per year, dilapidated housing, a high school dropout rate double the national average, and an average rate of death twenty years younger than that for the country as a whole." Is 5% of EDA's expenditures an equitable amount in view of the agency's own statements?

In EDA's statement to the Joint Economic Committee in 1969, the EDA concluded that "the tribal attitude toward change will, in the long-run, determine progress and allow them to move toward self-sustained economic growth." I submit that this is only partially the answer. It is only with the assistance of the Federal Government in the economic development program in the Economic Development Administration, which must be adequately supported financially, that Indians will be able to move toward the goal stated by EDA. Only further despair, a feeling of disillusionment, and further hardships for the members of each Indian nation will result if this Committee, the Congress, and the Administration do not see fit to provide greater funds for economic development of Indian communities who are ready and willing to match funds with the Federal Government to help Indians toward a better life.

I thank this Committee for its time, its interest, and hopefully, its willingness to assist all Indians in America in a direct way by adding \$60 million to the EDA Appropriation with the idea of assisting Native Americans.

As Mrs. Fred Harris said for the Indian members of the National Council on Indian Opportunity to the Chairman and federal members:

"Just as Alcatraz stands as a symbol of the frustration and despair long felt by Indian people, let the positive actions of this government insure that such a symbol is never needed again."

#### RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Federal Government of the United States of America saw fit to establish a water control program affecting the Allegheny River, flooding approximately 10,000 acres or one-third of the land of the Seneca Nation of Indians, by erecting the Kinzua Dam north of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and south of the Allegheny Reservation of the Seneca Nation of Indians;

Whereas, By Public Law 88-533, 88th Congress, H.R. 1794, August 31, 1964, the Federal Government authorized funds for "relocation, rehabilitation, social and economic development of the members of the Seneca Nation;"

Whereas, The Federal Government established the Economic Development Administration of the Department of Commerce in 1965 to assist areas of high unemployment by assisting with matching grants for public works;

Whereas, The Seneca Nation of Indians Cattaraugus and Allegheny Reservations are designated EDA areas and have been urged by EDA officials for five years to apply for funds for a Recreation-Tourism Project;

Whereas, The late President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, directed in a letter to all agencies and departments of the Federal Government that they assist the Seneca Nation in all ways possible in the development of a Recreation-Tourism Project;

Whereas, The Seneca Nation of Indians proceeded in an orderly fashion to study potential economic development projects by participating in ten feasibility studies between 1965 and 1969, finally combining the

best parts into the project known as "Iroquoia" which would reduce the high unemployment on the reservation to a level at or below the national level;

Whereas, EDA officials, showing a sincere interest in helping the Nation, from the period of 1965 through 1969, stated on numerous occasions their interest and support, even urging the submission of an application;

Whereas, The Seneca Nation of Indians in 1969, after completion of an EDA technical assistance study, moved positively to implement the study by:

(1) Hiring an Economic Development consultant to coordinate all efforts toward conceptualizing a project, bringing together the best elements of all the studies and preparing an application for an EDA Public Works grant;

(2) Hiring a former president of the Seneca Nation of Indians to serve as Assistant Project Manager in the preparation phases of the total complex;

(3) Hiring a cultural development specialist for researching and coordinating all cultural aspects of the project;

(4) Hiring an architectural-engineering firm to develop the preliminary designs and requirements dictated by EDA;

(5) Holding numerous meetings and conferences with Federal officials and nationally-known cultural consultants;

(6) Preparing a complete application for EDA in the summer of 1969, only to be told that the project, originally prepared for several phases but told by EDA to put everything into one phase, should be put back into phases;

(7) Preparing the application again in two phases, the first of which was submitted to EDA in January 1970, only to be told by the Regional Office that both phases should be submitted since they considered the application as one phase, and still being told by EDA in Washington that they considered the application in phases;

(8) Meeting a multitude of requirements asked by EDA, such as actually drilling wells for water, and by meeting EDA officials for a year;

(9) Establishing a special Recreation Committee to work on the Project;

(10) Establishing a Recreation Foundation comprised of distinguished Indians and non-Indians, to assist with policy decisions prior to completion of the project;

(11) Engaging a legal firm, six months ago, to handle all legal aspects of the project;

(12) Coordinating all elements leading to a successful and worthwhile project;

(13) Passing a Council Resolution that the Nation make \$4,000,000 of its funds available for the project;

Whereas, The EDA has provided conflicting and confusing reports and information relative to the funds available for the project;

Whereas, EDA, through Mr. Fagan, Assistant to Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development, and his staff, indicated orally to the Nation on May 6, 1970, that the project not be funded this year, next year, and probably never because no funds would be available for the Nation's type of project and because the Indian Public Works program was reduced from 19 million dollars to 13.5 million dollars in this fiscal year since a heavy demand on funds was made by Mississippi because of the results of Hurricane Camille;

Whereas, The United States Congress failed to produce a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Commerce for Hurricane Camille damages, and an administrative decision in said Department resulted in reducing Indian Public Works grant allotments in EDA;

Whereas, Should a grant be made, the size of the Nation project requires immediate action if large costs to the Federal Government and to the Nation are to be prevented, since

it is estimated that added inflationary construction costs amount to \$100,000—\$200,000 per month;

Whereas, The Nation deems it vital to its future welfare that the Recreation-Tourism Project become a reality;

Whereas, The Nation cannot fund the whole project by itself and will have to abandon the Project if no Federal assistance is made available;

Whereas, The Nation has one of the lowest EDA Public Works grant per Indian ratio of all reservations in the United States having received such grants;

And whereas, The failure of the Federal Government to assist the Nation pursuant to the above will contribute to the continued high unemployment of members of the Nation and to the delinquency of the Nation's improving the economy of the area, contrary to the desires of Congress, as stated in Public Law 88-533;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the Council of the Seneca Nation directs the President of the Seneca Nation to:

(1) Advise and inform the appropriate elected, appointed and other individuals, including the President and Vice-President of the United States, of the history of the Iroquoia Project, seeking their support for the EDA application;

(2) Appear before the appropriate Congressional Committees with appropriate supporting testimony in official hearings to present the Nation's case;

(3) Appear before the 1970 Supplemental Appropriations Committees, seeking a supplement in EDA funds to make possible the funding of the Nation's Project, and to appear before the 1971 EDA Appropriations Committee, seeking a larger and reasonable amount for Indian projects, with testimony concerning the Nation's Project.

(4) Seek any and all means to assist the welfare of the Nation through the Recreation-Tourism Project by continuing with the EDA application process, the efforts to obtain Appalachian Funds, and efforts to obtain financial assistance wherever possible;

(5) Do everything possible to exert the Nation's thoughts and influence to increase the funding of public works in Federal programs for all Indians and that this be done as soon as possible.

STATEMENT BY MRS. LADONNA HARRIS, DIRECTOR, AMERICANS FOR INDIAN OPPORTUNITY ACTION COUNCIL, BEFORE THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: Positive action by your Committee is needed now to provide adequate and appropriate economic development funds for assisting American Indians, Eskimos and Aleuts in the reduction of unemployment and low income conditions which are so prevalent in many areas where they live.

The Americans for Indian Opportunity Action Council supports the earlier testimony of Mr. William Seneca, President of the Seneca Nation of Indians. The case history of the Seneca EDA application substantiates the desire of American Indians to develop programs for incorporating their present values with new opportunities for human resources development.

If such a comprehensive program as that of the Seneca is not funded, other Indian tribes will be seriously discouraged in their economic development activity.

American Indians do not seek a disproportionate share of EDA funds. Instead, the Americans for Indian Opportunity Action Council recommends as does the Seneca Nation of Indians, that the EDA appropriation be increased by \$60 million for American Indian economic development.

Native Americans are entitled to a fair share and to equality of opportunity while still retaining their right to be different—

a fundamental American idea. Yet, they continue to be the minority group in America with the worst health, housing, education, income and unemployment statistics.

An increased appropriation, together with a directive from this Committee that greater attention be given to American Indian economic development would substantially lift their hopes and opportunities in American society today.

The Senecas typify the new spirit of self-help and self-determination of American Indians, Eskimos and Aleuts. The Americans for Indian Opportunity Action Council respectfully urges this Committee to act now to encourage this new spirit and these new efforts by substantially increasing—for the Senecas and for all American Indians—funds available for economic development and public works.

STATEMENT BY BRUCE A. WILKIE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS, JUNE 25, 1970

We respectfully request that this Appropriations Committee, as it considers further funding of the Economic Development Administration, look seriously at the needs of the American Indians nationwide.

American Indians, not by choice, are among the most economically deprived people on this Continent. We have not in the past, had the opportunity nor the tools and expertise to develop on the same level or even near the same level as other United States citizens.

Programs which have been developed from funds appropriated through the Economic Development Administration have been creating a grand opportunity for American Indians to, in a sense, catch up with the rest of the nation in progress and in opportunity.

We respectfully urge that this Committee provide increased funding through the Economic Development Administration to Indian Reservations throughout the United States.

The National Congress of American Indians supports the Seneca Nation of Indians in its application to the Economic Development Administration for the funding of their program. We request that the Economic Development Administration act favorably without delay on this application. The Seneca Indians have worked diligently for several years on the development of this program and we feel that further delays or a rejection of their application could only lead to a great injustice to this Nation of Indians.

## PLANET EARTH IS SICK

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the July 1970 issue of the American Sportsman's Journal carried an article by Charles Arnett in which are discussed some of the symptoms of "planetary disease" which are to be found on planet earth.

Under unanimous consent I include the text of the article at this point in the RECORD:

### PLANET EARTH IS SICK—VERY SICK

(By Charles Arnett, American Sportsman's Guild)

The symptoms of this planetary disease are all around us. In our air, our water and our food. Some scientists say the disease may have already progressed too far. Will this be man's last decade? We must do something about it, and the American Sportsman's Guild intends to do something about it. Ac-

tion must be taken by an informed and concerned public now. In this series of three articles, we will inform our readers what we intend to do.

Other scientists warn that either mankind do something about it or the end of life is a certainty.

The United Nations General Assembly has moved to organize a worldwide assault on pollution. United Nations sponsored international conference on the fast rising global pollution crises is scheduled to convene in Stockholm, Sweden, in June 1972.

In the United States, President Nixon signed a bill on January 1, creating a council on Environmental Quality. "It is literally now or never" in combating pollution, said the President at the signing, his first official act of 1970. "I have become convinced that the 1970's absolutely must be the years when America pays its debt to the past by reclaiming the purity of its air, its waters and living environment," he said. In his state of the union message, he promised the most comprehensive and costly pollution control program in U.S. history.

Everyone is talking about it, but who is doing anything about it? One of the most important meetings to date on the pollution crises was held in San Francisco in late November 1969, but how many heard of it? Its title was "Man and His Environment: A View Toward Survival" sponsored by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Over 60 outstanding authorities on every phase of pollution—air and water pollution, industrial wastes, oil spillage, solid waste disposal, food contamination—provided the nucleus of the conference.

Rippling through the corridors was the theme: "ACT! do something now, don't just talk about it." There has been more verbiage about garbage in the last few years than in all history. Meanwhile, garbage and pollution in general continues to mount.

A large poster on display, in the lobby of the St. Francis Hotel stated in no uncertain terms the gravity of the situation. "Civilization faces a crisis . . . the question is whether man can live together in the numbers that make culture possible, without destroying the conditions of his existence." With our very survival at stake, nothing is more important than to move quickly from thought to action.

At most, five young pelicans hatched this year out of 1200 nests in California. All other eggs broke before hatching, with DDT concentrations of up to 2500 parts per million in the thinnest-shelled eggs. The Brown Pelican does not pollute. He does not gather together in numbers that nature cannot support. He is a victim of man and a warning that man himself may perish, by his own ignorance. Here is a danger signal that something is drastically wrong on earth. No one wants the Brown Pelican to perish.

Arthur Godfrey said at a U.N.E.S.C.O. Conference: "I like to use the analogy of the miners. They used to take canaries—they still do—down in the mines with them. The canary topples off the perch; look out man, let's go! That's what the brown pelican is telling us—and the osprey and the eagle: Look, you're about to be killed. Let's do something about it! We're running out of air, we're running out of water, we're running out of land. You see, all our technology can't produce one square inch of soil or one drop of water." Why are we in this predicament? It is the direct or indirect result of advances in technology. Man's insults, terrible abuse and tampering with his environment. So much, in fact, that he threatens to destroy it.

To name but a few: the internal combustion engine, synthetic pesticides, inorganic nitrogen fertilizer, plastics, man made radio isotopes—the list is endless. More automobiles, more electrical power, more gadgetry, more food from depleted soil. Man has felt it his destiny to manipulate, control, and

drastically alter his environment: to exploit nature and the earth's abundant riches, rather than to live in harmony with the laws that govern the intricate ecological balance of our globe.

Dr. Barry Commoner, a noted biologist, stated recently that mankind, the United States in particular, has embarked on a "suicidal course" and our ability to recover becomes harder and harder with each passing year. He suggested that President Nixon should declare a state of national emergency and reassess national priorities in order to solve our grim ecological problems.

In a panel session he was asked, "How long do we have?" He contended that unless we decide to act decisively in this decade we have had it.

President Nixon's own science advisor, Dr. Lee DuBridge, stated at the opening session of the U.N.E.S.C.O. Conference the following and his words, too, were grave: "It is our whole planet that is in danger of deterioration. Surely mankind has reached a turning point in history. He must do something now to reverse the deteriorating environmental trends, else our children and grandchildren will find the earth quite uninhabitable and it will even be increasingly more unpleasant and unhealthy for us."

Dr. DuBridge did not read before the assembled delegates the conclusion of his printed text which was released ahead of time to the press. It packed a wallop. It read: "The problem of pollution is a huge one. It involves nothing less than changing the habits of billions of people and the adoption of wholly new attitudes and very expensive new technologies by our whole worldwide industrial system."

Informing the public of the gravity of the pollution crises is no easy task, even with the current, nearly foolish, excitement over the topic. We must attract attention to the death of our planet. The sudden death of an individual makes the front page of the newspaper, but the slow imminent death of us all goes unreported.

The American Sportsman's Guild is embarking on a tremendous undertaking to educate the masses in our great country. The next two series of this article will appear in our next two issues of the American Sportsman's Journal. In these articles we will advise you of our endeavors.

In the next issue we will discuss our earth, our water, whose purity has been sold out to progress, our air—Don't Breathe Too Deeply—the Ocean, that Final Garbage Dump, solid waste, (a total of 3.5 billion tons of discards per year and growing), mountains of waste, noise pollution—the very survival of man is at stake. Be sure to get your copy of our next edition.

In our third article, we'll tell you what could and must be done. We must begin to act, not just talk, or we'll have another form of pollution—*Word pollution*.

### IS BIOLOGICAL AGING INEVITABLE?

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

#### IS BIOLOGICAL AGING INEVITABLE?—PART II INTEGRATED THEORY OF AGING

The inability of the foregoing important theories—and others—to present individually a comprehensive theoretical picture of the causes of biological aging should not be

considered as discouraging. It is the nature of scientific research that the initial stages of most research efforts are characterized by the proposing of a great number of theories. There is usually a separate theory suggested to explain each different aspect of a given phenomenon under study. (This is often considered to be the "hunting" stage of research.) Eventually, however, laboratory work sifts this crude material—eliminating that which is useless, and leaving the worthwhile concepts to form a sound basis for more sophisticated approaches.

Until recently, attempts to explain the phenomenon of aging were in the "hunting" stage; a great number of worthwhile concepts were advanced during this stage, but laboratory evaluation of these concepts was most notable in its sparsity. Despite the discouraging fact that the amount of laboratory support is still very inadequate, enough useful experimental results have become available to permit the proposing of more sophisticated theories.

In 1968, Carpenter and Loynd suggested an "Integrated" theory of aging in which many of the preceding theories were blended together to form a cohesive theoretical picture. The "Integrated" theory assumes that (1) the major cause of aging is cross-linkage of all types of molecules within the organism, (2) the cross-linkage rate is roughly proportional to the metabolic rate and is dependent upon the density of chemical crosslinkers within the system, and (3) some types and amounts of increased stress upon the organism result in biochemical changes which enhance the rate of crosslinkage.

The modes through which this detrimental crosslinkage affects the organism are separated—according to function—into (a) the non-genetic mode and (b) the genetic mode. The non-genetic mode includes treatment of both collagenous and non-collagenous molecules. Both of these types of molecules obey diffusion relationships; additionally, waste products also accumulate in accordance with diffusion relationships. On the other hand, the genetic mode is principally concerned with genetic material. The cross-linkage of such material produces mutations, but mutations are also normally produced by dissociation; in a radiation environment further mutations result from radiation-induced deletions and nucleotide substitutions. The effect of the mutations is strongly enhanced by immunologic reactions.

The genetic structure of each organism determines the molecular shapes, locations and functions of the organism's component parts. In turn, if many parts do not function adequately the organism will die. Thus, because of its genetic structure, each organism has a definite minimum molecular efficiency—about 83%—above which it must operate in order to survive. (For example, a hummingbird most likely would not survive if it operated at the metabolic rate of a turtle. Thus, if a sufficient number of energy-conversion molecules became inactive within the hummingbird's cells, it most probably would die.)

When an organism's genetic material is adversely mutated, succeeding generations of the organism's body cells are poorly structured for inter-cellular cooperation and survival. This means that the organism can ill-afford to lose the use of any of those functional molecules which are essential to its life processes. Thus, the minimum molecular efficiency required for the organism's survival is increased; it is further increased because of immunologic reactions—perhaps to 85%.

However, mutations and immunologic reactions do not appear to be the major cause of aging and subsequent death. The major cause appears to be a decrease in molecular efficiency—where such decrease is primarily brought about by the changing of non-genetic molecules by crosslinkage. In some parts of each organism, the normal "turn-

over"—chemical replacement—of molecules is sufficient to prevent accumulation of inert molecule and mutations but nerve cells, muscle cells, and collagen do not "turnover." In those last three items, crosslinkage gradually removes molecules from the "normal" category, and the molecular efficiency—number of remaining "normal" molecules times 100% divided by the number of original "normal" molecules—decreases with age. The difference between an organism's actual molecular efficiency and its minimum molecular efficiency required for survival is a measure of how much stress the organism can stand—ex. youth 96-83 = 13%, old age 80-85 = 4%. Whenever the applied stress exceeds the organism's capability to withstand it, the organism dies.

Now comes the question: does the "Integrated" theory actually provide a comprehensive theoretical picture of the way that real biological aging and death occurs? In all honesty, we don't know! The theory is plausible but that does not mean that it is right. It merely seems to interrelate the known facts better than has been done previously. If we really wish to determine the truth of the matter, we need to make a coordinated experimental and theoretical assault on biological aging.

#### ASSAULT ON BIOLOGICAL AGING

Other than to satisfy your insatiable thirst for knowledge, are there any constructive reasons why we should try to understand the physical processes underlying biological aging? The answer to that challenging question lies in the intriguing fact that, almost invariably, understanding brings control. A deep knowledge of the basic causes of biological aging could conceivably lead to a retardation or an arresting of the biological aging process. This, in turn, would yield at least three vitally important results: 1) the productive life span of individuals would be extended; 2) the onslaught of degenerative illnesses associated with advanced biological age would be postponed—giving medical research more time in which to develop effective treatments; and 3) with an increase in the average age, the attitudes of the populace on the problems—social, economic, et cetera—faced by our nation and our world would be far more mature, leading to more long-term, beneficial solutions.

To illustrate the outstanding significance of these three results, we will examine some of the benefits which would follow from just one of them—increasing the individual productive life span. In a long-range sense, the output of scientists, engineers and other experts would increase because a smaller portion of their lives would be taken up by education, thus leaving a relatively longer period of productivity. Of course, continuing professional education would be required at periodic intervals just as it is needed today. Nevertheless, a greater percentage of one's life could be devoted to gaining valuable operational experience and to applying this valuable experience to the material and mental betterment of the human race. In turn, this would lead to dramatic improvement in the present miserable condition of the world's poor, and to significantly increased rates of scientific progress in all fields. And, of course, a longer productive life span would also give us more time for fishing.

Considering the enormous benefits to be possibly reaped from organized research on biological aging, why weren't well-financed research programs started years ago? Well, in the first place, only during the last quarter century has enough background information become available to make such research programs feasible. Even now, very few people are aware that this essential background information exists. The second reason for delay in the starting of such research programs is the type of response obtained from individuals who have not had time to evalu-

ate carefully the available information. Even people who are trained to think logically usually respond that it is impossible to change the rate of biological aging—and then they give one or more apologetic reasons as to why it is impossible. (In one case, a physicist known to the authors stated rather matter-of-factly, "If God wanted man to live longer, he would.") Furthermore, people naively assume that increasing the life span means increasing only the period of decaying senescence rather than the useful middle years. Naturally, such attitudes are wrong. Yet, because of these attitudes—which have been implanted in peoples' subconsciousnesses by the apologetic themes in our culture—there is significant opposition to research on aging.

This opposition shows up in several ways. First, it is difficult—but not impossible—for researchers to obtain financing for their projects. This drives researchers into working on projects where funds are more readily available. Second, it is difficult to interest scientists in working on biological aging because neither researchers nor graduate students want to "waste" their time examining what they wrongly believe is tenuous evidence. Third, no funding agency is willing to provide the necessary leadership and organization which are at present so conspicuously absent although at least one nationally-known drug company has hired an independent laboratory to investigate biochemically the crosslinkage theory of aging. Of course, these foregoing comments apply only to the Western nations. Russia, on the other hand, has been involved in organized research on biological aging since the 1930s. L. V. Komarov of Moscow has stated that there is no apparent biological barrier to man's living to age 200. In contrast, the United States' attitude towards research on aging is revealed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's assignment of biological aging research to the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. The Department's Section Head for biological aging research, Bernard Strehler, became so disenchanted with HEW's attitude in 1967 that he resigned, accepted a position with the University of Southern California, and started a non-profit organization—the Association for the Advancement of Aging Research (AAAR). The AAAR recently forwarded a proposal to the Senate Special Committee on Aging, which the Senate Committee amplified into a Bill known as the Preliminary Gerontological Research Act. Senator Harrison Williams (D-N.J.) introduced this Bill (No. 3784) into the Senate on July 15, 1968 but it apparently was introduced too late for consideration in 1968. (It will be re-introduced this year.) The core of the Bill is formation of an inexpensive (\$5 million to \$50 million a year) Aging Research Commission (ARC)—first suggested by Donald Carpenter in *Science*—which would have the authority to support fundamental biological research on aging, and be responsible only to the President and Congress. Despite some inadequacies in the proposed Bill, it is hoped that the ARC will gain enough popular support that Congress will soon pass the pertinent legislation.

#### NEW WARNING ON DELTA CANAL

### HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, last week the U.S. Geological Survey released a report on the hydrology of South San Francisco Bay that is of vital importance

to all of us concerned with the preservation and enhancement of our most important natural resources.

The Geological Survey report concluded that there is ample scientific evidence to conclude that diverting great quantities of fresh water inflows into the bay and delta estuary system will result in serious degradation of this magnificent resource.

Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the San Francisco Chronicle describes the significance of the USGS Report and the logical conclusion that the proposed Peripheral Canal project, jointly financed by State and Federal funds should be scrapped.

The editorial follows:

#### NEW WARNING ON DELTA CANAL

The U.S. Geological Survey has now issued what prudent men would consider the final word on the proposed \$209 million Delta Peripheral Canal.

In essence, the survey has found that significantly diminishing the flow of the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers into Northern San Francisco Bay would probably create in the Southern Bay a torpid, turbid stagnation, incapable of supporting marine life other than algae and totally unattractive for human uses of any kind.

The Geological Survey scientists found that the bay south of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge receives its major flushing (and cleansing) from its receipt of large quantities of fresh water from the north and not, as the State Department of Water Resources contends, from Pacific Ocean tidal flows. The Federal scientists, in preliminary studies, have also found that periods of high river runoff are also periods of low South Bay salinity and phosphate content.

They have determined, through use of flow markers, that incoming tidal flows bypass the South Bay and move into the North Bay and Delta.

The Peripheral Canal, as envisioned by State Water Plan enthusiasts, is a massive 43-mile straw which would suck up 10 million acre feet of water annually from the Sacramento river south of Sacramento and deposit it at pumping plants near Tracy for export to the south. Though there is much expert opinion in the long record that the canal would cause severe ecological destruction in the Delta, adherents have insisted that it must be built.

The latest warning is the most ominous thus far. It poses the threat, as Congressman Paul McCloskey and Jerome Waldie have observed, that the southern end of the bay will become another putrescent Lake Erie. The Bay Area is being asked to pay an overwhelming price for the development of waste lands far to the south.

#### HELP WHERE HELP IS NEEDED

### HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, in a recent letter to the Members of the Congress, Leonard Woodcock, newly chosen president of the United Auto Workers, has made the simple and preeminently equitable proposal that people who are the supposed beneficiaries of private employers' pension plans be given at least as much consideration as those who invest in the companies that employ them.

Pointing to the administration's deep solicitude for those who suffer financial loss through the troubles that beset brokerage houses, and to the strong administration recommendations that the Government bail out the Penn Central Railroad, Mr. Woodcock asks for no more than equal treatment for "the many American workers who own no railroads and possess no stock portfolio to speak of, only a private pension promise that offers them hope."

The General Subcommittee on Labor, of the House Education and Labor Committee, chaired by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), are working vigorously on this precise problem, and it is my hope that when that subcommittee concludes its work, it will have made a significant start in the direction in which Leonard Woodcock's letter points. I insert Mr. Woodcock's letter at this point in the RECORD:

INTERNATIONAL UNION, UAW,

Detroit, Mich., July 2, 1970.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing to you and to the other members of the Congress to urge that at least as much consideration be given to public reinsurance of the accumulated private pension rights of workers as is being given to bailing out both Wall Street speculators whose brokers go bankrupt and the stockholders of the Penn-Central Railroad.

In his June 17 televised address on the state of the economy, President Nixon told the nation that we are in transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy. Senator Mansfield and economic indicators suggest that the word for our situation is recession. We in the UAW are struck by the fact that whether we are in an economy of war, peace or transition, in recession or what passes for prosperity, the conduct of government and economic affairs remains too largely in the grip of a double standard: all Americans are equal, but some Americans are more equal than others. Walter Reuther used to refer to this double standard as Park Avenue socialism for the rich and free enterprise for the poor. The President's program "specifically addressed to help the people who need help most in a period of economic transition" reflects that double standard. Mr. Nixon called for:

"Establishment of an insurance corporation with a Federal backstop to guarantee the investor against losses that could be caused by financial difficulties of brokerage houses. . . ."

Yet he made no reference to and indicated no support for a long-pending proposal to provide similar insurance to meet the urgent need of wage-earners and lower-salaried workers who stand to lose the protection of privately negotiated pensions if the companies they work for should go out of business before their pension programs are fully funded. Yet the closing of plants and the wiping out of workers' pension rights are an obvious potential consequence of a transition from war to a peace economy, while it is difficult to see any necessary connection between such a transition and trouble in brokerage houses.

Again, the collapse of the Penn-Central Railroad has brought on the spectacle of Administration figures falling over each other in their haste to shore up the managements and to protect the stockholders of the Penn-Central and other threatened lines through massive infusions of Federally guaranteed loans. The Secretary of Transportation admitted that such action to help the Penn-Central management would be "gambling" on "high-risk loans." Nevertheless he attempted

to panic the Congress and the country with the hobgoblin of nationalization of the railroads if the risk were not taken. And the President himself, in his June 17 speech on the economy, authorized the gamble by calling for: "legislation that will enable the Department of Transportation to provide emergency assistance to railroads in financial difficulties."

We in the UAW are not in principle critical of financial aid to stricken corporations. Nor are we necessarily opposed to action to protect investors or even speculators from losses stemming from financial difficulties of brokerage houses. Yet we ask: Are these people—the well-heeled managements of conglomerate corporations and others affluent enough to be able to speculate in Wall Street—among "the people who need help most in a period of economic transition"?

We think not. These people may need help, but they certainly need help less than the poor, the unemployed, and millions of aging Americans for whom retirement brings a severe slash in income that frequently means ending their days in poverty.

The President gave a thought to these older Americans in his economic speech, proposing that the Congress tie Social Security benefits to the cost of living. This would be helpful, but tying a poverty retirement income to the cost of living would merely guarantee an unruined prolongation of poverty.

It is the gross inadequacy of Social Security benefits that has given privately negotiated pension rights such crucial importance in workers' hopes and plans for retirement. Yet the President was silent with respect to the plight of the many American workers who own no railroads and possess no stock portfolios to speak of, only a private pension promise that offers them hope of a standard of life in retirement beyond the bare minimum possible under Social Security. Public reinsurance of private pension funds—similar to the insurance provided since the 1930s for bank deposits and akin to the backstop Federal protection the President asks for investors—would bring all of us closer together and nearer to fulfillment of the American dream of which Mr. Nixon spoke to such applause in his address to the Junior Chambers of Commerce.

The number of persons dependent upon private pension plans is far greater than the number of Wall Street speculators and Penn-Central stockholders whose problems have generated the urgent concern and precipitate haste of an army of would-be rescuers. Some 28 million persons are presently covered by private pension plans and it is forecast that 42 million will be covered by 1980.

In contrast to the handful of brokerage firms that have experienced difficulties and the one railroad recently forced into receivership, some 4,000 pension plans were terminated in the United States between 1955 and 1965. These terminations, all too frequently, subjected affected workers to the double tragedy of lost jobs and loss of substantial prospective pension rights at a stage in life when they had little or no opportunity to earn further pension entitlement.

We in the UAW have been pressing since 1961 for an insurance program to protect private pension funds. Delegates to a UAW convention that year, comparing the promissory nature of bank deposits and pension plans, declared:

"Pension plans also represent private promises, this time by employers, which they may not be able to keep if they get into deep financial difficulties before the plans have been fully funded. These plans are so widespread and private pensions to supplement social security have become such an integral part of our system of providing for retirement that their protection must also be accepted as an essential feature of public

policy. The catastrophe to the worker who sees the security which his pension rights represent to him swept away by the failure of an employer is just as great as the catastrophe of the depositor who loses his lifetime savings in a bank failure. The solution is essentially the same."

Congress in the relatively prospering early 1960s was not impressed by the reality or urgency of this problem and failed to enact legislation which would have shored up the security of workers' pensions. Then, 5 days before Christmas 1963, the last car came off the South Bend line of the Studebaker Corporation, and as a result some 4,400 workers between the ages of 40 and 59, who had earned a vested pension right through ten or more years of service to the corporation, found that right meaningless when their plant shut down with only enough money in the fund to provide pensions to workers age 60 and over. As a result, workers with as much as 40 years of seniority who, even if they found another job, were too old to start acquiring new pension credits from another employer, were left stranded.

The collapse of Studebaker dramatized the predicament of its workers and of workers in other companies who might also find the paper promises implicit in unfunded pension rights repudiated as a result of plant closings. Still the Congress failed to enact a pension reinsurance law, leaning heavily on the argument that great technical difficulties in framing such a law stood in the way.

As of February 26, 1970, when Walter Reuther made a plea for a pension reinsurance law in one of his last statements to the Congress, the opposition no longer rested on technical difficulties; it was more or less conceded that, as Mr. Reuther said, for a small premium cost spread universally over all plans, they could be protected. The argument had now shifted to the claim that there was no need for such a protective mechanism, since only a small percentage of workers were affected in what was after all but an "incidental failure" of the present system.

Mr. Reuther stated that this is the logic to be expected from a computer but not from a human being. He called for:

"A balanced combination of adequate public and private pension plans, with appropriate public support assuring the fulfillment of expectations of the private sector..."

And he stated:

"As the richest nation in the world we cannot continue to deny our older citizens their measure of economic justice and human dignity. We must act now to assure society's promise to present retirees and to avoid the potential failure for even a small number of the millions of workers rightfully anticipating a secure retirement."

The closing down of plants or operations is not a rare occurrence in any industry in our economy. In our own industry, we think of Hudson, Studebaker, Packard, Kaiser-Fraser as well as a host of smaller companies. Nor has it been rare in recent years for plants to close or operations to end, wiping out the hopes of security in retirement for men and women too old to start from scratch on other jobs. In recent years the UAW has been obliged to close out negotiated pension plans for a variety of reasons: a fire totally destroying the plant; the close-out of a smaller plant bought by a larger company; part of an operation discontinued because an obsolescent plant had become uneconomic. The latest closing of a plant under contract to UAW took place on July 1, 1970, with its pension plan 11 years away from full funding. Among the victims of that closing were a man and a woman, both 52 years old, each with 37 years of service. Because of their age, their entire 37 years with the company were washed out as far as pension benefits are concerned.

When plants are closed down, there is apt to be talk about "the price we pay for progress"—yet that price is too often inequitably distributed, entailing, for example, a more efficient operation for the employer but unemployment and a wiped-out pension promise for the worker. Certainly from the fruits of the progress that we are all supposed to enjoy, assurance can be given that the security of pension benefits will be maintained.

The President speaks of the people who need help in a period of economic transition. But it should be clear that for wage earners and to a somewhat lesser extent for salaried workers, the "transition economy" is not a sometime thing but a permanent aspect of their lives. Blue-collar workers particularly work and live all their lives on the cutting and bruising edges of technological and economic change, in war and peace, in sickness and health, in youth and age. A special White House panel that studied the problems and needs of blue-collar workers has within the last few days transmitted a report to the President urging Administration action to deal with the economic and social needs of such workers, whom the report described as economically trapped and socially scorned. It is primarily these workers and their families, rather than railroad managers and speculators, who need help.

We detect a disproportion in the rationing of the President's concern, a show of preference for a kind of Wall Street or Easy Street welfare state which if indulged by the Congress would come dangerously close to—if it did not actually arrive at—a politics of class verging on the classic Marxian strain.

In this disturbing situation, we feel that the Congress has a strong role to play and a considerable responsibility to play it. The question of establishing a pension reinsurance system has been in Congressional limbo for years. The President of the United States has asked the Congress to produce legislation to insure investors against their losses. We earnestly hope that the Congress will now see the substantive and symbolic merit of enacting a pension reinsurance law without further unseemly delay. Having thus offered assurance of retirement security to American workers, the Congress could then go on with good grace to consider the security needs of Wall Street speculators.

If we are to bring this country together, we are going to have to curb the impulse of Wall Street socialism in favor of much larger doses of Main Street and back-street democracy—on both sides of the railroad tracks. Treating Americans more equally would facilitate our progress not only toward a peacetime economy but toward a more peaceful society as well. Enactment of a law to protect negotiated pension funds would be one firm step in that direction.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD WOODCOCK,  
President.

LIBERAL FOOL TAXPAYER TWICE,  
SHAME ON TAXPAYER

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the lead editorial of the Wall Street Journal of July 8 raised a very pertinent and oft ignored question as to what benefits have accrued from the vast outlays of Federal funds for domestic programs in recent years. For those who would still resolve national problems with more

dollars from Washington, the question of past performances should prove embarrassing. What has happened to staggering sums expended on urban renewal and antipoverty programs, for instance. It would seem that the taxpayers are entitled to an accounting, especially from those who advanced and supported these programs in the recent past.

If an article in the Philadelphia Inquirer of July 8 is any indication, the days of the big Federal spenders are far from over. It seems that former HEW Secretary John W. Gardner, now chairman of the National Urban Coalition, is planning a new mass-membership political organization to deal with the Nation's domestic problems such as race relations, education, housing, and poverty. According to Mr. Gardner, as quoted in the article, the new effort will be slanted not only toward liberals but will include "people who are in the center but want to see progress." Their method of operation will be to influence legislation by large quantities of mail on specific issues to Members of Congress.

When one considers that the liberals in recent years have been responsible for the huge waste of tax dollars on ill-devised and poorly administered schemes, Mr. Gardner's new venture rings like an echo from the recent past. If the same people and philosophies direct this proposed undertaking that squandered vast sums of tax moneys in the last decade, the taxpayer would be well advised to ask of Mr. Gardner and his colleagues an accounting of, say, antipoverty funds, since the inception of this program in the 1960's, along with other ill-fated programs which they would rather forget. To paraphrase an old Indian saying:

Liberal fool taxpayer once, shame on liberal; liberal fool taxpayer twice, shame on taxpayer.

I insert the two above-mentioned items in the RECORD at this point:

#### PRIORITY ON FAILURE

The air is full of talk of reordering national priorities as the Vietnam involvement continues to diminish. The President himself gave impetus to the discussion in his speech stressing that the nation is already in a transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy.

Plainly the Indochina tunnel is still a long one, even if the Administration eventually does get the U.S. out of it. Yet the troops are coming back, and defense spending, although unacceptably high, is declining. So it is none too soon to weigh national priorities, and we are in favor of the principle, depending on what is meant. Unfortunately, what many people mean by it is but feebly grounded in reason and experience.

Liberal Democrats and Republicans in Congress especially have in mind quite simply to turn not only the Federal Government's attention but also more of its money faucet onto America's myriad domestic problems. (At the moment, of course, the proposition sounds slightly academic, with unofficial forecasts suggesting a multibillion-dollar Federal deficit this fiscal year.)

One of the liberals' main complaints about the war over the years has been its cost in relation to those problems; think, they say, what the war's \$30 billion or so a year could have done for the nation's beleaguered cities, crowded schools and hospitals, the poverty of disadvantaged minorities and other citizens.

The problems are bad enough, everyone knows. So much having been granted, the argument that the Government should spend its Indochina "savings" on them, plus considerable additional money no doubt, involves a couple of leaps in logic that ought not to be allowed to pass unchallenged.

First, it is not the case that the public sector has been starved, that favorite theme of John Kenneth Galbraith and others. War outlays notwithstanding, Federal domestic spending has risen more than they have, in fact at fantastic rates. As Milton Friedman asks (and these columns have often asked), what has the public been getting for it all? The answer is, not much, if indeed anything of value at all.

Scores of billions of Federal dollars have poured into the cities in recent years, and yet in many ways—convenience, environment, "quality of life," to name a few—the cities are worse off than ever. When you get down to specific Federal urban programs, horror stories abound.

So-called urban renewal and public housing, for example, are notorious for their failures. The barracks-like structures designed to replace slums have often turned into new slums. Worse, bureaucratic inhumanity has evicted many poor people without providing alternative accommodations, or accommodations at rents they could afford.

Under the Federal aegis, the nation's transportation is chaotic. A number of the nation's vital and potentially highly efficient railroads are in parlous state, while the highways and streets in and around urban areas are clogged with autos and trucks beyond belief and patience. Some coordination, not to mention the money.

The Federal effort to pull people out of poverty, albeit well intentioned, is a dubious effort at best. True, people are rising out of poverty all the time, encouragingly so, but it is largely the result of the workings of, and the opportunities available in, a relatively free economy. Manifestly the outpouring of Federal funds in this and other directions has failed to ease the hatreds and factionalisms now marring our society.

So it goes. The public and its representatives ought to think long and hard before deciding to spend vast new sums, from any Vietnam dividend or the inflationary printing-press or both, on further such exercises in futility. Why, moreover, should the hard-working citizens who pay the bulk of the oppressive taxes be forced to subsidize more of this kind of failure?

We know it is anathema to those who long to get their hands on military money to widen the Government's domestic role, but the real priority should be on giving the people and the economy more leeway, with far less of a burden of Federal spending and taxation. That is how the nation has always prospered, materially and spiritually, and that is how it could again.

#### MASS-MEMBERSHIP CRUSADE IS ENVISIONED TO ELIMINATE NATION'S NAGGING PROBLEMS

(By James K. Batten)

WASHINGTON.—One day sometime in August, 200,000 letters will be dumped into Washington's Post Office headed for unsuspecting citizens in every state in the Union.

The recipients, identified by the hawkers of high-priced mailing lists as public-spirited, good-hearted Americans, will be invited to join a new crusade aimed at nothing less than saving the Republic from disintegration.

The man behind this visionary scheme is not some religious crackpot, a right-wing zealot or a hot-eyed revolutionary of the New Left.

He is John W. Gardner, the widely respected scholar-politician who served as secretary of health, education and welfare

in the Johnson Administration and now is chairman of the National Urban Coalition.

Gardner has confirmed that he and his colleagues at the Urban Coalition are about to launch an unprecedented mass-membership political organization to help America pull up its socks and get on with the business at hand.

"There are a lot of people out there," Gardner declared in an interview, "who want to be part of something that's moving—to be able to join a large-scale citizens' effort to solve the problems of his country."

This grass-roots organization—which still has no name—will be pragmatic and non-partisan, he explained, not competing with the Democrats and Republicans but goading them to do better.

The focus will be on efforts to deal with the nation's nagging problems of race relations, education, housing, poverty and the like.

Gardner drew a parallel with the Populist movement of the late 1800s, which eventually faded as the major parties began adopting large chunks of the Populist platform.

"We're set up for people to steal our thunder. We'll say 'great—take it and run,'" Gardner explained. "We will needle both parties and do everything we can to encourage leadership."

Inevitably, rumors about Gardner's new enterprise have in turn triggered talk in Washington that he was building a base for an unannounced Presidential candidacy in 1972.

This gossip has been spurred along by Gardner's outspoken disenchantment with President Nixon.

Both Gardner and his closest associates, however, insist that he has no such intentions.

"I personally am not inclined to politics," Gardner said. His new organization he added, would be doomed from the start if people suspected it was merely a front for a Gardner-for-President campaign organization.

"I literally cannot see how I could be a candidate—even in my own mind—and make that organization go," he said.

While plans for the new organization are still taking shape, Gardner grows almost rhapsodic in discussing his views of its potential for American politics.

"I would like to see this organization bring about a Renaissance in the political life in this country," he declared enthusiastically.

"I would like to think it would be a factor in rehabilitating the political process-making politics again a worthy calling for Americans."

At the moment, Gardner added sadly, politics rarely attracts the nation's best talent.

"There are some very good guys in politics—and God knows we don't deserve them—but there are also a lot of hacks. By and large, the political parties have fallen into the hands of hacks."

In the last year, the 57-year-old Gardner—by nature a quiet, reflective man—has become something of a blunt-spoken, latter-day Jeremiah.

He has warned again and again that the nation's racial, economic and political divisions are cutting dangerously deep.

In one memorable statement a few weeks ago, Gardner declared: "And while each of us pursues his selfish interest and comforts himself by blaming others, the nation disintegrates. I use the phrase soberly: The nation disintegrates."

Now Gardner has decided to take his own advice and try something new.

His proposed organization, which he has already discussed in private with members of Congress and others, will be an offshoot of the Urban Coalition Action Council, the lobbying arm of the Urban Coalition.

As Gardner and his staff see it, the new organization will attract thousands of people who have not been active in politics and who may lack strong ideological convictions—but who share a deep apprehension about where the nation is headed.

"We think there's a great hunger on the part of individual citizens to make themselves heard," explained a Gardner lieutenant.

"We're interested not just in the guy who's always supported liberal causes, but also in people who are in the center but want to see progress."

For dues of \$10 or \$15 a year—the figure has not yet been set—members will be kept informed of current issues in Washington, especially in Congress.

Using the same lobbying techniques used so effectively by groups like the National Rifle Association, Gardner and his aides believe that their organization can produce great volumes of well-timed mail and telegrams to sway key votes in the House and Senate.

Also, members will be furnished information and suggestions on how to work effectively for political goals in their home communities.

Gardner conceded that many people may regard his scheme as naive and idealistic, without much chance of having any serious impact.

"There just isn't any way of knowing," he said. "It's a big gamble. But we're going to go for broke."

## RAMPAGING INFLATION

### HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, once again I call attention to the wild inflation that is threatening the very existence of our Nation while the present administration sits idly by watching the destructive forces at work.

On this occasion I call attention to our plight by placing in the RECORD an article written by John Kenneth Galbraith on the low estate of our economy and steps that can be taken to halt inflation.

Professor Galbraith's article should awaken all, and above all the slumberers in the executive department, to the need for rapid action to end inflation and the unemployment that is sweeping the Nation. It is my continuing opinion that the Congress, with every means at its command, should whiplash the President, his advisers and aides into affirmative and fruitful action.

The article follows:

GALBRAITH ASKS FOR WAGE, PRICE CURBS TO STOP INFLATION

(By John Kenneth Galbraith)

These last few months have, just possibly, been decisive in the modern history of economics.

Ideas in which economists have reposed the greatest confidence have been proved wrong and therewith, not surprisingly, the responding policy. And this has happened under circumstances which admit of no really plausible explanation, rationalization or alibi—things in which we economists are more than minimally accomplished.

There was, to be sure, more than a suspicion of error before; the evidence was high-

ly adverse to the reputable ideas. But the heretics were a minority and the adverse evidence could be attributed to a lag. In economics, any inconvenient disassociation of effect from cause is always attributed to a lag. But not forever.

The doctrine was, of course, that the United States economy could be regulated by general measures in such manner that prices would be approximately stable. A "trade-off," a new and popular word among economists, would exist between price stability and employment. The closer the approach to the level prices, the more people who would be out of work; the lower the unemployment, the greater the rate of price increase.

The Nixon economists when they came to office a year ago last January were superlatively confident of such management. Under their guidance, the President promised never to interfere with wages and prices; in one of the more ecstatic examples of economic phrase-making, he said that inflation would be ended by "fine-tuning" the American economy—a figure of speech roughly comparable with one about fine-tuning a major Mississippi flood.

The then current inflation was blamed on the previous bad management of the economy—on tuning that, that was too coarse. The reaction to anyone who suggested that wage and price restraint might be necessary was lofty.

Pierre Rinfret, the consulting economist, dispatched a letter to his clients telling them, quite correctly, that so far as the administration was concerned, the lid on prices was now off. It is possible that in these first weeks the administration did more to promote inflation than it accomplished in the next year and a half in controlling it.

But promises that inflation would end were not lacking. Advising the President of the United States on economic policy, since few presidents find the subject at all interesting, is tedious work. The tedium is relieved, after a fashion, but the liturgical functions of the office.

As the promises continued, so at an increasing rate did the inflation.

Dr. Paul W. McCracken, the head of the council of economic advisers, became, perhaps, the most overpromised man in the history of the economics profession. There is an unfortunate tendency in public life when you want something to happen to predict that it will happen. And then when it does not happen, you escalate the predictions.

Not since Herbert Hoover predicted the turning of the immortal corner has prediction therapy been so remorselessly pursued as in the last 18 months. It was called the "game plan" for defeating inflation. There has been no game quite like it since the Rose Bowl of 1929, when Roy Riegels ran 75 yards toward the wrong goal.

As the Kennedy and Johnson economists returned to the campus, talk of wage and price restraint was muted. The guideposts were defended as a useful adjunct to the policy—more cosmetic than real: It was fiscal and monetary policy that really counted.

Almost no one talked about making the guidelines mandatory, I.E., making them work. That was too radical.

There was never any strong proof that high employment and stable prices could be combined. Much of the proof antedated modern corporate price-making and collective bargaining. Rather there were hope and faith.

But in economics, hope and faith coexist with great scientific pretension and also a deep desire for respectability.

Fiscal and monetary measures in whatever mix are impeccably respectable, and the question of the particular mix is the kind of thing that can be resolved between gentlemen.

Control of wages and prices has no similar standing. Its advocates have been thought

to lack subtlety of mind and manners—to go too abruptly to the point. The sociology of economics is not without interest and by no means unimportant.

The flaw in the respectable doctrine is the appalling obduracy of circumstances. Wages do not shove up prices. Prices do pull up wages. The bargaining that produces the wage and price increases continues even under conditions of severe fiscal and monetary restraint. Circumstances can be unbelievably cruel.

Accordingly, after a full year and half of the most rigorous application of the general measures, prices are still rising at a nearly record rate.

Meanwhile unemployment has risen to nearly 5 per cent of the labor force and exceedingly uncomfortable side effects of the policy have appeared.

Smaller business men who must borrow money are being punished with a highly selective brutality. Tight money does not much hurt the big corporation which has internal cash flow and favored position at the banks. In contrast the policy has put the housing industry into an acute depression, as the administration itself concedes.

The continuing price increases in the private sector of the economy have been exported to the public sector as increases in living costs. And there, among teachers, police, firemen and sanitation workers, they are causing an unprecedented but wholly predictable turmoil. The balance of payments is also weakening again.

Finally, there has been the effect on the financial markets. These had been made vulnerable by jerry-built and debt-burdened conglomerates, overbitten glamour stocks and the multiplication of the mutual funds headed by financial geniuses whose genius consisted only in a rising market under the pressure of the tight money policy, this price structure has collapsed. This had to happen sometime. But further pressure on the financial market would be very uncomfortable for all involved.

Within the framework of general measures, there is almost nothing the administration can do. It is trapped. It could allow an increase in loanable funds at lower rates.

This would ease unemployment, encourage home construction and ease the sorrow in Wall street. But inflation is still at a near-record rate. This action would make it worse. And just ahead are wage negotiations which, with the compensating price increases, will give that inflation protean shove.

To continue the present policy is to accept the side effects and to invite more of the inflation that the policy has not cured. To tighten up and end the inflation is to invite worse side effects and perhaps a serious recession.

Economics, like foreign policy, allows for an escape from error thru what may be called the Indochina effect.

This generous device enables a man who has been wrong to denounce his previous position without admitting error and, by becoming right, thus greatly to enhance his reputation. Arthur Burns, now chairman of the federal reserve board, has taken this route.

He now demands the wage-price guideposts he previously condemned. His transmigration is still incomplete, for he proposes something less strong than the Kennedy-Johnson measures.

The only answer is one that has for so long been dismissed as too disreputable. That is to act directly on the wage-price spiral—to have wage and price control where the spiral contributes actively to inflation.

This must be real control. Dr. Burns and the economists of the Kennedy-Johnson period are ducking reality when they talk about a return to the voluntary guideposts.

The guideposts will not do. They were

strong enough before; even stronger measures are now required. Also voluntary measures are highly discriminatory. They favor the individual or organization which refuses to comply and penalize those that are cooperative. This guarantees their eventual breakdown. And there is nothing to be said for Billingsgate as an enforcement device. It is much better public practice to lay down fair firm rules after careful consultation with all concerned and then, when someone violates the rules, have resort to law.

Given wage and price controls, interest rates can be reduced for they will not have to carry the present burden of inflation control, which they cannot control anyway.

With lower rates, home construction would increase, the pressure on small business would be reduced, employment would rise, and all without a new surge of inflation.

Were this policy combined with prompt withdrawal from Indochina—which would ease the pressure of demand and, a more important matter, restore our reputation for elementary good sense—the immediate economic problem would be largely solved.

Such price and wage action, it is said, interferes with free markets. This is self-evident nonsense.

The policy interferes with markets in which the interference of unions and corporations is already plenary. It fixes in the public interest prices that are already fixed.

Only prices that are so set by unions and strong corporations need to be [or should be] controlled. Prices of farm products, most services and products of small manufacturers need not and should not be touched. These are still subject to market influences.

Where prices are still set by the market, general measures to restrict demand still work—or they do as much as can be done. One does not need to interfere with the market where the market still governs.

Over the years I have experimented with various ideas for such a limited system of wage and price control. [I am not without experience in the matter or in the difficulties involved. During World War II, price control was under my direction from its inception until mid-1943. No one else, I suppose, has ever fixed so many prices.]

But the most practical pending proposal is not mine, but that of Robert Roosa, former under secretary of the treasury under Kennedy and now a leading Wall street banker.

He would simply freeze all prices and wages for six months. During this time, presumably, there would be extensive consultation with firms and unions to work out a more durable system of restraint.

Such a course would get immediate results while offering eventual accommodation to the problems and inequities of particular unions and industries.

It would be possible to incorporate in the Roosa proposal arrangements of an even earlier correction of gross irregularities. And immediately after the freeze, all small enterprises—those employing, say, fewer than a hundred people—should be exempted.

I would also exempt all retail firms; they have little independent market power.

The objective is not perfectly level prices, but something much better than the grossly inflationary thrust of the present wage-price spiral. The long-run objective is, of course, an annual wage gain that accords roughly with the increase in productivity and thus requires no general increase in prices.

Controls are not a temporary expedient. There must, also, be a permanent system of restraint. That is because we will continue to have strong unions and strong corporations and a desire to minimize unemployment. The combination, in the absence of controls, is inflationary. It will not become otherwise in the future.

No one who has had experience with wartime price control will be casual about the problems in managing it. Nor is it a formula

for popularity; everyone unites in disliking the price-fixer.

But if it is confined to the unions and to the corporations with market power, the administrative structure need not be vast. Dealings will be with only a few hundred unions and a few thousand firms, and for the latter it is sufficient to specify the limits within which average as distinct from individual prices may be moved.

All price and wage control involves an arbitrary exercise of public power. But this is not an objection, for it replaces an arbitrary exercise of private power and one that has further and exceedingly arbitrary effects for those that suffer from the resulting inflation.

In the weeks and months ahead, more and more economists will come to accept the remedy here proposed—including, one suspects, those who advise the President. They are very decent men who have been substituting hope for reality, and hope unrequited does not sustain even an official economist forever.

Promises of eventual prices stability have become comic. Within the older framework of policy, the choice is between very severe inflation—worse than now—or severe unemployment, extreme distortion with the economy, great turmoil among public employees, and serious strain in the financial markets—and along with all this, a good deal of inflation, too.

Whoever made respectable economic policy a choice between such repellent alternatives had obviously a bad upbringing and is a very mean man. But so it is. So the less reputable course of controlling the wage-price bargaining obtrudes itself. And, since there is no escape, it will continue to obtrude itself.

#### EULOGY FOR AL ATKINSON

### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, all of Capitol Hill was stunned recently with the news of the sudden death of one of the most capable, knowledgeable lobbyists in Washington—Al Atkinson of the Communications Workers of America.

I was a freshman in the 86th Congress and Al became legislative representative of the CWA in the middle of the second session of that Congress. In all the years since then, in countless meetings and legislative sessions and committee hearings, I never knew him to be other than totally honest and genuinely willing to work with others.

In these sad days since his death, I have heard dozens of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle remark that his particular integrity and truth will be sorely missed. We could always count on him for specific answers to questions, for a willingness to put in untold hours of work on a bill, and for a rare ability for keeping a cooler head than most in trying situations.

Al Atkinson was a close personal friend and adviser. Those of us who had an opportunity to work with him over these past 10 tumultuous years will miss him greatly.

Mrs. Pucinski joins me in extending heartfelt condolences to Mrs. Atkinson and their two children. They have a memory of a man who was proud of his work and whose pride was reflected in everything he did.

#### IMPORTANT CURBS SHOULD NOT DAMAGE FOREIGN RELATIONS

### HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, one of the arguments raised against the Mills textile garment-footwear import bill is that its passage would provoke our trading partners, especially Japan, into enacting reprisals in the form of trade barriers against U.S. goods. But in fact Japan has long maintained various barriers against U.S. trade which have helped create the severe trade imbalance in Japan's favor between our two countries.

I commend to my colleagues' attention the following editorial from the Columbia, South Carolina State of June 30, 1970, which cogently develops this point:

#### IMPORT CURBS SHOULD NOT DAMAGE FOREIGN RELATIONS

At long last, the Nixon administration has flashed the green light for textile import curbs. It has come not a moment too soon. American textile jobs are being washed away every day by the flood of imports from the Far East.

It is therefore imperative that the House finish work on the bill, chiefly sponsored by House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Wilbur Mills, and that the Senate which seems to prefer debates of limited purpose to substantive action, give the legislation priority attention.

We can expect more speeches of course, to the effect that this bill is protectionist, that it goes counter to America's long commitment to free trade. Perhaps it is, to an extent, but it must be remembered that the United States is about the only real free trader in the world today.

New Hampshire Sen. Norris Cotton made this point most forcefully in a major speech in support of the Mills bill two weeks ago. "The free flow of goods—free trade—should be our goal. At present, we do not have a free flow of goods. Every nation with whom we trade has, in some form and to some extent, barriers against American goods—tariffs, quotas, import licenses and so on. We alone raise no such barriers . . . Free trade must be a two-way street; otherwise it is not free trade."

There has been a good, solid, historic reason for America's big-hearted view toward international trade. For decades, the United States has been the world's economic and industrial Goliath. After World War II, we set out to rebuild the shattered economies of Europe and Japan. We could afford to take a generous view and we repeatedly gave up more in trade negotiations than we received.

This attitude helped our friends and allies abroad to regain their economic strength. As strong foreign competitors appeared in virtually every industry, American Presidents were reluctant to risk damage to foreign relations by taking a stronger stand in trade negotiations, by administratively restraining imports undercutting U.S. industry, or by supporting legislation to do this.

But, as Senator Cotton has said, "the world of the 1970s is a very different world from the one we knew in the past. We can no longer afford to squander economic advantage for uncertain political or foreign relations gains."

The Japanese, who have raised the greatest hue and cry over the Mills bill, are in no position to charge the United States with protectionism. While Japan's own bustling industries have a well-protected corner on the rich home market, that nation has built

up a \$1.5 billion annual trade surplus with the United States, which of course poses a terrific strain on the dollar.

Furthermore, the Nixon administration, and its predecessors, have negotiated in good faith with the Japanese over a long period of time in an effort to gain voluntary controls over imports of wools and man-made fibers (items covered by the Mills bill). The Japanese have been unyielding even after it was all but certain that they were forcing Congress' hand. When the last round of talks collapsed last week, the Administration had only one responsible course of action left—support the Mills bill.

Senator Cotton believes this will impose no foreign relations risk. "Rather, I suspect we will gain further respect from them (the Japanese). They are able competitors and they are known to respect strength in those they deal with in business and government."

The Mills bill will not by any means shut Japan and other Far East exporters of cut-rate textiles out of the American market. It will merely limit imports to allow the severely damaged American textile industry to recover. Furthermore, the Mills bill has a handy clause which will exclude from its provisions any country which negotiates voluntary restraints. It will be, in effect, a lever, a bargaining tool.

We will be very surprised indeed if the Japanese or other nations attempt any serious reprisals as a result of this legislation. They need us and we need them. They must learn to sympathize with our problems as we sympathize with theirs. The relationship is too strong and the business too good to make a trade war likely.

#### UNITED NATIONS SHOULD CONTAIN ALL NATIONS, U THANT DECLARES

#### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary General of the United Nations has urged that "the universality of the United Nations" should be "the priority item" for this year.

Speaking in San Francisco on June 26, U Thant said:

The absence of the People's Republic of China and of the divided countries has given to the United Nations a great deal of artificiality.

The Secretary General added:

The simple people in the street, those whose sons are dying in far away countries, cannot understand why the United Nations is not seized with the most burning issue of 1970, the war in Indo-China. Rhetoric and intelligence are not enough to explain the reasons to them. They demand, as concerned citizens of the world, that their national leaders and international officials find the means, through necessary vision and elevation, to solve urgently this fundamental problem. I therefore urge Governments to consider the idea of the universality of the United Nations as the priority item of this year's agenda for world affairs.

With unanimous consent the full text of his speech of June 26 is set out at this point in the RECORD:

#### ON GIVING THE CHARTER A CHANCE

All of us who work in the United Nations are deeply grateful for the opportunity

which the Mayor and citizens of San Francisco have so generously given us to celebrate here the twenty-first anniversary of the signing of the Charter of the United Nations.

To return to San Francisco is not only to come back to a beautiful, gracious and civilized city; for us in the United Nations, it is also to return to the birthplace of the Organization and to the congenial and forward-looking atmosphere in which the Charter was created. Here we are reminded of the sense of dedication and urgency, tempered with realism and a vivid awareness of the horrors of war, which inspired the authors of the Charter 25 years ago. If we have not yet succeeded in realizing their vision of a world at peace, we can still draw inspiration from the ideals and objectives which they set out with full support from the peoples. Our best tribute to them is to increase our efforts to strengthen the United Nations.

This is the third time that the representatives of the United Nations—national ambassadors and international Secretariat—have come back to San Francisco to celebrate the signing of the Charter.

Fifteen years ago, in 1955, this ceremony took place in an atmosphere of cautious optimism at a time when the world seemed to be awakening from the tribulations of the post-war period and the long winter of the cold war.

Five years ago we gathered here again in a less happy mood to speak of a world in which new problems and new conflicts had dimmed the hopes of a just and peaceful world order—hopes encouraged by the great political emancipation of decolonization and the possibility of emancipation from drudgery made possible by science and technology. At that time, the United Nations itself was in the throes of a crisis which had arisen over the fundamental issue of financing peace-keeping operations.

Now we meet again in a mood of uncertainty and anxiety, with only the knowledge that humanity is moving at an increasing speed in uncertain directions, and that time is running short. I hope we can make use of this opportunity, so generously afforded by the City of San Francisco, to turn the tables on the forces of doubt and gloom, in order to survey calmly, but with a sense of urgency, the course we must take in the next 25 years.

Like many institutions, the United Nations is today facing a crisis of confidence. It has been the lot of institutions throughout history to have their usefulness questioned from time to time by the people. This process serves a useful purpose in keeping institutions up to the mark.

In our time, this disillusionment has undoubtedly reached a new pitch. The United Nations, as a relatively young institution, faces a crisis of confidence without ever having emerged, as some older institutions have, from relative impotence to a position of accepted power and authority.

If we are to respond to this challenge, nations, especially the great nations, must improve and change the quality and performance of the United Nations and the way it is used. There can be no question of taking the easy but suicidal way out by consigning the United Nations, along with other institutions, to the dusty attic of history. In an age where physical conservation has become an urgent issue, a degree of institutional conservation may also be in order.

Institutions must constantly adapt and develop in response to new challenges. In our time, the inherent obsolescence of institutions has been emphasized by the extraordinary rate of change in the way we live. I scarcely need to remind you that the membership of the United Nations has grown from 51 in 1945 to 126 today; that the world's

population has increased from under two and half billion in 1945 to well over three and a half billion today; that in the next 38 years this population is likely to be doubled again; that more than half the people of the world were not born when the Charter was signed 25 years ago; that in this quarter century we have seen the advent of nuclear energy and weapons, intercontinental missiles, space exploration, computer technology and comparable advances in medicine, biology, biochemistry and other branches of science, accompanied by revolutionary advances in the techniques of communication.

These, and a hundred other developments, have changed our lives and our prospects on a scale and at a speed never experienced before in history. It is small wonder that those of us who grew up in the twenties and thirties may sometimes be regarded as antediluvian by the youth of today, who are tempted to reject many of the habits and ways of doing things which we have always taken for granted. This reaction should not dismay or surprise us. It should rather encourage us to adapt our ideals, our behavior and our institutions to meet the challenges which we ourselves have created, and to lean on the younger generation to help us meet the urgent demands of change.

The widespread disillusionment of the young with institutions is now more important than ever for another, more encouraging, reason. The younger generation of today is, in general, more widely conscious of what goes on and what is wrong in the world than their predecessors. Much to their credit, they are also far more demanding and concerned about it. It is thus increasingly difficult for institutions which do not fulfill their objectives to command respect.

An acute observer of the international scene recently wrote that "All institutions provide a temptation for their members to clothe selfishness in the language of idealism". Our twenty-fifth anniversary is a most appropriate occasion to ponder this uncomfortably shrewd comment.

I do not think that responsible people anywhere doubt the need for a world organization or the validity of the basic ideals and objectives of the United Nations, which were set out here in San Francisco 25 years ago. On the contrary, the world has never before so urgently required a universal organization which can build and maintain a peaceful and safe terrestrial society, and the United Nations is undoubtedly the best—in fact the only—existing organization with the potential capacity for that task. What we should be asking ourselves in this twenty-fifth anniversary year is how can we make the United Nations the organization we know we need, and what changes in attitudes and priorities are imperative for this purpose.

This evening I can only briefly summarize the new approaches which seem indispensable to me.

First and foremost, there must be on the part of Governments a radical change from present power politics to a policy of collective responsibility towards mankind. Governments, especially those of the great nations, have drifted year after year farther away from this basic requirement of the Charter.

As matters stand, the management of world affairs lies essentially in the hands of nations. A successful management of the world therefore depends on the behaviour of nations. The justice, peace, security, prosperity, health, cleanliness, and the beauty of our world must become the prime preoccupation of Governments. The world is too small, its people are too intelligent and the mass problems that lie in store for us are too frightening to allow continued blind acceptance of the sacrosanct concept of national interest.

World affairs are no longer foreign affairs of Governments. They have become internal affairs of all.

Where has national interest led us? To an arsenal of ugly weapons, which cost humanity 200 billion dollars a year; to the greatest historical deadlock between Big Powers that the world has ever seen; to north-south, east-west, ideological, racial and economic cleavages; to a belt of divided countries; to a series of smouldering or active conflicts stretching across the globe.

No big Power will be able to solve these problems alone. No big Power will ever rule the world alone. No nation will ever be able to live again in splendid isolation.

Since the weight and cleavage of interests is greatest among the big Powers, I have recently recommended that their Heads of State, Heads of Government or Foreign Ministers, including the People's Republic of China, meet from time to time at one of the offices of the United Nations in a neutral country to initiate a change from confrontation and division to the building of a safe and peaceful world. I have made this proposal because I feel that it is high time that the People's Republic of China is involved in international affairs. Are not the events in South-East Asia, the 750 million people of mainland China and its recent emergence as an atomic and satellite Power enough evidence that the People's Republic of China is a key element if we are to move towards a solution of many of the present world problems? This is also why I have recommended a reactivation of the Geneva Agreements and, more recently, proposed a new Geneva conference on South-East Asia in which the People's Republic of China would participate.

Second, and still having the People's Republic of China in mind, I recommend that the United Nations be made universal. The absence of the People's Republic of China and of the divided countries has given to the United Nations a great deal of artificiality.

The simple people in the street, those whose sons are dying in far away countries, cannot understand why the United Nations is not seized with the most burning issue of 1970, the war in Indo-China. Rhetoric and intelligence are not enough to explain the reasons to them. They demand, as concerned citizens of the world, that their national leaders and international officials find the means, through necessary vision and elevation, to solve urgently this fundamental problem. I therefore urge Governments to consider the idea of the universality of the United Nations as the priority item of this year's agenda for world affairs.

Third, we must resolve, with new determination and will, the dangerously deteriorating situation in the Middle East. The world is increasingly alarmed at the trend of events in that theatre of hostilities. In this case, the conflict is within the responsibilities of the United Nations. Big Power responsibilities in the context of the Charter of the United Nations have been acknowledged.

But here again we have the vivid illustration of a deadlock nourished by claims, counter-claims, arguments, positions, counter-positions, accusations, denials, attacks and counter-attacks. Again the simple man in the street wonders why the people in this region cannot live in peace.

During the three years following the 1967 war, there has been no evidence that the issues of the Middle East conflict can be settled by the parties through their own efforts. Therefore, international assistance should be increased and intensified. Here, the United Nations has a definite role to play, and in the past few days there have been indications that the permanent members of the Security Council have made perceptible progress in their common search for a just and lasting peace.

Fourth, I believe that it is high time that we look more inquisitively into the obstacle of ideologies. From the vantage point of the United Nations, the crisis of extreme inward-looking nationalism is further aggravated by the superimposition of ideologies or political systems which claim that they alone have the key to man's future.

There has been nothing more dangerous and more damaging in human history than the claim of exclusivism. To it we owe the long religious wars, all waged in the name of exclusive possession of the truth. It is only recently that there has been evidence of tolerance and some mutual understanding in the pursuit of common religious objectives.

Should we again lose precious years in a similar divisive exercise? Is it so difficult to recognize that systems and ideologies are perfect only in theory?

We must realize that adaptation and change are imperative to the survival of social systems and institutions. Indeed the world has become so complex, the pace of change so rapid and the newly emerging problems so numerous, that no rigid system, however well established on a few sacrosanct principles, is able to cope with all problems. I believe that we are about to embark on the most variegated search for political, institutional, legal and moral solutions to the social problems of our time.

In a world of many billions of people, who are divided into highly industrialized societies as well as regions of extreme poverty, each with their own culture and special problems, there can be no universal recipe or system. Nations must therefore enrich each other with what has proved good in the art of governing men.

Private initiative may be the solution in one case, public initiative may be the answer in another. Many countries have demonstrated that the two can coexist and that one can admirably complement or even correct and stimulate the other. Each system has good and bad aspects.

Those who have the difficult task of governing should recognize that such an art must be highly flexible and non-dogmatic in a rapidly changing world. The earlier we recognize this, the sooner we will reach an accord and understanding among nations, and such recognition will conform to one of the basic purposes and principles of the Charter that the United Nations shall be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations.

Fifth, we must look anew at the categories of vast unsolved world-wide problems such as economic and social development, justice and human rights, with which the United Nations, through its system of specialized agencies and the United Nations aid programmes, have come to grips during the last 25 years. Much more needs to be done. Economic aid must become a matter of international justice and progress and not remain an appendix of divisive power politics and influence. Individual rights must be upheld and protected and not remain the dead letter of lofty declarations. The present anarchy and absence of the rule of law at the international level is a constant invitation to dissension and conflicts. Progress must be made towards the adherence to international law.

Sixth and last, we must diagnose, monitor and face together the new collective challenges and dangers which arise from a rapidly mushrooming scientific and technological civilization accompanied by unprecedented mass phenomena. If not, while Governments are actively bent on spending the best of their intelligence, people, resources and energies trying in vain to advance their respective zones of influence, the world will rapidly deteriorate behind their backs and above their heads.

There is, I am glad to say, a new movement in the United Nations to face these problems through the initiative of various Governments, from the largest to the smallest. The Organization has become concerned with such problems as population, outer space, the peaceful uses of the sea-bed, and, more recently, the most complex question of all, the preservation of our environment.

This is a step in the right direction, but only a step, and it would be naive, if not dishonest, to pretend that efforts to grapple with these problems of the future are not still seriously impeded by political difficulties and attitudes, which are largely a remnant from the past. For this reason, the advancement from inward-looking nationalism to active international commitment must still have priority among our aims, for our hopes of success depend upon it even in fields which are not primarily political.

Progress in solving the problems of the environment may well show how far this new concern for problems of the future can lead us. A few weeks ago, I suggested that urgent consideration be given to creating a global authority to study and act on environmental problems in the interest of all earth-dwellers, and that, if it were to be of real value, this authority should have powers to police and enforce its decisions. I hope that this suggestion will not be taken simply as a well-meaning idealistic exercise, for I believe that our capacity to preserve and enhance life on our planet may well depend on our ability to set up a new kind of international institution with new authority.

Of course, the possible form and methods of operation of such an institution are very complex and will take time and effort to work out, but that is all the more reason for making an early start, and the hour is already late. I also believe that if this step could successfully be taken, it might help us to find solutions to some of our other problems and a way out of some of the emotional, ideological and political blind alleys in which we, in the United Nations, now spend so much of our time and energy.

Ladies and gentlemen, no one can accuse me of having been impatient during my eight and a half years of service with the United Nations. Some have even accused me of being too patient. I have made every effort in the privacy of my functions to be of help and to bring people and their points of view closer together. I will continue this task in the same manner until the end of my mandate.

But, on this solemn occasion, when the eyes of the world are focused on us, I must most emphatically warn nations not to pursue their present outmoded and fratricidal course. Time is running short. People are getting impatient. We need a fresh start: we need a fresh look. Governments must be able, once again, to lift themselves to the same high level of determination and vision as that of the authors of the Charter.

Sages tell us that if there is a will, there is a way. We have the way, but there seems to be diminishing will and increasing discouragement.

The Charter drafted here 25 years ago is still our best chance. May nations therefore, especially the powerful ones, give it at last a real chance.

#### PICTUREPHONES?

**HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, The Bell System is installing its new picture-phones in Pittsburgh, Pa. This news

has an ironic twist for those of us who have to struggle with deteriorating telephone service in New York City. The following is an editorial comment on the matter in the New York Post, July 2, 1970.

**SORRY, THAT FACE HAS BEEN DISCONNECTED**

It's interesting to contemplate some of the sights the new picturephone will focus on when the Bell System gets around to introducing it here, after a trial run in Pittsburgh.

The first view will probably be the tormented expression of a caller waiting for a dial tone. Or it might be the dogged look of someone trying to dislodge his dime from a vandalized coin slot, the bewilderment sweeping the face of the person who keeps dialing the right number and keeps getting the wrong party, or the flagging features of the guy who repeatedly encounters an out-of-order message whenever he dials a phone he knows to be functioning in his own home.

Picturephones will also add titillating new dimensions to the daily lives of those telephone company employees, who, according to recent reports, arbitrarily monitor hundreds of thousands of personal calls in a check-up called "service observation."

The last significant observation of service here, undertaken by the Federal Communications Commission in January, found it to be the worst in the nation. For that reason, Pittsburgh rather than New York was chosen by the Bell people for yesterday's first commercial installation of the picturephone. The new device is an impressive piece of sophisticated technology. But for the moment New Yorkers would settle for more modest reforms. Like just hearing the sound of a voice.

**DEBT OF HONOR**

**HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have seen the scandalous conditions in veterans hospitals cannot believe that they can continue to exist in the richest country in the world.

Whatever our differences on the war, we ought to be able to agree that those who have been wounded and maimed fighting it should have the best medical care available.

I hope the President and the leaders of both parties will read the editorial in Tuesday's Washington Star, another voice in the national outcry against this disgrace, and then act to do something about it. I am inserting the editorial in the RECORD.

**DEBT OF HONOR**

It would seem to be an elementary rule of decency that men wounded in our nation's wars should be cared for by the people for whom they fought. Yet a combination of budget-scrimping, ignorance and bureaucratic failure—all of it amounting to neglect—has resulted unconscionably in an increase of suffering for some victims of the hostilities in Vietnam.

The evidence of this neglect cannot be discounted. Testimony before a subcommittee headed by Senator Cranston of California included authoritative accounts of filthy conditions, inadequate staffing, obsolete and uncomfortable buildings, broken equipment and lack of space in many Veterans Administration hospitals. Assurances from the VA that all is well have a hollow sound besides the

tales of disillusioned veterans who thought their country would do what it could to compensate for their sacrifice.

Making the VA mess all the more inexplicable is the fact that, in other respects, our soldiers are treated better than ever. Their equipment is the best in the world, and they enjoy more amenities in the battle zones than their counterparts in past wars. They have a better chance of surviving serious wounds because of efficient evacuation methods and quick surgical attention. There have been few complaints about the military hospitals, where most of the wounded recuperate for further duty.

But the level of attention to the needs of the wounded man drops off sharply at the point where it is determined he cannot return to duty and must be discharged and sent to a VA hospital for long-term care. In such a case the patient may be permanently disabled, having paid a price as great as death itself for the privilege of serving his country.

It is particularly fitting in the wake of the star-studded Fourth of July festivities—at which we were exhorted to realize how great a nation we are—to consider whether we seem so great to a paralyzed veteran waiting to be tended in an understaffed hospital.

There is plenty of blame to spread—among this administration, Congress and their predecessors—for the failure to provide the best possible care for the most seriously wounded of the returning veterans. It is more important, though, to rectify the situation immediately.

The administration has asked for a \$122 million increase in the VA medical budget, and Cranston would add another \$174 million. These amounts may not be enough. But whatever is needed to make VA medical care the best there is, the American people ought to provide it.

**PUBLISHER PUSHES FOR THE LIFE OF A QUEEN**

**HON. LEE H. HAMILTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent editorial from the July 5 edition of the Louisville Courier Journal & Times.

Mr. Barry Bingham, editor and publisher of the newspaper, asks not only for the exemption of the picturesque *Delta Queen* riverboat from Federal safety-at-sea regulations, but for the preservation of a bit of river history.

As he points out, the beauty of the river and the tradition and romance of the stern-wheel riverboat are incomparable and irreplaceable attractions of the area.

Mr. Bingham's editorial reads as follows:

**LET'S ALL RUSH TO THE RESCUE OF A DAMSEL IN DISTRESS**

(By Barry Bingham)

"Save the *Delta Queen*!" The plea wafts out from the loud-speaker system, to the plaintive strains of a country-rock tune, and the passengers lounging on the sunny deck of the steamer stir from their happy reverie. The Queen must be saved.

It is hard to invoke the crusading spirit among a group of people as blissfully content as the Queen's customers. It is their joy in cruising down the Ohio on a richly

traditional stern-wheeler, however, that makes militants in this one good cause out of relaxed vacationers.

The *Delta Queen* is truly unique, in a world that has been stretched almost out of all meaning by the hot-rod publicists of Hollywood. It is the only survivor of the old river steamers in all of America that still takes passengers on overnight trips.

There are still a few day excursion steamers, notably the Belle of Louisville, that give people a taste of river travel. But it takes the longer exposure offered by the *Delta Queen* alone to turn harried, hurried, Twentieth Century Americans into relaxed river philosophers, ready to hobnob with the genial ghost of Mark Twain.

A June weekend found a group of 18 such tension-fleers from Louisville in a floating party aboard the Queen. We drove up to Cincinnati to board the boat for an eight o'clock sailing on Friday evening, and returned to dock at five on Sunday afternoon.

**WHERE'S THE RIVERBOAT GAMBLER?**

The very act of stepping onto the gangplank seems to turn back the hastening hands of the clock. Life suddenly assumes a more leisurely pace. A wide staircase opens into a capacious lounge, decorated in the rococo style of the old river boat days. There was a full load of passengers, but nobody was crowded, nobody was in a hurry.

The staterooms are comfortable, clean, and air-conditioned. Instead of nautical bunks, they are equipped with regular beds with good mattresses. Plenty of lounging chairs surround the two decks. Nothing is formal, everything is easy.

The moment of sailing is celebrated by a rising tide of music from the ship's calliope. Nothing quite rivals the nostalgic, slightly off-key strains of the traditional steam piano. This is visible as well as audible music, for each note emerges in a little jet of steam from one of the instrument's pipes. Deckhands cast off ropes, onlookers wave, small boys run along the wharf in a fever of excitement.

There is good food waiting in the dining saloon, and cheerful service to go with it. (The quality of the fare was the only point I could not praise on a cruise in 1969, but it has improved markedly since.) The breakfasts are in the old, hearty tradition—cereal, scrambled or fried eggs, bacon, country sausage, grits, hot biscuits, and big pots of steaming coffee. The other meals are a little more restrained, but ample.

The passengers are nearly all in family groups. Many are middle-aged, but there are some lively oldsters and plenty of children. The black-mustachioed gamblers of the old packets, with their gaudy vests and gold watch-chains, have no counterparts in this wholesome company.

For those who like entertainment, it is readily available. A combo plays dance music in the dining saloon after dinner, and its members break up into a pleasantly corny floor show. There may be a Bloody Mary party or a Scarlett O'Hara cocktail party in the bar. The band provides some spirited New Orleans jazz for these occasions, and the bartenders strut to the music as they serve the drinks. Juleps are available, garnished with mint from two out-sized window boxes that flank the paddle-wheel.

The heart of the cruise, however, is the beauty of the scenery that glides so softly by. There can't be many rivers in the world as fine to travel as the Ohio. Its aspect varies from mile to leisurely mile.

On the Kentucky side may be towering cliffs, hung with luxuriant greenery that hides any trace of human habitation. On the Indiana shore will lie a great water-meadow, stretched serenely along a majestic bend in the river. Then, a little further on, the scenery may reverse itself from port to starboard.

The locks at Markland Dam, and those below Louisville at McAlpine Dam, offer a lively diversion for the passengers. Further downstream are the famous Ox-Bow Bends of the Ohio, where the river flows in sinuous coils between steep, wooded banks on both sides.

#### MEMORIES OF A DISASTER

Sallings depart and return on time, but the schedule afloat is informal. There will be a stop at Louisville, with the big bridges looming impressively above. A pause at Madison can afford an opportunity for walking past handsome old houses, prime examples of the urban architecture of the earlier Nineteenth Century.

Longer cruises take the Queen down to Kentucky Lake. The most extensive of all is a trip to New Orleans and back, always scheduled to include the Mardi Gras celebration. Shorter cruises, such as the Cincinnati Weekend, are scheduled through most of the year. Those who have been on fall cruises say they are the best of all.

Must this delightful diversion end forever on the second day of next November? That is what will happen, unless Congress passes a bill to keep the Queen in overnight service. And the time for such action is getting short at the current session.

The problem lies in a Federal law passed in 1966. It followed a disastrous fire at sea on the S.S. Yarmouth Castle. Only steel-structured ships are allowed to carry overnight passengers under this law. The Delta Queen was given a steel hull when built in Scotland in 1928, but the superstructure is a traditional blend of teak, mahogany, ironwood and oak.

The Queen has been relieved twice by special acts of Congress, in order to give the Greene Line a chance to plan for a replacement. But the cost of such a vessel has soared above \$10,000,000, which casts the project in grave doubt. A new vessel would apparently have to be diesel powered. That would eliminate all the romance of the old crimson paddle-wheel, splashing through the water in a soft cascade of spray.

The Safety at Sea Law of 1966 doesn't make sense as applied to the Delta Queen, anyway. It was designed to protect passengers on oceangoing vessels. The Queen plies only along inland waterways, and she is never more than four minutes from shore. A simple beaching operation would be the answer to any conceivable emergency. Fires on the old river packets were caused by boilers bursting in a desperate effort for speed. The Queen never moves out of a dignified saunter. The owners would no doubt be willing to provide a full sprinkler system, or any other reasonable device considered necessary.

Bills to exempt the Delta Queen have been introduced in the House of Representatives by Reps. Leonor Sullivan of Missouri and Lee H. Hamilton of Indiana. Kentucky Republican Marlow Cook and Indiana Democrat Vance Hartke have piloted an exemption through committee action in the Senate. The critical point seems to be the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, of which Frank Albert Stubblefield of Kentucky and William G. Bray of Indiana are members. Committee chairman Edward A. Garmatz of Maryland has shown reluctance to bring up the Delta Queen issue for a hearing.

#### THE QUEEN FILLS THE BILL

The boat lures tourists from all over the country and Canada to the Ohio Valley, and puts them in a mood of mellow appreciation for all they see. The publicity of the annual race with the Belle of Louisville at Derby time would cost hundreds of thousands of dollars if it had to be bought, but it comes free. Our region needs the unusual, the picturesque, the colorful attraction to woo the

tourists and their happily-spent dollars. Nothing fills the bill more neatly than the Delta Queen.

A loud cry should go up to Washington from the whole Ohio Valley. Life in America has grown increasingly strained and standardized. A paddle-wheeler gliding along the gentle Ohio is a floating lesson in regional history, a reprieve from the pressures of the modern world, a tranquilizer more soothing than any doctor's prescription. There is just enough time left to make ourselves heard in Congress: "Save the Delta Queen."

#### FIGHTING DRUG ABUSE

### HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to dramatize the attack against drug abuse among our very young. A San Francisco girl, described in an article in the July 5 Evening Star, began experimenting with marijuana at 13. But, realizing the dangers of drug use after 3 years, she stopped and has been courageously fighting drug abuse ever since. I should like to insert this item in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an instance of valiant and exemplary action in this field:

#### MARIHUANA AT 13: GIRL TELLS OF "KICKING" DRUG

SAN FRANCISCO.—At 13, Linda Mayfield of San Francisco began experimenting with marijuana. At 16, she kicked the habit and joined a student team crusading against drug abuse.

The attractive, miniskirted youngster, now 17, was the only teen-age member of a panel on drug abuse at the National Education Association's 108th annual convention in San Francisco Civic Auditorium.

She told how the Washington High School team of 20 members—half of whom had used drugs—talked with elementary school pupils about the experience.

"I think we got through to a majority of the kids because they trust us. Kids were open to us. I think we taught them something," she said.

Later in an interview she told her own story.

"Some friends and my older sister experimented with grass," she began. "I waited a long time but I was curious and tried it at a friend's house.

"I enjoyed it. It was strange, a different feeling than I'd ever experienced—laughing and feeling light, kinda not caring.

"I used it for nearly three years—just every once in a while, mostly socially."

What caused her to give it up?

"Not any one particular thing. I was sleeping too much. Drugs made me very tired. All I did was read and sleep. I got nothing done.

"Beginning last summer I decided to stop." Did this cause her marijuana-using friends to drop her?

"No, they would ask me why I stopped and I told them. This was fine and it had no effect on our friendship. Even when they're stoned we communicate better than when I was stoned."

Did she have adverse effects from drugs?

"I had a little loss of memory. My will to do anything was broken down. I had a tendency to be forgetful and had loss of memory."

Did she or her friends ever use a hard drug like LSD?

"No. I don't consider LSD a hard drug. Personally, I feel the bad trips are caused when a person is in poor physical condition or is under a severe emotional strain."

Is it difficult to get marijuana in San Francisco?

The 5-foot-5, 115-pound brunette who will enter Heliotrope Free University of San Francisco this fall, said her mother knew about her venture with drugs but that her stepfather was "hostile when I told him about it after I had stopped. It scared me. He didn't want me to come down here."

"Talk to your kid openly and freely and listen to him. Always have your mind open and don't shut him out. Make him feel free to come to you without fear of the consequences. If you don't know the answers tell him so. Then help him try and find out the answers."

ADDRESS OF MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM R. DOUGLAS

### HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past Armed Forces Week Maj. Gen. William R. Douglas of Tennessee's Military Department delivered a speech which I wish every Member of Congress would read.

General Douglas speaks with knowledge and authority, having entered the Tennessee National Guard as a private in 1933 and having gone through the ranks to major general in 1964. He retired from the Tennessee National Guard in 1966 and 2 years later was appointed Deputy Adjutant General in the Military Department of Tennessee.

Here follows his speech:

ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM R. DOUGLAS

Ladies and gentlemen, my talk here today will have four areas on which my personal concern has reached a stage of alarm. They are proper sense of values in the world today; inability to see a clear picture of the designs of enemies of freedom; failure to put our aims on proper targets; and the action which I feel each of us must take to put us back on the right track.

To take action we must first analyze conditions in our own country and throughout the world in order to get a clearly defined picture of the problems; then we must apply a proper sense of values to judge the appropriate target for our aims in the interest of mankind; and, finally, take action in that interest and that interest alone.

Never in history have problems been greater—population explosion, pollution, poverty, inflation, crime, dissension . . . and last but not least, the threat to freedom. In my book, I place that last item as number one on my list. I do so because I feel never before has this threat been so ominous. And the frightening aspect is that never before has this been placed so far down the list on world problems. In World War Two, nations united and defeated an enemy to freedom which tried to enslave other nations and snuffed out the lives of six to seven million persons through atrocious genocide.

In Korea the United States sprang to the rescue when overt aggression took place by Communists, but without defeating the enemy, an enemy which has snuffed out the lives of some fifty million persons, or a total of some eight times that of Hitler's Germany. But in Korea, we only fought off the enemy, we didn't defeat him. In Vietnam to-

day the United States and a handful of allies have battled nine years, not to defeat an enemy, but to prevent a Communist takeover. And the so-called "spin-off" from our "Don't Win, Just Defend" policy has so confused the free world that Laos and Cambodia face certain Communist takeover from the same attackers—North Vietnam. Why? I think this. So much has the information media allowed itself to focus attention on the minority clamors and goals. . . . So much have they allowed the anti-Vietnam war yells to ring out . . . and so little has the media done to bring world condemnation on the Communists for their aggression and subversive actions which caused these wars. . . . The so much and so little today has created an atmosphere which hands Laos and Cambodia to the enemy with only token resistance.

We have never lost a war in our two-century history. That is, we have never lost a war with weapons. Today, however, we are losing a war—a battle for public opinion, worldwide public opinion. The Communist-directed, frontal attack against the U.S. is winning support not only on the other side of the curtains, but even in the United States. Their continuous verbal assaults on us, both from within and without, have gained such momentum that it is obvious this Nation may have to write off Laos and Cambodia to the Red side of the ledger. With 105,000 Communists overrunning Laos and Cambodia and threatening the program under which we would withdraw forces from South Vietnam, the President sent troops to erase sanctuaries. Within hours the public opinion assault labeled us as the invaders and you know what else took place. Now we wonder what will happen if Russian-backed, Russian-helped Arab attacks on Israel accelerate to full-scale war status. We wonder because public opinion has reached a point where the defense of any nation anywhere in the world will bring nothing but violence within our own borders. The immediate cries will be don't make the same mistake you made in Vietnam. Don't make the same mistake you did in Cambodia.

The latest popular expression is: "We made a mistake in Vietnam, let's not make another in Southeast Asia."

I cannot agree with this or the popular expression which made its rounds earlier. It was: "Let's admit we made a mistake in Vietnam." This, to me, is completely idiotic, erroneous and ridiculous. Our nation signed a treaty with Southeast Asian countries to come to their aid with weapons and manpower in the event of aggression. The Communists conducted a reign of terror in South Vietnam, a program involving torture, assassinations and finally overt attack by forces infiltrating from North Vietnam. Can anyone with honest and sincere logic say we made a mistake in keeping our promise, in carrying out our pledge in that SEATO treaty? The frosting on the cake to this is a vote of approval—with only one dissenting ballot—from the hundreds of congressmen which were elected by the millions of Americans as their representation in Government. To say we made a mistake is to say Congress and four Presidents—Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon—were guilty of sacrificing 40,000 American lives in our Vietnam action . . . for nothing. To say we made a mistake is to condemn the advice given them by civilian and military leaders of the most highly qualified knowledge of international affairs. And to call it a mistake is to say we did so from day to day, month to month and year to year over a period of almost a decade. Can anyone say the leadership of this greatest nation on earth could so compound a mistaken military action? And finally, let's assume we had not provided assistance in that area over these years. Would this small nation still be among those of the free world? Would

Thailand? Would Malaysia? Singapore? Indonesia? Would we now be engaged in more fighting in South Korea? Would not Laos and Cambodia already be Red? Where, I ask, just where do we draw the line on aggression? How many millions of people do antiwar critics think we should sacrifice to the slavery of Communism?

And where is that point of no return—that point where the balance of power is tipped to the enemy to an extent that defense of our own land would be useless? No, gentlemen, Vietnam was and is no mistake, Americans proved we keep our word. Americans proved overt aggression cannot go unpunished. Americans proved we shall fight for freedom and we proved we shall use our strength to help the weak defend their freedom. No, gentlemen, we did not make the mistake, Hanoi and her Communist allies made the mistake. That we so intervened in Vietnam may already have discouraged adventures they may have considered in recent years or any they might consider in the future. That alone may already have saved hundreds of thousands of lives and billions or trillions of dollars. We may never know what could have happened, but we do know that we are still a free nation and we can assemble like this and say what we wish just like I'm doing here and now.

The disturbing factor about this is the very principle of the situation. Criticism—such as this statement that the United States made the mistake in South Vietnam—yes, anti-American criticism such as this has prevailed in a steadily increasing manner since World War II. Where, on the other hand, have you read in the news commentaries, heard on radio programs, or seen over television criticism of the enemy? Think hard. Have you heard anyone say: "Let's admit the Communists made a mistake in Vietnam"???? For every 100 articles, commentaries, so-called television specials, demonstrations, speeches, or the like . . . for one hundred of those, which are in substance anti-democracy, anti-establishment, anti-free enterprise, and anti-American I would estimate you can find less than five which are anti-Hanoi, anti-Peking, anti-Moscow, anti-Cuba, or anti-Communist, this is frightening. It is terrifying. You sometimes wonder whose side the information media is on. You wonder if the so-called silent majority is quickly becoming a silent minority. There had better soon be a 180-degree turn in the principles of our freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of the press, and freedom to bear arms, or we soon will be a silent minority.

Now let's analyze the status of these freedoms as it appears today:

**Freedom of speech.**—This is being used daily by communist elements for anti-American purposes and even condones open, outright, public pronouncements advocating violence and revolution.

**Freedom of the press.**—Such pronouncements, anti-war activities and operations which logically can more aid and abet the enemy than help preserve our own principles are accelerating rapidly in the total information output. You hear more and more on atrocities of our troops or our allies. You hear less and less of the atrocities of the enemy. More time and space are given to activities bent on reducing and weakening our defense posture. Less and less time and space are given toward strengthening it.

**Freedom of assembly.**—In this area—with few exceptions—aims and goals of the most publicized assemblies are anti-American. Demonstrations are for Americans to get out of South Vietnam. None ask the North Vietnamese get out of South Vietnam. There were and are demonstrators to ban-the-bomb, stop producing nuclear subs, forget anti-ballistic missiles, eliminate-the-draft, take R.O.T.C. out of colleges, quit manufacturing napalm bombs, and others which have been and are anti-United States. Again I ask you

to think hard. Where or when have any similar demonstrations urged the communists to end such defense programs??? One more thing on freedom of assembly. I'm going to quote verbatim the reading in our constitution on this and you can read between the lines as to another important point and I quote: "The right of the people *peaceably* to assemble."

The previous freedoms are listed in amendment one to our original constitution. Let's go to amendment two and I shall also quote verbatim: "A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed." Here, too, the enemies to our way of life are using one of our freedoms toward an apparent attempt to end that freedom. Organized crime and terrorists, both contributing to the decay of this nation, have projected violence to an unprecedented high under the false front of their right to bear arms.

An article last month said troublemakers, foreign and domestic, are now concentrating on phase three of a concerted effort to knock our Nation off balance. I would have called troublemakers what they are—communists. The first phase was street and campus demonstrations and the second a militant affront to our court system. Now, the article continues, Guerrilla warriors, schooled and skilled in making and planting bombs have launched a spring offensive against military, governmental and industrial installations. . . . New York had 400 bomb scares in 48 hours less than a month ago. A blast damaged 23 stores in Pittsburgh. Seattle had 32 bombings, most of them in the past four months . . . within the past month two packages were mailed from Seattle, one to President Nixon, the other to Selective Service Director Theodore Tarr, both containing bombs triggered to explode when opened. They were intercepted and defused. . . . San Francisco had one hundred bombings, attempts or threats. R.O.T.C. buildings, a jurist's home, police stations, draft boards and even the office of an Army recruiter were targets. In Greenwich Village fire and explosions destroyed a townhouse where evidence of a bomb factory was found. Among the dead was Theodore Gold, S.D.S. campus revolt leader at Columbia University who last year spent several weeks in Cuba. The F.B.I. has identified other radicals involved in recent bombings as having close links with foreign Communists. How many of you right here remember the news about these bomb cases? I'm sure most of you do. But let me ask another question. How many of you were informed in those news stories of these communist links I have just mentioned? I wasn't. I had to learn this from another source.

If I make no other specific point in my talk, it is this . . . let's help bring about a 180-degree turn in our information efforts. Let's get off the backs of defense leaders and let's instead return our attention to the ill-doings and the dangers of our enemy or enemies. I do not mean end criticism nor hide wrong-doings. But I do mean we should attempt in every way possible to provide that information which will help keep the free world free. Let's think twice about any and all activities and information which aid and abet the enemies of freedom.

The strategy and tactics of such enemies is to use various minority group movements to tear down and destroy the entire fabric of the free society. Where they are thus allied to such causes, a democratic society must screen carefully such minority goals. The church, the courts, the entertainment world, schools and the press must not *ally* themselves with smoke screen causes which chip away at freedom.

If the letter of the law were obeyed, there would be no need to suggest what I have . . . but somehow, in some way it is being disobeyed continuously. . . . Here is the law

on which I speak and it has been upheld by the Supreme Court . . . "whoever knowingly or willfully advocates, abets, advises, or teaches the duty, necessity, desirability, or propriety of overthrowing or destroying the Government of the United States . . . by force or violence . . . shall be fined not more than \$20,000 or imprisoned not more than twenty years, or both. . . ." That is section 2385, Title 18 of the U.S. Criminal Code. A little bit of enforcement of this could go a long way toward protecting those freedoms of which I spoke. And it could stop some of this destructive action by dissidents.

When we get into discussions on the dissident elements across our Nation, I think our Vice President has summed up my feelings, Mr. Agnew's words were, to be exact: "Indeed, as for these deserters, malcontents, radicals, incendiaries, the civil and the uncivil disobedients among our young, S.D.S., P.L.P., Weatherman one and Weatherman two, the revolutionary action movement, the hippies, yippies, yahoos, black panthers, lions and tigers alike—I would swap the whole damn zoo for a single platoon of the kind of young Americans I saw in Vietnam."

It was Vice President Agnew who gave the right answer in responding to a statement of Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman J. William Fulbright that if the Vietnam war goes on much longer "the best of our young men" would flee to Canada. The Vice President replies: "The best of our young men are serving their country in Vietnam."

Television should continuously inform the public on Communist and subversive threats

from within and without, and give less time to Rap Brown, Eldridge Cleaver, Chicago Sevens and Communist lackeys to spew their venom of hatred and revolutionary, treasonous propaganda against our country. Ditto for other information professions.

Yes, the mass information media—governmental, military, entertainment, journalistic, religious and others providing influence on the general public—this media must make a 180-degree turn.

The question now is how to make this 180-degree turn. I suggest the answer is for action in the national interest. Government officials must act in the public's interest, not party or political interest, businessmen must act in the public's interest, not personal interest, Newspapers must print in the public's interest, not in the publisher's interest. Radio and television must operate in the national interest, not minority interests. Labor must perform in the interest of national unity, not union interest alone. Jurists must judge in the interest of the majority, not of the minority. The entertainment profession must return to moral interests, not financial interests. Churches must return to religion and abandon politics. Teachers must educate in the interest of freedom, not in the interest of freedom's enemies. Parents must close the generation gap in the home, not through juvenile courts. The individual must act in the interest of all, not just himself.

It may seem ironic that I speak before Veterans of Foreign Wars and Rotarians at this moment to bring out these issues. I say it is ironic because you of the V.F.W. and most of you in the Rotary already have served

in uniform in the interest of freedom. And I am sure all of you have served as civilians in the same manner. And my text is not directed at you, in a manner of speaking, but for you. If enough of us get together and speak out on issues, maybe we will find it easier to unite and get this country back on the right track.

In a recent Rotary magazine was a history of your mottoes and one, in particular, caught my attention. It says "Rotary is based on the ideal of service and where freedom, justice, truth, sanctity of the pledged word and respect for human rights do not exist, Rotary cannot live nor its ideal prevail." I believe this reflects much of the content of my words today.

This is Armed Forces Week and it is set aside to honor those who are dedicated to the task of defending our nation against the communist threat, to the defense of freedom. Our heritage is rich in heroic deeds of men who have preserved our freedoms. It continues today and to those who have made the supreme sacrifice, I repeat remarks of General Douglas MacArthur:

"His name and fame are the birthright of every American citizen. In his youth and strength, his love and loyalty, he gave all that mortality can give. He needs no eulogy from me, or from any other man. He has written his own history and written it in red on his enemy's breast . . . I do not know the dignity of their birth, but I do know the glory of their death. They died unquestioning, uncomplaining, with faith in their hearts and on their lips the hope that we would go on to victory."

## SENATE—Thursday, July 9, 1970

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, holy beyond our comprehension, loving beyond all earthly love, good beyond all that is good, help us to pattern our lives after the Great Galilean.

Spare us, O God, from being cruel because we have power, blunt because we have authority, arrogant because we have wealth, or unbrotherly because we have won a victory. Grant that in our differences there may be moral unanimity, in our diversity a spiritual unity which strengthens our labor for the Nation.

Give us stout hearts, O Lord, that having resolved upon the course we believe to be right, we may steadfastly pursue it, serve Thee faithfully, and leave the consequences to Thy providence.

In the Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 8, 1970, be dispensed with.

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

### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today,

it stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

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

### RECOGNITION OF SENATOR YOUNG OF OHIO TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following disposition of the Journal tomorrow, the distinguished Senator from Ohio (Mr. Young) be recognized for not to exceed 20 minutes.

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

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

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

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the distinguished Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE) is now recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

### PROGRESS IN THE WORK OF THE SENATE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the distinguished ma-

majority leader whether he thinks we are moving along a little better now, a little more rapidly, and that we may yet catch up with the other body.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, may I say that after the Republicans, following their leadership meeting with the President on Tuesday morning last, prodded us, we have been showing reasonably good progress, thanks to the cooperation of the Republicans in this matter, and due to the good attendance on the floor of the Senate, and also due to the fact that the committees are still meeting. The legislation, although it is not pouring out, is coming out, because it has to be given legitimate and due consideration. I would say that the Senate is in very good shape at the moment and we hope to keep it that way in the weeks and months ahead.

Mr. SCOTT. I want to thank the distinguished majority leader. I think it proves the healthy interaction of the two-party system.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It does, indeed.

### PRODUCTION OF THE C-5A AIRCRAFT

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I have been very much concerned about the fate of the C-5A military cargo airplane. I am concerned about the aircraft, the company, and the people of Georgia who build it.

Mr. President, the fact is the very existence of the Lockheed-Georgia Co., is at stake. Congressional debate over funding for the C-5A will determine the future of the company. This in itself is no small responsibility for the Senate and the Congress to shoulder.