

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ADDITION TO THE WEST SIDE OF  
THE CAPITOL

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, we have a continuing interest in and concern for the plans to make an addition to the west side of the U.S. Capitol.

Charles C. McLaughlin, a distinguished historian, is an authority in particular on the landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted. Mr. Olmsted was named Landscape Architect of the Capitol grounds by the Congress in 1874.

Professor McLaughlin is an associate professor in the history department at the American University. He is a native of Massachusetts and his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth B. Murdock, now make their home in the Sixth Congressional District in Beverly.

Professor McLaughlin has studied the problems of the west front extension and prepared a paper given recently before the Columbia Historical Society. His research has disclosed significant correspondence regarding changes in the west front which were proposed in the 19th century. I have no doubt that Professor McLaughlin's paper will be of great interest to the Members of Congress who will be again considering the extension of the front and to the general public who quite rightly share our concern over whatever steps are taken for alteration of our National Capitol. I bring Professor McLaughlin's research to the attention of the Members and ask that the paper be printed in the RECORD. It follows:

THE CAPITOL IN PERIL? THE WEST FRONT  
CONTROVERSY FROM WALTER TO STEWART

(By Charles C. McLaughlin)

Today the United States Capitol is in peril. Almost everyone agrees to that. J. George Stewart, the present Architect of the Capitol, has shored up the crumbling sandstone of the old building's west front with timber bracing to prevent its collapse. His plans to construct new outside walls of marble forty-four feet further to the west to buttress the present walls and add interior space have alarmed some members of Congress and the press. His extension scheme and his proposal to enlarge the present terrace below the Capitol for restaurants and tourist facilities, some of the critics argue, would distort the appearance of the historic structure most unhappily.<sup>1</sup>

Throughout its history there has been warfare between those who would expand the Capitol to house every plausible use that has been suggested and those who wish to save the original structure from almost any alteration. President Millard Fillmore decided in the 1850's not to extend the old Capitol east and west to accommodate enlarged quarters for the Senate and House, but rather to add new wings to the north and south, leaving the original Capitol as it was except for replacing the Bulfinch dome with Thomas Walter's present one of cast-iron, completed in 1865. Like the plans for the

Senate and House wings, the addition of an architectural terrace below the west front of the Capitol left the old building untouched although it added approximately 84,000 square feet of interior space, which is at present divided into 137 numbered rooms. Demands to extend the old sandstone building lessened further when the Supreme Court and the Library of Congress moved out to their own buildings and the first Senate and House Office Buildings were constructed in 1905.<sup>2</sup>

Many Architects of the Capitol have advocated the east and west extension of the central building in marble to provide more room and to replace the softer sandstone. Thomas Ustick Walter, who designed the new House and Senate wings in the 1850's proposed in 1865 and 1874 to extend the old building east and west. His plans became the basis for those made by later Architects of the Capitol, Edward Clark and Elliott Woods. J. George Stewart, the present Architect, was the first to persuade Congress to build onto the old Capitol. He carried out an east front extension plan in 1962 which reproduced the Latrobe facade in marble thirty-two and a half feet east of the original sandstone walls. The extension has added 50,000 square feet of interior space for offices and restaurants to the old building. This is not enough, argues Stewart. According to a survey he made in 1957, the east front extension provides only a third of the floor space the Congress wants.<sup>3</sup>

To gain the rest of the space and shore up the sandstone walls, the Architect of the Capitol has made preliminary plans for a new marble structure which would project 56 feet westward from the present connecting wings, 88 feet from the original House and Senate chambers, and 44 feet from the central portico. Stewart's plans for a new west front include a portico wider than that designed by Charles Bulfinch in the 1820's with a pediment similar to the one Thomas U. Walter proposed in 1874. This new front, argues Stewart, would be more dignified and appropriate for Walter's dome and his Senate and House wings of the 1850's than Bulfinch's, which went with a much smaller building and lower dome. Despite the fact that the present terrace was built in the late 1880's to accommodate Walter's proposed west front, Stewart wishes to alter and widen it to house two restaurants, two truck docks, four private dining rooms, visitors' facilities, and additional offices. Congress has not yet (in 1968) appropriated the more than \$4 million dollars necessary for the scheme.<sup>4</sup>

The present debate over the Stewart plan is only the latest in a dispute that has gone on since 1875. In preparing an edition of the papers of Frederick Law Olmsted, whom Congress appointed Landscape Architect of the Capitol grounds in 1874, I found an exchange of letters remarkably pertinent to the present controversy. The letters record a discussion of Thomas U. Walter's extension plans of the 1860's and 70's. The brilliant civil engineer, Montgomery C. Meigs, who was superintendent of the construction of Walter's House and Senate wings and the Capitol dome, began the exchange of views by writing to Frederick Law Olmsted and Senator Justin S. Morrill, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Grounds. Soon Walter's successor as Architect of the Capitol, Edward Clark, and Walter himself were drawn in.

These men were aware, as perhaps all the present disputants are not, that the west front of the Capitol has always been a difficult aesthetic problem, even to the early

Architects of the Capitol, Benjamin Latrobe and Charles Bulfinch, who were first concerned with it in the early 1800's. The trouble comes from the fact that the Capitol is perched further out over the brow of Jenkins Hill than was intended in 1800 so that it presents an unclassical multi-story facade to the west.<sup>5</sup> The aesthetic embarrassment is almost as bad as the Greeks would have faced if one front of the Parthenon inadvertently had been built over the edge of the Acropolis. In 1811 Benjamin Latrobe made plans for a structure like the Propylaea forming the approach to the Parthenon to be placed below the Capitol to provide a grand entrance to the Capitol from the west and ease the visual transition from the sloping ground to the building.<sup>6</sup>

Charles Bulfinch, who in 1822 designed the present west front of the Capitol, heaped up an earth terrace around the west side of the building to hide the subbasement. Features of his landscape plan anticipated the much larger stone terrace proposed by Frederick Olmsted, which was finished in 1892. Like the present terrace, Bulfinch's had two staircases at the center separated from each other by an arcade and an open courtyard between his earth terrace and the subbasement to give light and air to the lowest windows.<sup>7</sup> Thomas U. Walter, when called upon to suggest a design for the grounds in 1864 appropriate to the Capitol with the new House and Senate wings, did not propose any change in the Bulfinch steps and arcade, but rather extended a similar grass-covered earth terrace to the north and south around the new wings. He also retained the handsome iron fence and gates with stone gate posts which Bulfinch designed to go with the Capitol.<sup>8</sup>

Apparently Walter's plan was not satisfactory. At the urging of Senator Justin Morrill, Congress appointed Frederick Law Olmsted to redesign the Capitol grounds in 1874. The grounds had not had much attention and had been damaged by the construction work of the 1850's and 1860's. Everything in Olmsted's design was intended to display the building. He cleared the forest of sickly trees from the west lawn which had hidden the Capitol from that vantage point for years. He replaced the charming iron fence of Bulfinch around the grounds with unobtrusive low curbing and retaining walls which would not obscure views of the building. On the east he removed the neglected flower beds, squares of trampled grass, horse car tracks, and streets to make room for a great paved plaza for ceremonial occasions which would also provide access to the building. Many of the lamp posts, water fountains, and architectural features of the grounds, done in 1870's Romanesque for Olmsted by the Architect Thomas Wisedell, are out of keeping with the style of the Capitol, but still Olmsted's was a great landscape setting for the building.<sup>9</sup>

The most conspicuous and successful addition Olmsted introduced was the great architectural terrace for the building, which finally took the place of Bulfinch's in 1892. No one in the United States had yet built such a large and formal structure intended almost entirely for aesthetic effect. The Bulfinch Terrace, charming though it was, was much smaller and only partly architectural. The only place a comparable structure could be found was in New York's Central Park where in 1864 Calvert Vaux had constructed the Gothic-Romanesque Bethesda Terrace. This terrace, with which Olmsted was familiar because he was co-designer with Vaux of the park, was nearly as large as the one proposed for the Capitol, and like it had an arcade, two stairways, and blank retaining walls stretching out on either side of the

Footnotes at end of article.

stairways. The first design for the Capitol terrace which Wisedell drew for Olmsted looked much like that in Central Park.<sup>10</sup>

It took Olmsted ten years to persuade Congress to build the present terrace. Not all the members understood Olmsted's argument that such a windowless base, like Bulfinch's earth terrace, was to give the effect of a solid foundation for a building perched on the brow of Capitol Hill, and avoid a multi-story facade draped over the hill. The ninety-three rooms proposed for inside the structure were to be lighted with skylights and windows facing into the courtyard. Instead, the legislators wanted these rooms to have windows in the outside wall for ventilation and a spectacular view of the Mall.<sup>11</sup>

The desire for outside windows was so strong that the Architect of the Capitol, Edward Clark, wrote to Olmsted: "I sincerely hope that you will consent to this change, as the leading men of both houses will demand it."<sup>12</sup> One of the leading men was Senator Henry L. Dawes of the Senate Committee on Buildings and Grounds. He was unpersuaded by Olmsted's testimony before his committee in the summer of 1886. He wrote up the proceedings for his wife's amusement in the following manner:

"The Senate disgraced itself yesterday, calling each other corrupt. Miss Swan brought poor Morrill up to the Capitol to save his blank walls which our Committee are determined if they can to pierce with windows—and Olmsted [*sic*] read a paper to us, so ridiculous that we begged that it might be printed, for our use, and he graciously condescended [*sic*]. We have all been under a delusion that the blank walls were to give light [*sic*] to the building. "No such thing the thought never entered his head." The building appeared as if it was going to slide down the hill and these walls are "a sort of dam, as it were" to avert that awful catastrophe—"and whoever saw windows in a dam?"<sup>13</sup>

In spite of the opposition, the dam was finally built. The only windows Olmsted allowed in the terrace were in the archways between the staircases.<sup>14</sup>

Olmsted was circumspect in making any judgments about the architecture of the Capitol building itself. He was quite willing to defend his terrace idea from attack, but thought he should hold himself strictly subordinate to the wishes of Congress and the Architect of the Capitol as far as the building itself was concerned. He did, however, express himself more freely on the subject to the former Chief of Construction of the Capitol, Montgomery C. Meigs, who wrote him in 1875 complimenting his terrace proposal, but criticizing him for including the Walter east and west front extensions of 1874 in his plans. Olmsted explained himself as follows:

"My duty has been with the grounds of the Capitol and I have avoided approaching the province of the architect further than was necessary to the presentation of the proposition of the terrace and the stairways. As to the building proper, I obtained drawings from Mr. Clark representing a plan which I assumed to have been provisionally adopted and to this my plans have been strictly accommodated. I stated to him as well as to Senator Morrill and to Senator Howe that, among the various propositions which (after forming my plans) I found under discussion in regard to the projection of the central porticos, I regarded that as the best by which they would be advanced the least, and that, as to the west portico, I thought that a reduction from the assumed projection of forty feet beyond the line of the present wall would be better than any addition to it."<sup>15</sup>

His plan for the grounds of 1874 made room for a substantial extension of the central portion of the Capitol both to the east and to

the west. He remarked in one report, "On the west it is assumed . . . the present facade of the old Capitol will eventually be replaced by a wall of marble, corresponding in dimensions and architectural character to those of the wings. . . ."<sup>16</sup>

Although Olmsted was not enthusiastic about the Walter extension of the west front, he did make room for it, and assumed that the addition would be of marble. His was a middle position between that of Montgomery Meigs who opposed any extension, and that of Thomas U. Walter and Senator Justin Morrill, who wished the addition in order to give the Library of Congress more room for its rapidly accumulating books. Meigs wrote to Olmsted:

"I think it an error to extend the central portions of the old building, thus hiding the further wing in oblique views and spending money to diminish the apparent magnitude and grandeur of this noble building.

"I understand that in this extension you acted under instructions of the Committee and I do not believe that on full consideration you would of yourself think it advisable."<sup>17</sup>

Olmsted's reply to Meigs, saying that he regarded that projection best by which the central porticos would be advanced the least, evidently pleased Meigs who answered, "I see that we concur substantially, as I supposed to be the case. . . ." At the same time he queried Olmsted, Meigs had written to Senator Justin Morrill of the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and to Ainsworth R. Spofford, the Librarian of Congress. To Morrill, he had commented that:

"To throw out the centre portion changes the plan to that of a cross in which, in many views, large and important portions of a building are concealed behind the arms of the cross.

"As the building now exists it has in the oblique views all the regularity and symmetry of classical architecture with a variety of light and shadow and of sky line not excelled by many of the best examples of Gothic architecture."<sup>18</sup>

Senator Morrill asked Meigs for his permission to send a copy of his letter to Thomas U. Walter, the designer of the extension. Morrill's caution was perhaps inspired by the fact that Meigs and Walter had quarreled violently about who was subordinate to whom during the construction of the dome and the House and Senate wings in the 1850's. Meigs replied:

"While Mr. Walter is probably the highest authority in Classical Architecture in this country and is an artist of great taste he has certain qualities which long since separated us. I have no objection however to your sending him a copy of my letter."<sup>19</sup>

Thomas U. Walter sent Morrill a note thanking him for letting him see Meigs's letter and promising a fuller reply later:

"The letter of Gen. Meigs contains many well studied points, and I am much gratified with the complimentary [way] in which he refers to me as mentioned in your note.

"I am in haste to acknowledge your kindness, and shall not now attempt a consideration of the matters you refer to; suffice it to say that I am in accord with your views, and will take pleasure at any time in communicating with you on the subject and if you think the success of the improvement will be promoted in any degree by my visiting Washington I shall be happy to do so."<sup>20</sup>

Senator Morrill still continued to advocate an extension of the west front along the lines proposed by Walter even though he thought that the Library of Congress should be removed from the Capitol and housed in a separate building. In a speech of 1879 he said:

"I confess that I look with some apprehension upon the idea of further patch-work on the Capitol. The last extension was intended to put a full stop to anything beyond.

When the east and west centers shall each be brought out twenty or thirty feet as they will be when the soft sand-stone shall be replaced with marble, and finished in harmony with the wings, it will be all that was originally designed. It will then be the completed work of Mr. Walter, who, if not a great artist, is certainly not a mean one; and better qualified than all other men to give counsel as to any impending changes. No conceited American Bernini should be permitted to botch the Capitol."

Conceited Berninis were in abundance, proposing among other things, to accommodate the growing Library of Congress by lifting the Capitol dome fifty feet into the air and sliding the Library under it. As to a plan that would project the building two hundred and seventy-five feet further west, Morrill continued:

"Any extension which could possibly furnish one-fourth part of the room needed for a new library of Congress would not only cruelly distort the Capitol itself, utterly destroying its admirable singleness of design, but would be an equally flagrant maltreatment of the Capitol grounds.

"The Capitol should be let alone. Neither swag-belled centers, nor right-angled tail-ends can be added without destroying the imposing facades of the east and west fronts. Add a pile here, and just such another there, and we should have a block suggestive of diverse uses, commercial or charitable, manufacturing or insane, but no longer stamped as the home of the American Congress."<sup>21</sup>

When called in to advise about lifting the dome fifty feet skyward in 1881, Meigs, like Morrill, reaffirmed the position he had taken in 1875, but left out his bouquets to Thomas U. Walter:

"I have had to study this building for years, and my admiration for the genius and skill of the architect, Latrobe, increases with the years.

"What has been added to it has been mere extension to accommodate the needs of a growing nation. The wings are of the same order and harmonize in style and detail with Latrobe's work. When the building was so greatly extended horizontally by addition of the wings, something was needed to mark more distinctly the center, and a dome rising two hundred and eighty-eight feet above ground was added. I think that this is all that was needed, and that the building is now complete."<sup>22</sup>

Meigs touched upon another aspect of the present controversy about the west front: the condition of the sandstone walls. In his testimony about the feasibility of an addition of two stories to the Capitol, Montgomery Meigs pointed out that the sandstone walls could not carry the extra weight. In preparation for the construction of the dome in 1856, Meigs had investigated the condition of the walls and found that no cement had been used when the building was erected. The mortar was lime and sand which was so soft that, Meigs noted, it could "easily [be] removed from the joints by the fingers without the aid of tools. . . ." The keystones of the arches over the lower windows in the south wall had dropped probably, he stated, because the walls in which they were inserted were spreading apart. It must have been because of Meigs's investigation that the dome was constructed to rest on its own supports carried up from the foundations. The walls are more than a hundred years older now and further deteriorated. The present Architect of the Capitol plans to enclose them and buttress them within his forty foot addition to the building. The officers of the American Institute of Architects want them restored and kept as exterior walls, a difficult and dangerous task according to Stewart.<sup>23</sup>

The problem of what to do about the west front is more complicated than that of fixing

Footnotes at end of article.

the wall. Besides the aesthetic and structural considerations there is the question of what additional space is really necessary and where it should be provided. In the correspondence I have been citing there are some interesting comments on this point as well. Both General Meigs and Senator Morrill were agreed that substantial future extensions to the Capitol might best be made following a general plan of building around the square to the east of the Capitol. As Meigs put it in 1875 in a letter to Morrill:

"The legitimate mode of extending the Capitol, when that becomes necessary, is by erecting the additions on lines ultimately to surround and enclose a great square, or cortile, to the eastward of the existing building. The final enclosure of a square of 800 ft, exterior side, would not make a building larger than some of the palaces of Europe. But, if the additions are designed & executed in the style and with the material of the wings, this building and this square will be the finest in the world."<sup>23</sup>

Meigs amplified this idea in a separate letter to Olmsted in which he said, "I believe that the extension of the Capitol & provision for the Library should be made on a general plan which will provide for the future filling of the sides of a great square to the East of the present building. I should prefer to see this done, not by a variety of buildings in different styles of Architecture, but in the Roman Corinthian style, of marble. . . ."<sup>24</sup>

Morrill paid Meigs the compliment of repeating this idea in a speech and attributing it to "an officer, creditably connected with the extension of the Capitol. . . ." Morrill quotes the officer as predicting:

"That around the entire grounds of the eastern front of the Capitol, as once were around the bounding-lines of the ancient Roman Forum, there will yet be large public buildings, such as courts, libraries, museums, and departmental offices, that will be hereafter imperatively required by the augmentation of States and the ever-increasing wants of the Government. It must be conceded that the idea is progressive and possibly too magnificent; but, if all of the Executive Departments had originally been constructed around one large square, not only would public convenience have been better consulted, but the general effect would have been more imposing than that produced by the Departments which have strayed away from both the Capitol and the Executive Mansion."<sup>25</sup>

This prediction of the future of Capitol Hill made in 1879 has been fulfilled, although the neo-classic buildings facing three sides of the Capitol grounds are not connected to the Capitol to form the huge square palace that Meigs suggested. Senator Morrill had a part in the fulfillment of Meigs prophecy when he succeeded in reserving the southwest corner of the Capitol square in 1886 for the Library of Congress building. In 1902 the Senate Park Commission, without referring to either Morrill or Meigs, proposed that a great square of neo-classic buildings surround the Capitol, but they considered the placing of the Library of Congress across Pennsylvania Avenue a terrible mistake, because it destroyed the view of the Capitol from the southwest. With the construction of the House and Senate Office Buildings and the new Supreme Court Building, however, the wishes of Meigs, Morrill, and the Senate Park Commission have been met.<sup>26</sup>

What is important for us to note today, whether or not we like Meigs's and Morrill's great Roman Corinthian court, is that both these men advocated following a general plan for Capitol Hill which would meet the needs of Congress without adding incongruous wings and fronts to the Capitol building. Down the years Congress has provided sep-

arate housing for the Library of Congress, the Supreme Court, the offices of members of Congress, and rooms for Congressional committees. The removal of these functions from the Capitol has saved the building from becoming "a block suggestive of diverse uses, commercial or charitable, manufacturing or insane, but no longer stamped as the home of the American Congress," as Morrill put it. Unfortunately, Meigs's plea that the development of the Capitol square be done following a general plan has not been consistently heeded. The Randolph Bill of May 1967 is a step in this direction, because it proposes that a comprehensive plan be made for the development of the Capitol grounds and contiguous and related areas.<sup>27</sup>

The present Architect of the Capitol has proposed a projection of the west front, more or less along the lines of that by Thomas U. Walter of 1874, because he thinks, as did Senator Morrill, that this will complete the Capitol building aesthetically. He also thinks that such an extension will fill the needs, which cannot be provided elsewhere, of the seven million tourists who visit it each year and the several hundred legislators who meet in it. To this end the Stewart plan would add 101 offices, five committee or conference rooms, two cafeterias, two large dining rooms, and two service docks under the staircase of the terrace. In all it would give the occupants of the Capitol the 139,250 square feet of floor space they said in 1957 they would need in twenty-five years and, in addition, a 69,634 square foot dividend.<sup>28</sup>

Some of the additional room would be provided by advancing the west central portico 44 feet, an extension allowed for in Olmsted's plan and in his elevations of the terrace. In his drawings of the terrace he shows the changes in the central portico proposed by Walter and by Edward Clark presumably to demonstrate how his design would harmonize with them. This is not quite the same as making studies of the west front as Architect Stewart's *Preliminary Report* says he did. I have seen no evidence that Olmsted made architectural studies of the Capitol. He would have considered such work beyond his professional competence.<sup>29</sup>

While we may expect opinions from Meigs, Morrill, and Walter on the architecture, we cannot hope for similar pronouncements from Olmsted. It is possible, though, to find out what Olmsted would have thought of the Stewart plan for the terrace and the grounds because he suggested the present design. The Stewart plans would make some significant changes in the design of the grounds, and much of the additional space to be gained from the Stewart plan is to be added to the terrace.

First of all, we can ask what Olmsted would think of the proposed service roadway running across the grounds directly in front of the Capitol and under the terrace at the stairways from Constitution or Pennsylvania Avenue to Independence or Maryland Avenue. This roadway is designed for semi-trailer trucks and service vehicles carrying food, freight, garbage, and trash to or from two service docks under the Capitol. The *Preliminary Report* affirms that such a service road would not intrude into the landscape composition because it will be screened from view by trees and appropriate plantings.<sup>30</sup>

What would Olmsted think of the introduction of a roadway on this side of the Capitol grounds? He probably would not approve of it, if he were to follow the general principle he laid down for himself in 1874:

A building may have two fronts and most noble buildings, in fact, are designed with two, of which not unfrequently that of the carriage, or most used entrance, is the less important architecturally and in the landscape. . . . It is much better for most pur-

poses to which a large building is to be put that one side of it should be left entirely free from the disturbance of carriages and it is on that front that any beauty of architecture possessed by the building will commonly be seen to the highest advantage and on which any landscape beauty associated with it may be best enjoyed.<sup>31</sup>

Now, it may be argued that carriages are not the same as garbage trucks, but I do not really think that distinction would make Olmsted want to introduce them on the west side of the building, even behind a screen of planting.

The change that would bother Olmsted the most in the Stewart terrace plan is a revival of Senator Dawes' scheme of 1886 to pierce the walls with windows. The curved, arched wall and the fountain at the present ground level of the terrace would be replaced in the new plan with a longer straight wall punctuated with five arched windows. Above this, on the second level of the terrace, ten square windows are to replace the present arches which contain the only windows Olmsted would allow in the terrace. These new windows would be about as wide and tall as the present arched ones. On either side of the stairways the present blank terrace walls would be pierced with windows in each panel. The twelve outside panels would be replaced with twelve windows. The twenty-two windows on the second level of the terrace are to give a view to the tourists in two cafeterias and the members of Congress and their guests in the two dining rooms proposed for this level.<sup>32</sup> Stewart would thus punch holes in the dam which Bulfinch and Olmsted erected to hide the bottom story of the west front.

If one decides to be a strict conservative about the Capitol—following Meigs' advice not to extend the west front and Olmsted's not to change the terrace by adding windows—the various needs of the Congress and the annual invasion of seven million tourists eager to see the Capitol remain unsolved problems. The crowding has transformed Olmsted's great east plaza into a parking lot. Tourist buses and garbage trucks reduce the monumental effect. The Architect of the Capitol, George Stewart, has written:

"The extension and reconstruction of the East Front as constructed did not allow or provide for adequate service facilities in that such provisions were to be provided in the Underground Garages which have never been approved by the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol project. The United States Capitol is still without adequate means for service. It is one of the few major buildings in the United States that is without truck docks, service elevators, or other means for the orderly handling of the necessary services of the building and for its occupants."<sup>33</sup>

The American Institute of Architects also suggested that ". . . an underground development for the east plaza side of the Capitol should be explored for the possible use of multi-level parking and visitor's [sic] facilities."<sup>34</sup>

To be faithful to Olmsted, Stewart's plan for service facilities under the East Plaza should be followed. Perhaps tourist buses might also have a stop there too. The present proposal is to have buses deliver their passengers at the foot of Capitol Hill to hike up to the new terrace entrances in the west front. This plan might not be popular with the infirm, especially in bad weather, and the Architect might be tempted to permit the buses to deliver their passengers to the "unassigned public space" of 9,052 square feet between the two truck loading docks planned under the stairways of the new terrace structure.<sup>35</sup> Then we could expect a parade of buses across the west front of the Capitol joining the delivery trucks and service vehicles.

It must be remembered, however, that since Olmsted's day, the grounds controlled

by the Architect of the Capitol have been extended all the way to the Union Station Plaza, an addition of 6.8 acres.<sup>30</sup> A vast new visitors' center has been approved for the station giving Washington a chance to imitate on a much larger scale, the successful Information Center of Williamsburg where great throngs of tourists are given a preview through movies and exhibits of what they are to see in the historic restoration. Leaving their cars behind they take free buses to the points of interest in Williamsburg. The tourists coming to Washington will find that there is room for 4,000 cars over the tracks at Union Station and that they can go on foot or by minibus to the Capitol among other places.<sup>31</sup> Fewer people would want to park on the East Plaza. Thanks to the new facilities at the Union Station, the demands on restaurants and tourist services at the Capitol will be less.

How much guidance do the letters and documents penned by Frederick Law Olmsted and his associates, Thomas U. Walter, Edward Clark, and Justin Morrill, provide anyone trying to preserve the historic Capitol that tourists come to see and at the same time keep the increasing needs of Congress well supplied? Of these, Olmsted is unique in his conception of the grounds of the Capitol as a unified work of art serving as a dignified setting for the architectural grandeur of the building. The East Plaza must be a grand entrance to the Capitol and the stage for ceremonial occasions, not a parking lot, even by permit as it is today. The west grounds display the Capitol to the Mall and the city, and in green foliage and sweeping lawn provide a soothing contrast to the brilliant whiteness of the building. The terrace is a solid windowless base for the building rather than an extension of it going stepwise down Capitol Hill. No one else, not even Walter or Bulfinch, had this consistent and brilliant an idea for the setting of the Capitol. Olmsted's plan and the reasons behind it seem worth understanding when changes are suggested.

Thomas U. Walter and Senator Justin Morrill anticipated the aesthetic reasoning behind the Stewart proposals to extend and redesign the central porticos of the old Capitol. Walter proposed many extensions, one of them grotesque,<sup>32</sup> but his design of the dome and the new House and Senate wings is impressive romantic classicism. If the central portico is brought further west his drawings should be followed. The opinions of his friend, Justin Morrill, champion of the Library of Congress, are worthy of great respect. His Library of Congress Speech is full of sage remarks such as:

"Nothing more can be expected from experts and artists, selected to do a work fore-ordained, than a presentation of some constrained plans for the extension of the Capitol. They are to be so instructed. They will furnish the pictures. They can do no less than to supply the specific demand insisted upon by those under whose authority they are to act, and especially if there should be an undimmed prospect of finding future employment in the construction of their new plans. The answer to the Hudibrastic question: 'What makes all doctrine plain and clear?' was, 'A thousand pounds a year,' and can be understood by modern draughtsmen, I do not say architects, as well as by ancient theologians."<sup>33</sup>

Morrill's mistake, according to present-day disciples of L'Enfant, was his suggestion that the Library of Congress be built blocking Pennsylvania Avenue so that today, it cuts off a view of the Capitol from the southwest. Still, it was he who sought out Olmsted and was willing to listen to both Walter and his rival, Meigs.<sup>34</sup>

Montgomery Meigs cared enough about the Capitol to follow the work on it as long as he lived. Three years before his death he was in

correspondence with Edward Clark inquiring about his list of Walter's drawings of the Capitol and expressing his concern for Walter's widow. He wrote, too, that he approved of the nearly completed Terrace. I do not think that his quarrels with Walter blinded him to the merits of the man. He was able to improve upon the latter's interior design of the Senate and House wings because he followed his own advice: "In a multitude of counselors there is safety," and consulted with eminent scientists, A. D. Bache and Joseph Henry, in making his revisions.<sup>35</sup> His argument against the western projection of the Bulfinch portico is well-considered as Walter admitted. Yet he did not consider what the effect of such an extension would be on the view of the building from the base of Capitol Hill.

Olmsted, by contrast, did make a careful estimate of the effect his proposed terrace would have on a view of the building from the west lawn. He dropped the level of the outside walls of his terrace four feet below the height of his previous design so that the basement of the Capitol would not be obscured.<sup>36</sup> Meigs, on the other hand, did not consider a perspective of the extension. Yet, such a study would show more clearly than any other why the flat roof line Bulfinch designed for the central structure, which Walter duplicated on the House and Senate wings, should be kept and why a projection at the center would mar the most important view of the building.

The seated statue of John Marshall is a fixed vantage point which will not be changed should the extension be built.<sup>37</sup> Standing now in front of the statue one can see half of the peristyle above the drum of the Capitol dome to the top. Standing there after the proposed improvement is made one will be able to see only the rounded part of the dome over the peak of the pediment. To have a view of the dome comparable to that of the present day from the Marshall statue, one would have to go back down Capitol Hill at least 429 feet, if not further, because of the slope of the ground. From a comparable position in 1930, Bulfinch's dome was badly obscured by his west front, but his flat roof, which he may have wanted to change, works well in exhibiting the Walter dome even when one is quite close to the base of the terrace.<sup>38</sup> After the Stewart extension, the best close-up view of the dome would be from the East Plaza, not the west grounds.

The aesthetic mistake made by widening the terrace and projecting the central portico to the west would be similar to, but not as serious as, that made by Carlo Maderna in building his 17th century facade on the front of the Vatican by which he obscured a full view of Michaelangelo's dome from the Great Piazza. The proposed addition to the Capitol will spoil the present sight of the dome from the west and hide the wings from the north and south sides of the building. Perhaps more damaging, the graceful features of the present terrace, particularly the arched curve on the first level back of the fountain, will be replaced by an uninteresting straight wall with the windows which Olmsted opposed piercing his dam.

Should these aesthetic considerations be ruling, the practical problems of how to fix the sandstone, what to do with seven million tourists, and how to serve Congress better will not be solved, but other solutions may be more seriously considered than they are now, and a national architectural masterpiece will not have been altered for transitory reasons.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> J. George Stewart and Associate Architects, *Preliminary Plans for the Extension of the West Central Front of the Capitol* (Washington, D.C., 1967), pp. 15-23, 111-115; Nan Robertson, "Plan to Extend the Capitol Scored," *New York Times*, June 24, 1966, p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Wolf Von Eckhardt, "Lesser Minds Fiddle

with What Fathers Fussed Over," *Washington Post*, July 24, 1966, p. E-5; I. T. Frary, *They Built the Capitol* (Richmond, 1940), pp. 240, 242, 246-247; Architect of the Capitol, et al., *Compilation of Works of Art and Other Objects in the United States Capitol* (Washington, D.C., 1965), p. 199; Frederick Law Olmsted to E. H. Rollins, n.d., printed, Box 35, Olmsted MSS, Library of Congress.

<sup>3</sup> Stewart, pp. 80, 106; Von Eckhardt, "Lesser Minds Fiddle..."

<sup>4</sup> Stewart, pp. 24, 25, 33-36, 40, 89; Frederick Law Olmsted to Montgomery C. Meigs, January 15, 1875, ALS, Quartermaster General's Office Papers, Record Group 92, Entry 294, National Archives.

<sup>5</sup> Frederick Law Olmsted, "Memorandum," quoted in U.S. Government Printing Office, *Documentary History of the Construction and Development of the United States Capitol* (Washington, D.C., 1904), p. 1160. Compare plates 14 and 47, Frary, pages 54 and 145 to see the difference between the ground plan of 1800 and that of ca. 1818.

<sup>6</sup> Frary, pp. 76-79.

<sup>7</sup> Frary, pp. 139-155, 287-290; Charles A. Place, *The Life and Letters of Charles Bulfinch* (New York, 1925), pp. 260-263; *Documentary History*, pp. 1038-1039, 1209, 1218.

<sup>8</sup> Thomas U. Walter, *Report of the Architect of the United States Capitol Extension*, November 1, 1864 (Washington, D.C., 1864) with accompanying plan, pp. 5-6. See figure 4. For a slightly different Walter plan see negative 22884, Architect of the Capitol's Office.

<sup>9</sup> Senator Justin S. Morrill to Frederick Law Olmsted, May 6, 1873, ALS, Olmsted Associates, Brookline, Mass.; Frederick Law Olmsted, "Historical Notes of the Capitol Grounds," and "The Present Design," printed in *Appendix to the Annual Report of the Architect of the Capitol*, June 30, 1882 (Washington, D.C., 1882), pp. 13-18; John Nolen, "The Work of Frederick Law Olmsted, Part II: The Terraces and Landscape Work of the United States Capitol at Washington," *House and Garden*, IX (March 1906), 117-123.

<sup>10</sup> Henry Hope Reed and Sophia Duckworth, *Central Park: A History and a Guide* (New York, 1967), pp. 82-84 and jacket illustration; "Proposed Improvements at the Capitol," *Harper's Weekly*, XXIX (December 26, 1885), 860, with engraving.

<sup>11</sup> Frederick Law Olmsted to Mr. Perry, March 20, 1885, letterpress copy in Letter-Book dated June 1884-September 1887, pp. 178-181, Olmsted MSS, Library of Congress; Frederick Law Olmsted to the Honorable William B. Allison, n.d. (ca. July 30, 1886), typed copy in Box 35, Olmsted MSS, Library of Congress; *Documentary History*, pp. 1238-40, 1245-48, 1251.

<sup>12</sup> Edward Clark to Frederick Law Olmsted, February 16, 1886, letterpress copy, Letter-Book 29, pp. 201-202, Architect of the Capitol's Office.

<sup>13</sup> Henry L. Dawes to his wife, July 16, 1886, ALS, Henry L. Dawes MSS, Box 15, Library of Congress.

<sup>14</sup> Frederick Law Olmsted to Edward Clark, February 13, 1886, ALS, Architect's Office. (One of two letters the same day.)

<sup>15</sup> Frederick Law Olmsted to Montgomery C. Meigs, January 15, 1874, ALS, QGO Papers, Record Group 92, Entry 294, National Archives.

<sup>16</sup> Frederick Law Olmsted, undated draft (probably 1874), Box 35, Olmsted MSS, Library of Congress, which is quoted in Stewart, p. 80.

<sup>17</sup> Montgomery C. Meigs to Frederick Law Olmsted, January 13, 1875, Olmsted Associates.

<sup>18</sup> Montgomery C. Meigs to Frederick Law Olmsted, January 18, 1875, TLS, Olmsted Associates.

<sup>19</sup> Montgomery C. Meigs to Justin S. Morrill, January 11, 1875, ALS, Olmsted Associates. In a draft of this letter dated January 8, 1875 in QGO Papers, Record Group 92,

Entry 294, National Archives, Meigs directs that it be sent to Senators Morrill, Edmunds, Allison, as well as to Spofford.

<sup>20</sup> Montgomery C. Meigs to Justin S. Morrill, January 11, 1875. For details of the quarrel between Meigs and Walter see Letter-Book, VI, pp. 1824-1837, Architect's Office for some of the correspondence.

<sup>21</sup> Thomas U. Walter to Justin S. Morrill, January 20, 1875, ALS, Morrill MSS, Library of Congress.

<sup>22</sup> Justin S. Morrill, "The Library of Congress, the Capitol, and its Grounds," Speech in the United States Senate, March 31, 1879, printed (Washington, D.C., 1879), pp. 7, 11.

<sup>23</sup> Montgomery C. Meigs to Ainsworth R. Spofford, March 13, 1882 as quoted in W. W. Rice, "The National Library," Speech in the House of Representatives, June 20, 1882, printed (Washington, D.C., 1882), pp. 13-14.

<sup>24</sup> Rice, "The National Library," p. 13.

<sup>25</sup> Rice, "The National Library," pp. 9, 13; Stewart, pp. 92, 104-106.

<sup>26</sup> Montgomery C. Meigs to Justin S. Morrill, January 11, 1875, ALS, Olmsted Associates.

<sup>27</sup> Montgomery C. Meigs to Frederick Law Olmsted, January 13, 1875, ALS, Olmsted Associates.

<sup>28</sup> Morrill, "The Library of Congress, the Capitol, and Its Grounds," p. 12.

<sup>29</sup> John W. Reys, *Monumental Washington: The Planning and Development of the Capitol Center* (Princeton, N.J., 1967), pp. 108, 108n., 112-117, 179.

<sup>30</sup> 90th Congress, First Session, *Senate Joint Resolution 74*, May 22, 1967, p. 1.

<sup>31</sup> Stewart, pp. 34-36, 58-61, 80.

<sup>32</sup> Stewart, pp. 24, 35, 80-81. Olmsted's reluctance to practice architecture is made clear by his letter to Meigs of January 15, 1875 quoted above and also by the fact that he resigned from the supervision of the construction of the terraces on July 1, 1885 because he thought that a matter for an architect. Frederick Law Olmsted to William Mahone, draft, Box 35, December 9, 1884, Olmsted MSS, Library of Congress; Frederick Law Olmsted to Mr. Perry, March 20, 1885, letterpress copy in Letter-Book dated June 1884-September 1887, pp. 178-181, Olmsted MSS, Library of Congress.

<sup>33</sup> Stewart, pp. 33-36, 44, 110.

<sup>34</sup> Frederick Law Olmsted to Justin S. Morrill, undated draft ca. January 1, 1874, Box 35, Olmsted MSS, Library of Congress.

<sup>35</sup> Stewart, pp. 33, 47.

<sup>36</sup> Stewart, p. 28.

<sup>37</sup> F. D. Lethbridge, Norman Fletcher, et al., "AIA Task Force Report," *A Report on Conditions of the West Front of the Capitol*, The American Institute of Architects (Washington, D.C., 1967), p. 7.

<sup>38</sup> Stewart, pp. 35, 46, 61.

<sup>39</sup> Frary, p. 254.

<sup>40</sup> House of Representatives, 90th Congress, First Session, "Hearings Before the House Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Committee on Public Works," *National Visitor Center Act of 1967* (Washington, D.C., 1967), pp. 1-2, 80-100.

<sup>41</sup> Frary, p. 179; Glenn Brown, *History of the United States Capitol* (Washington, D.C., 1900), II, 169-170, plates 145, 146, 274; Von Eckhardt, *Lesser Minds Fiddle . . .*

<sup>42</sup> Justin S. Morrill, "The Library of Congress, the Capitol, and Its Grounds," pp. 5-6.

<sup>43</sup> Justice S. Morrill to Frederick Law Olmsted, May 6, 1873, ALS, Olmsted Associates; Reys, pp. 61, 108n., 115.

<sup>44</sup> Montgomery C. Meigs to Justin S. Morrill, January 11, 1875, ALS, Olmsted Associates; Glenn Brown, *United States Capitol*, II, 126-128, 132-136; Edward Clark to Montgomery C. Meigs, July 1, 1889 and July 8, 1889, letterpress copies, Letter-Book 35, pp. 320-321, 40-41, Architect's Office.

<sup>45</sup> Frederick Law Olmsted to Montgomery C. Meigs, January 15, 1875, ALS, QGO Papers, Record Group 92, Entry 294, National

Archives; Frederick Law Olmsted to E. H. Rollins, n.d., printed, Box 35, Olmsted MSS, Library of Congress.

<sup>46</sup> Stewart, p. 67.

<sup>47</sup> Stewart, pp. 24, 109.

### SECRETARY VOLPE REVIEWS NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION NEEDS: OUTLINES PROGRAMS TO MEET THEM

#### HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the United States is developing a growing awareness of the burden being placed on our national transportation system and of the urgent needs to find solutions to the requirement for expanding and modernizing this system.

The facets of the transportation system are no longer viewed as separate, but as parts of a unified whole that must be considered in this light.

The Department of Transportation was created to take a consolidated approach to the problems of transportation and is coordinating the activities in a number of related fields.

On January 27, Hon. John A. Volpe, who has served for the past year as Secretary of Transportation, returned to his home State to deliver a major address outlining the major problems faced by his Department. His speech before the Worcester, Mass., Chamber of Commerce was an eloquent delineation of the situation as it exists and what is being planned to meet the needs.

Mr. President, because of the national scope and impact of Federal transportation activities, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Volpe's address be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION JOHN A. VOLPE

Our greatest aviation challenge is the explosive growth of the aviation industry. Airline passenger miles have doubled in the last 4 years and are expected to triple in the next decade.

General aviation—non-airline aircraft—have, at the same time been increasing their flying time by about 4-thousand hours a day. This is a phenomenal growth. It is good growth, too. It is an indication of solid economic progress. Yet at the same time, we face problems with the supporting systems—airfields, traffic control facilities and navigational aids.

Everywhere we are short. Right now we need 9-hundred new airports, and we need improvements at over 27-hundred existing airports.

I am—of course—well aware of the Worcester Chamber's efforts regarding a new regional jetport to take some of the pressure off Boston, and even New York.

And I want to congratulate you for your interest. This is the kind of community support that makes a city and a region grow and develop.

But airports are not our only shortage. We shall need to spend on the operation, maintenance and expansion of airways sys-

tems 12-billion dollars over the next ten years. That averages out about 3-million dollars per day.

To meet these needs, the President has sent to the Congress our Airport/Airways legislation which proposes new user charges to be paid by those who benefit directly from the services provided. The funds from these charges will be used to help pay the tremendous costs of operating, maintaining and expanding the supporting facilities needed by our flying public.

The Bill passed the House by the astonishing vote of 337 to 6. Hearings are completed on the Senate side and we are hopeful of final action in time to put the Bill on the President's desk as a Valentine's Day present. Passage of this legislation will do much to solve the near-crisis that has developed in our air system.

We have similar problems in land transportation. You, of course, are all aware of the tremendous job done by our Federal Highway Administration, particularly with the beginning of the Interstate Highway Program in 1956 which I was privileged to initiate for President Eisenhower.

Our highways have brought great progress, both economic, industrial and by way of safety on our highways. As a matter of fact, we know that for every five miles of interstate system that we build we save one human life—not just for that year but for every succeeding year.

Your Worcester Expressway is, of course, perhaps our best advertisement for our interstate highway system. I remember how many meetings I came to here in Worcester to resolve the location of the expressway as well as other highway improvements and I remember being pushed rather hard as Governor for commitment as to when the Worcester Expressway would be fully opened to the public. I remember well that I said that we would have the project substantially completed by the end of 1969.

I remember that day in November 1968 when we opened up the section from Brosnihan Square, Frank McGrath stated publicly that despite earlier disagreement, the city now recognized that the D-P-W and the Bureau of Public Roads were right, and that the Worcester Expressway's present location is best for the City of Worcester.

I was delighted to hear that the 11-mile section down to I-495 was opened this month, and I think that high praise is certainly in order for Governor Sargent and Commissioner Ed Ribbs and the people at the D-P-W. And despite many setbacks, including the freezing of Federal funds, work stoppages, not to mention the inescapable adversity of a very wet November and the present unfavorable snows, we made it almost right on the nose. The actual completion date is June 15, and I think all hands deserve hearty congratulations.

On the national scene, in the past year we have opened to traffic 1,774 new miles of interstate highways. This brings our total interstate mileage to nearly 30,000—or about two-thirds of the whole system. And the interstate system—I might point out, will—when completed—amount to only one percent of our mileage but will carry 20 percent of our traffic.

Notwithstanding the tremendous progress that we have made, however, in highway construction, and without a doubt we will have to build more highways, the fact remains that this has been done without a parallel effort in developing our public transportation.

In our cities, public transportation is carrying about 10-billion passengers a year. It is the life blood of our urban areas. Yet public transportation is in difficulty. In recent years, some 235 transit companies have gone out of business. And there has been very substantial reduction in the number of passengers using public transportation

from about 25-billion passengers per year to less than 10-billion passengers per year. Many transit companies, consequently, are in serious financial difficulty. Many are victims of the same cycle—increased costs require increases in fares which, in turn, results in lower patronage. Yet, my friends, public transit is a vital necessity.

Our cities—and I'm talking here of even small cities in the 50,000 population bracket—cannot depend on the automobile alone. The private automobile has tremendous shortcomings in urban areas—all serious, but some more serious than others.

Never mind the fact that an automobile is some 20-feet long, weighs 2 tons, and carries, on the average, 1.6 people on each trip. Never mind the fact that the internal combustion engine (depending on whether you listen to its fans or its critics) generates from 50 to 80 percent of all the air pollution we breathe every day. Never mind the fact that the automobile kills 55,000 people every year, over 150 every day.

Never mind the fact that the leading cause of death among our young people, aged, 16 to 25, is the highway crash. Never mind the fact that in America today we have one linear mile of highway for every square mile of land, and with the automobile population growing by 10,000 vehicles every 24 hours the demand for additional pavement is enormous.

Over and above all these items, we must accept the fact that there are those in our economy for whom the automobile is far too expensive a purchase.

We must accept the fact that all our proposed social remedies, such as model cities projects, health centers, evening college classes, job centers, suburban employment opportunities, and you-name-it, just aren't going to get full utilization if we make automobile ownership an unwritten prerequisite for participation.

Because of these factors, we attach great importance to public transportation. I recommended to the President and the President proposed to the Congress last August bold new legislation in this field.

Our Bill proposes a long-term, \$10-billion program to provide funds on an assured basis for the construction, expansion and improvement of public transportation in a growing America.

It is not just a big city Bill, designed to build subways and rapid transit systems. It will provide for sharply upgraded bus transportation, will enable the use of exclusive busways on urban freeways, and will provide for such things as "maxi-cabs," buses that provide door-to-door service in response to programmed demands. And it provides, too, for such things as new turbine buses, which practically eliminate the sort of air pollution we get today from conventional buses, as well as being far quieter.

Passage of this legislation can directly benefit the City of Worcester, and will tie in efficiently with the massive urban redevelopment projects you have underway for a revitalized center city.

I hope that each of you will see fit to help us on this Bill, and pass along the "good word" to our Congressional Delegation to get this vital legislation passed.

Our other land transportation interests are covered by our Federal Railroad Administration—the sponsor of the new high speed Metroliners between Washington and New York and the Turbotrain between New York and Boston.

We are convinced at the Department that there is a definite necessity to continue a basic minimum national rail passenger service, and this Administration is hard at work—right now—drawing up legislation that will provide continued service over medium-haul distances in and between densely populated areas of the country.

At sea, our Department is represented by the men of our great United States Coast Guard. Their mission is far greater than ever—Marine sciences, oil pollution, boating safety, inspection of merchant vessels, and coastal support for our ground forces in Vietnam, to mention just a few.

Our other Maritime interest is the United States side of the Saint Lawrence Seaway—America's fourth seacoast which is making the great cities of the Midwest truly international ports.

The great thrust of our Department, however, is toward the future; research and development—the new—the different, the daring. We helped in opening up the Northwest Passage through the Arctic for supertankers to the north slope of Alaska.

We are sponsoring research on tracked air cushioned vehicles that will travel at high speeds on a cushion of air over a single track—Gravitrails that will travel in vacuum tubes underground—linear induction motors—the supersonic transport. We are developing new ways to make public transit more attractive. Every method of transportation is being scrutinized and examined for improvement.

We are looking for speedier and more efficient transportation, certainly, but we now have two equally urgent additional purposes. The first is safety. And safety on our Nation's highways comes immediately to mind.

The repetition of the number of highway fatalities may have dulled our senses. Let me tell the facts another way . . . 10,000 accidents per day . . . 10,000 persons injured everyday . . . total economic loss . . . \$40-million every day. This must stop. And I intend to stop it.

I have brought into the Department of Transportation the best highway safety expert there is. He is Doug Toms, from the State of Washington. He is a recognized safety expert, well known and respected. I have put him on my staff reporting directly to me. And he and I are moving.

I am ordering here and now, tonight, that our program to build an experimental safety car begin. This car will be a mobile crash laboratory. The car we are planning must be safe in any type of crash up to 50 miles an hour. It must be able to crash into a concrete barrier at 50 miles an hour with no injury to the occupants. It must be capable of rolling over at 70 miles per hour with the passenger compartment still intact. It will offer new handling and braking capabilities superior to anything on the market today. It will provide improved visibility for the driver and it will be powered by an engine which can effectively use low pollution fuels.

Our plan is to have 14 of these cars built and tested by the end of 1972. It is our intention that the auto industry will seize on the new safety improvements we develop and will incorporate them in production models. These cars will also provide us data to be used in setting future standards of safety for the manufacture of production automobiles.

Today, in Washington, we have asked for proposals to develop, design and construct a family sedan. We shall let two contracts for prototype development. Later we shall select the best car of these two and order an additional 12 models.

This is a beginning. Our plans call for us to build additional safety cars in models other than sedans, and be capable of withstanding crashes at greater speeds.

This is an integrated systems approach to highway safety, and I am confident that it will result in a substantial decrease in highway fatalities.

While the knowledge and the benefits of this program may be a few years coming, there are more immediate steps that we can

and are taking. One is the airbag restraint system, which automatically cushions the occupant at the instant of a crash. We are aiming at having this ready for 1973 models. Another project is the so-called "plastic hinge" flexible bumper which also is nearing the stage where it can be added to present cars and take the "crunch out of the crash," for the benefit of those inside the vehicle.

Safety, then is a priority consideration. Another is the preservation and protection of our environment.

President Nixon stated the case most eloquently in his State of the Union message last week. He said, "clean air, clean water, open spaces, these should once again be the birthright of every American." For my part, I am determined to support this cause to the fullest.

The toll of environmental destruction is horrifying—yellow blankets of smog over most of our major cities—smog so thick it shows up on aircraft radar screens. Rivers and streams so dangerously polluted that out in Cleveland, the Cuyahoga River was so oily it caught fire.

We are going to change this. And I know the good people of Massachusetts will be solidly with us. This, our State, is a miracle of nature's beauty. We shall defend it. Frank Sargent made this perfectly clear in his annual message.

And I don't mind saying that I am proud of the Inland Wetlands Bill and the Coastal Wetlands Bill, both of which I had the privilege of signing into law when I was Governor. Not to mention the \$150 million water pollution measure we enacted a few years ago.

But even measures such as those are not enough. The Massachusetts spirit of conservation must become a national spirit, because drifting smog, oily rivers, noisy jet aircraft, and smoking internal combustion engines are no respectors of state lines. The President knows this, and this Administration is determined to get results, national results.

It was my privilege to be sitting directly in front of the President when he delivered his great State of the Union message last Thursday and I was very much impressed. He has the correct and best course in Vietnam. He is bringing an end to that war, honorably and sensibly.

His battle against inflation is courageous and he is winning. Friends, he is waging this battle on behalf of you and me and the 200 million other Americans. We must help him.

I could sense from that speech his great vision for this country in the decade to come. He foresees the peace and plenty that can be ours. I hope we all share that vision. There is nothing we cannot achieve. The opportunities of the future are the greatest ever. You people here, in this city, should have special dreams of the future, for this is the home of Dr. Robert Goddard, father of American rocketry. You have been fortunate in seeing all his great dreams fulfilled. But this is only a start. There is a passage in the book, *The Promise of Space* by Arthur C. Clarke which I should like to read to you. It has an awesome sense of the infinity of opportunities that can be ours in the future. He writes:

"Every age has its dreams, its symbols of romance. Past generations were moved by the graceful power of the great windjammers, by the distant whistle of locomotives pounding through the night, by the caravans leaving on the golden road to Smarand, . . . our grandchildren will likewise have their inspiration—up among the stars.

"Our grandchildren will be able to look at the night sky and they will know that some nuclear-powered mariners has set forth once more, on the ocean whose farther shore he can never reach."

And so, my friends, the only limit for us are the limits of our vision. Let us not dream little dreams for we are moving into a most exciting decade. I recall a Cabinet meeting just before Christmas. My colleagues and I presented reports to the President on the first year of the new Administration. Toward the end of the meeting, the President turned his attention to the future and as he spoke of the coming decade of the Seventies his voice lowered as though he spoke in prayer. There was in his voice deep faith and hope and charity for all mankind.

He reminded us all that although he was impressed with the material progress made during the year, and even though we foresee great technological advances such as 1,000 mile-an-hour aircraft, education for all of our young people, the elimination of poverty, he knew that more must be accomplished.

He felt that technological progress would be meaningless unless America and its citizens captured something else—

An ability to live with faith in God;

An ability for man to live at peace with his environment;

An ability for man to live at peace with all his neighbors throughout the world.

These are our goals for the next decade. I know we can reach them for I know we shall be seeing a spiritual rebirth in America. I thank God for this America, for even with its faults, there is among our people a tremendous reservoir of great faith. We must bring that faith forward. We must make its presence felt.

#### ADVERTISING AGAINST RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT—THE APPALLING PERFORMANCE OF ELECTRIC UTILITIES

### HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, at long last there is widespread and growing concern about the deterioration of the environment. We have on earth a sharply limited supply of resources. They are being depleted and polluted. Various methods of arresting the damage, which do not need restatement here, have been proposed. It shall be necessary to reorder priorities, to change systems and, above all, spend money, in order to assure that earth will be habitable a few generations from now.

I have studied several recent, large advertisements by components of the Nation's largest industry, electric power. One solicits readers to write for the pamphlet about how Commonwealth Edison is reducing pollution in the Chicago area. Another tells how Baltimore Gas and Electric's proposed Calvert Cliffs nuclear plant will be safe, for oysters as well as for people. A third encourages customers of Virginia Electric and Power Co. simply to use more electricity and buy more electrical equipment.

These advertisements are typical. Some encourage greater use of a product, even though it is in short supply. Others seek to assure readers that the sponsors are doing all that they can to improve the environment.

Under our regulatory system, advertising and sales promotion are included

in the operating costs of investor-owned utilities, which operate on a cost-plus basis. Thus utilities, unlike unregulated companies, are privileged to have free advertising. Similarly—and again unlike unregulated companies—utilities can include all research and development in the operating costs. The State utility commissions invariably approve a rate structure which will permit the utility a healthy return after all advertising, research and development and more basic expenses have been met.

Given that kind of an arrangement, one would suppose that the utilities, in keeping with their advertised policy of environmental protection and provision of "all the power that a growing America needs," are spending a great deal of money on research and development. Electric power supply is neither adequate nor reliable. Utilities are major contributors to pollution of the environment. Surely, one would suppose, "the folks at your investor-owned electric light and power companies"—as the ads say—must be doing their part, especially inasmuch as the customers pay—and gladly, I believe—the entire cost of research and development regarding environmental protection, adequacy, and reliability.

Mr. President, I thought I was past the point of being appalled at some of the practices of the investor-owned utilities. But I was not prepared for the statistics on their research and development expenditures, from the I.O.U.'s own reports, compiled by the Federal Power Commission, which has just released them.

The 212 major electric utilities together account for one-eighth of all the investment in this country. They took in \$19.4 billion in 1968. They netted 15.4 cents on the dollar, after paying all expenses, including taxes and interest. Yet almost one-fourth—51 companies to be exact—did not, according to their own reports, spend a cent on research and development in 1968, either within the company or through support for research and development by others.

Some of the 51 companies are small, in comparison with the large utility fiefdoms which dwarf some States in resources and area. Others are wholly owned generating subsidiaries of operating utilities. But among the 51 are large operating companies: Philadelphia Electric, which is a part of one of the most fragile transmission systems in the Nation; Montana-Dakota Utilities, whose service area covers probably one-fifth of the Nation's coal reserves, Commonwealth Edison of Indiana, Missouri Edison, Maine Public Service, Holyoke Water Power in Massachusetts, Florida Public Utilities, Black Hills Power & Light, and both the Virginia and Maryland Delmarva Power and Light companies.

On the average, only slightly more than 2 mills per revenue dollar were spent by I.O.U.'s on research and development in 1968, either within the company or in support of research by others; 57 percent—\$21,794,000—of the research was done outside the companies. The need for reliance on help from outside the industry itself was underscored by a recent survey conducted by the Engineer

Manpower Commission of the Engineers Joint Council. The survey, published in the May-June 1969 issue of *Engineer*, found the utilities industry the worst equipped of any for advanced research, by the important criterion of number of Ph. D.'s employed by industry—only eight among 11,800 engineers. The average number of Ph. D.'s among 11,800 engineers in this country would be 5 percent, or 590 rather than eight.

As a distinguished engineering professor told me recently:

An industry's ability to solve pollution problems requires complicated research and development, and any group's ability to solve technical problems is proportional to the number of highly trained engineers in it.

The Nation's largest industry is ill-equipped for doing its part to improve the quality of life in America.

Furthermore, the nature of some reported research and development expenditures by I.O.U.'s is open to question. The industry exhorts itself to use university faculty members to help solve industry problems. A typical result of such faculty use appears in the current, January 15, 1970, issue of *Public Utilities Fortnightly*.

Did the industry go to the engineering faculty for the advice now published in *Fortnightly*? No, it went to a professor of marketing, Thomas R. Wotruba of San Diego State College. He called for more "market research" and suggested that State utility commissions—some of which do not have enough staff even to read the ads and quarterly reports of utilities, let alone to regulate them—get some marketing experts. These experts would look kindly upon more expenditures on promotion.

It is worth noting that this professor, who emphasized the kind of "research" utilities love, recently completed a fellowship with San Diego Gas & Electric, through the courtesy of the right-wing Foundation for Economic Education at Irvington-on-Hudson, N.Y. Power companies have liberally contributed to FEE ever since it was founded in 1946, and indeed helped set it up as one of the high-voltage lines in the utility propaganda transmission system. In turn FEE, through its monthly publication, the *Freeman*, consistently plugs for complete market monopoly by the few investor-owned utilities and advocates abolition of public education, public roads, and the income tax as well.

The amount of advertising and other sales expenses reported by I.O.U.'s in 1968 amounted to almost eight times as much as the industry's expenditure on research and development. For a number of major companies, the research and development annual expenditure would not pay the salary of a mediocre engineer for one summer. I shall put the utilities' own statistics in the *Record* later on in my remarks. First, let me comment on how reported advertising expenditures understate the actual amount of money and time the utilities spend generating public opinion.

The utilities reported spending \$273,777,000 on advertising and other sales expenses in 1968. In another part of their report they list "National and Local Institutional Advertising Expense," which

totalled more than \$15.8 million. But there are many other utility expenditures in this area which show up in neither of those accounts. These are variously described as "industry dues," "professional services," "employee, customer, and stockholder information," "dues and contributions," "good will," or simply "other miscellaneous operating expenses."

These unaccounted expenditures include, for example, Pacific Gas & Electric's \$233,333 for "educational promotion projects" and, in Minnesota, Northern States Power's \$333,727 for "industry association dues," its \$293,553 for "information for stockholders," its \$37,793 to retain the law firm headed by the treasurer of the Democratic National Committee and its \$14,181 spent on "sporting events." These are, of course, all part of getting the lights to burn, from Minnesota to Mississippi, where the customers of Mississippi Power & Light unknowingly put up \$3,122 for season football tickets.

I wonder how many of the fans who are trying to obtain Redskin tickets actually have paid for them but did not get them, when they paid their utility bills?

In these unilluminated accounts Duke Power records its \$5,069 sent in 1968 to Central Surveys, the Shenandoah, Iowa, public opinion firm which always comes up with the public opinion the utilities seek, and its \$1,457 sent to Industrial News Review, the canned editorial service in Oregon which each week sends 11,000 editors free editorials praising power companies.

Only the tip of such expenditures can be seen in the annual company reports to the FPC. They do not record the numerous retainers paid to legislators, or the use of company airplanes and other utility perquisites and facilities, for political purposes such as those by the board chairman of Montana Power, who doubled in 1968 as western finance chairman for the man who is now President of the United States. Nor do they show the vast expenditure of time by key company executives whose principal assignment is to join all the local organizations and keep them pleasantly misinformed about the utility industry.

So with the realization that reported advertising expenditures understate actual outlay, let us compare reported expenditures for advertising and research and development:

Florida Power Corp. spent \$42,000 on research and development, both within and outside the company, in 1968. However, it spent \$2,661,616 on advertising and other sales expenses.

For Florida Power & Light, expenditures in those categories were \$84,636 and \$5,841,985.

Illinois Power—\$68,558 and \$1,584,867, respectively.

Iowa Electric Light & Power—\$6,102 and \$1,069,882.

Iowa Southern—\$1,961 and \$521,845.

Kansas Power & Light—\$4,960 and \$649,929.

Central Maine Power—\$24,030 and \$1,236,561.

Brockton Edison—\$6,799 and \$392,295.

Cambridge Electric Light—\$4,897 and \$228,872.

Fall River Electric—\$3,355 and \$166,615.

Massachusetts Electric—\$31,785 and \$2,942,142.

New Bedford Gas & Edison Light—\$6,390 and \$432,098.

Western Massachusetts Electric—\$30,497 and \$1,640,474.

Mr. President, the expenditures of the six Massachusetts companies mentioned above supports the admission of a utility executive in New England that their "Big Eleven Power Loop" transmission system was developed by the advertising departments rather than the engineers.

Let us move over to the Midwest.

Upper Peninsula Power—\$1,600 for research and development and \$304,420 for advertising and other sales expenses.

Minnesota Power & Light—\$15,624 and \$984,444.

Kansas City Power & Light—\$36,660 and \$1,875,759.

New Mexico Electric Service—\$2,008 and \$118,189.

Montana Power—\$23,443 and \$712,129.

I noticed recently that Montana Power's board chairman, John E. Corette, is now a trustee of Edison Foundation, which the company describes as "a non-profit organization seeking to stimulate careers in science, engineering; and technology." Yet Montana Power reduced its expenditure from \$30,308 in 1967 to \$23,443 in 1968. Montana Power could have increased its 1968 research and development budget more than 20-fold simply out of Board Chairman Corette's windfall profits on stock options.

Concord Electric in New Hampshire spent \$5 on research and development in 1968. The company was probably trying out new heavy-duty flashlight batteries.

In New Jersey, Rockland Electric spent \$135 on research and development. This was done "outside the company," and it would be interesting to know what project that financed. The company spent \$238,951 on advertising and other sales expense. For Atlantic City Electric, the amounts were \$25,547 and \$3,187,925.

Otter Tail Power spent \$16,532 on research and development. The Justice Department has filed suit against that company, accusing it of monopolizing the sale of power in 464 towns in three States. Nevertheless, Otter Tail found it necessary to spend \$682,273 pushing the product on which it has such a vast monopoly.

Here are a few others, to emphasize the nationwide disinterest by I. O. U.'s in advancing energy technology, despite the cost-free nature of research and development expenditures:

Columbus and Southern Ohio Electric—\$66,120 and \$2,078,408.

Pennsylvania Power—\$25,032 and \$730,020.

Potomac Edison of Pennsylvania—\$5,075 and \$267,792.

Blackstone Valley Electric, in Pennsylvania—\$6,570 and \$690,520.

Northwestern Public Service, out in South Dakota—\$30 on R. & D.—more flashlight batteries, or perhaps a lantern?—\$261,017 on advertising and sales.

El Paso Electric—\$21,509 and \$666,655.

Washington Water Power—\$1,596 and \$903,525.

Northern States Power of Wisconsin—\$12,365 and \$806,664.

Wisconsin Public Service—\$33,191 and \$921,111.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the expenditures of all 212 companies for institutional advertising, advertising, and other sales expenses and for research and development, as reported by the utilities themselves and published in Statistics of Privately Owned Electric Utilities in the United States, 1968.

There being no objection, the lists were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

National and local institutional advertising expenses 1968

Company	
Alabama Power Co.	\$222,435
Alaska Electric Light & Power Co.	7,681
Alcoa Generating Corp.	-----
Alpena Power Co.	46
Appalachian Power Co.	160,346
Arizona Public Service Co.	4,461
Arkansas-Missouri Power Co.	-----
Arkansas Power & Light Co.	347,029
Arklahoma Corp.	-----
Atlantic City Electric Co.	-----
Baltimore Gas & Electric Co.	145,295
Bangor Hydro-Electric Co.	-----
Black Hills Power & Light Co.	-----
Blackstone Valley Electric Co.	8,858
Boston Edison Co.	389,144
Boston Gas Co.	-----
Brockton Edison Co.	8,817
California-Pacific Utilities Co.	-----
Cambridge Electric Light Co.	7,457
Canal Electric Co.	-----
Cape & Vineyard Electric Co.	3,432
Carolina Power & Light Co.	384,564
Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp.	48,033
Central Illinois Light Co.	162,679
Central Illinois Public Service Co.	42,528
Central Kansas Power Co.	-----
Central Louisiana Electric Co.	-----
Central Maine Power Co.	6,977
Central Power & Light Co.	-----
Central Telephone & Utilities Corp.	-----
Central Vermont Public Service Corp.	-----
Cheyenne Light, Fuel & Power Co.	9,547
Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co.	226,100
Citizens Utilities Co.	48,265
Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.	731,018
Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co.	124,901
Commonwealth Edison Co.	298,739
Commonwealth Edison Co. (Indiana)	-----
Community Public Service Co.	-----
Concord Electric Co.	2,568
Connecticut Light & Power.	126,814
Connecticut Valley Electric Co.	-----
Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Co.	-----
Conowingo Power Co.	1,185
Consolidated Water Power Co.	-----
Consolidated Edison of New York	266,193
Consumers Power Co.	507,871
Dallas Power & Light Co.	-----
Dayton Power & Light Co.	201,723
Delmarva Power & Light Co.	74,626
Delmarva Power & Light Co. of Maryland	12,604
Delmarva Power & Light Co. of Virginia	2,929

Company	Company	Company			
Detroit Edison Co.-----	\$131,629	Mississippi Power & Light Co.----	\$216,578	St. Joseph Light & Power Co.----	\$991
Duke Power Co.-----	258,927	Missouri Edison Co.-----	-----	Rumford Falls Power Co.-----	-----
Duquesne Light Co.-----	387,467	Missouri Power & Light Co.-----	3,217	Safe Harbor Water Power Corp.---	-----
Edison Sault Electric Co.-----	526	Missouri Public Service Co.-----	29,631	St. Joseph Light & Power Co.---	991
El Paso Electric Co.-----	-----	Missouri Utilities Co.-----	-----	San Diego Gas & Electric Co.-----	124,224
Electric Energy, Inc.-----	-----	Monongahala Power Co.-----	-----	Savannah Electric & Power Co.---	-----
Empire District Electric Co.-----	870	Montana-Dakota Utilities Co.-----	-----	Sherrard Power System.-----	-----
Exeter & Hampton Electric Co.-----	-----	Montana Power Co.-----	28,848	Sierra Pacific Power Co.-----	4,985
Fall River Electric Light Co.-----	5,503	Montaup Electric Co.-----	-----	South Beloit Water, Gas & Electric Co.-----	-----
Fitchburg Gas & Electric Co.-----	4,782	Mount Carmel Public Utility Co.-----	-----	South Carolina Electric & Gas Co.-----	134,231
Florida Power Corp.-----	322,230	Nantahala Power & Light Co.-----	830	Southern California Edison Co.---	1,307,686
Florida Power & Light.-----	66,875	Narragansett Electric Co., The.---	98,253	Southern Electric Generating Co.---	-----
Florida Public Utilities Co.-----	-----	Nevada Power Co.-----	17,354	Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Co.-----	967
Georgia Power Co.-----	221,529	New Bedford Gas & Edison Light Co.-----	8,171	Southwestern Electric Power Co.---	27,409
Granite State Electric Co.-----	4,462	New England Power Co.-----	56,919	Southwestern Electric Service Co.-----	8,188
Green Mountain Power Corp.-----	10,752	New Jersey Power & Light Co.---	34,190	Southwestern Public Service Co.---	41,214
Gulf Power Co.-----	121,058	New Mexico Public Service Co.-----	-----	Superior Water, Light & Power Co.-----	2,407
Gulf States Utilities Co.-----	228,490	New Orleans Public Service, Inc.---	174,630	Susquehanna Electric Co.-----	-----
Hartford Electric Light Co.-----	247,033	New York State Electric & Gas Corp.-----	143,448	Susquehanna Power Co.-----	-----
Hawaiian Electric Co.-----	67,237	Newport Electric Corp.-----	2,433	Tampa Electric Co.-----	21,047
Hershey Electric Co.-----	-----	Niagara Mohawk Power Co.-----	251,276	Tapaco, Inc.-----	-----
Hilo Electric Light Co.-----	-----	Northern Indiana Public Service Co.-----	71,897	Texas Electric Service Co.-----	5,108
Holyoke Power & Electric Co.-----	-----	Northern States Power (Minn.)---	4,337	Texas Power & Light Co.-----	-----
Holyoke Water Power Co.-----	25,542	Northern States Power (Wis.)---	-----	Toledo Edison Co.-----	139,654
Home Light & Power Co.-----	2,500	Northwestern Public Service Co.---	12,452	Tucson Gas & Electric Co.-----	-----
Houston Lighting & Power Co.-----	281,850	Ohio Edison Co.-----	129,423	Union Electric Co.-----	470,442
Idaho Power Co.-----	28,405	Ohio Power Co.-----	238,014	Union Light, Heat & Power Co.---	34,495
Illinois Power Co.-----	86,883	Ohio Valley Electric Corp.-----	-----	UGI Corp.-----	13,391
Indiana-Kentucky Electric Corp.-----	-----	Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co.-----	98,954	United Illuminating Co., The.---	83,942
Indiana-Michigan Electric Co.-----	197,958	Old Dominion Power Co.-----	-----	Upper Peninsula Generating Co.---	-----
Indianapolis Power & Light Co.---	38,827	Orange & Rockland Utilities, Inc.---	8,942	Upper Peninsula Power Co.-----	5,023
Interstate Power Co.-----	98,436	Otter Tail Power Co.-----	-----	Utah Power & Light Co.-----	221,054
Iowa Electric Light & Power Co.---	140,287	Pacific Gas & Electric Co.-----	341,905	Vermont Electric Power Co., Inc.---	-----
Iowa-Illinois Gas & Electric Co.---	88,953	Pacific Power & Light Co.-----	1,363	Virginia Electric & Power Co.---	23,179
Iowa Power & Light Co.-----	87,322	Pennsylvania Electric Co.-----	87,526	Washington Water Power Co., The.---	108,497
Iowa Public Service Co.-----	67,008	Pennsylvania Power Co.-----	18,367	West Penn Power Co.-----	56,078
Iowa Southern Utilities Co.-----	70,983	Pennsylvania Power & Light Co.---	3,196	West Texas Utilities Co.-----	20,715
Jersey Central Power & Light Co.---	89,126	Philadelphia Electric Co.-----	( <sup>1</sup> )	Western Colorado Power Co., The.---	11,334
Kansas City Power & Light Co.---	68,766	Philadelphia Electric Power Co.---	-----	Western Massachusetts Electric Co.-----	91,372
Kansas City Gas & Electric Co.---	61,444	Portland General Electric Co.---	74,845	Wheeling Electric Co.-----	16,115
Kansas Power & Light Co.-----	35,762	Potomac Edison Co., The.-----	27,173	White Mountain Power Co.-----	-----
Kauai Electric Co., Ltd.-----	200	Potomac Edison Co. of Pennsylvania, The.-----	6,525	Wisconsin Electric Power Co.-----	296,806
Kentucky Power Co.-----	21,039	Potomac Edison Co. of Virginia, The.-----	8,778	Wisconsin Michigan Power Co.---	3,026
Kentucky Utilities Co.-----	-----	Potomac Edison of West Virginia, The.-----	9,704	Wisconsin Power & Light Co.-----	158,635
Kingsport Power Co.-----	8,951	Potomac Electric Power Co.-----	78,763	Wisconsin Public Service Co.-----	59,122
Lake Superior District Power Co.---	1,513	Public Service Co. of Colorado.---	178,053	Wisconsin River Power Co.-----	-----
Lockhart Power Co.-----	-----	Public Service Co. of Indiana.---	170,438	Yadkin, Inc.-----	-----
Long Island Lighting Co.-----	119,616	Public Service Co. of New Hampshire.-----	121,736	Yankee Atomic Electric Co.-----	6,387
Long Sault, Inc.-----	-----	Public Service Co. of New Mexico.---	27,581	Total.-----	15,832,203
Louisiana Power & Light Co.-----	299,325	Public Service Co. of Oklahoma.---	25,939		
Louisville Gas & Electric Co.---	141	Public Service Electric & Gas Co.---	211,381		
Madison Gas & Electric Co.-----	1,814	Puget Sound Power & Light Co.---	9,073		
Maine Public Service Co.-----	-----	Rochester Gas & Electric Corp.---	137,750		
Massachusetts Electric Co.-----	292,515				
Maui Electric Co., Ltd.-----	-----				
Metropolitan Electric Co.-----	95,867				
Michigan Gas & Electric Co.---	1,599				
Minnesota Power & Light Co.---	70,301				
Mississippi Power Co.-----	117,418				

<sup>1</sup> Not in file.

STATISTICS OF PRIVATELY OWNED ELECTRIC UTILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES FOR YEAR ENDED DEC. 31, 1968—ELECTRIC OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES

Item	Alabama		Arizona		Arkansas			
	Alabama Power Co.	Southern Electric Generating Co.	Arizona Public Service Co.	Citizens Utilities Co.	Tucson Gas & Electric Co.	Arkansas-Missouri Power Co.	Arkansas Power & Light Co.	Arkklahoma Corp., The (A)
Sales expenses:								
Supervision.-----	\$441,702	-----	\$105,506	-----	-----	\$14,429	\$175,542	-----
Demonstrating and selling.-----	3,635,580	-----	171,190	-----	\$18,037	25,689	1,278,976	-----
Advertising.-----	836,715	-----	325,937	\$21,740	58,903	55,730	579,224	-----
Revenues from merchandising, jobbing and contract work.-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	107,358	78,629	-----	-----
Cost and expenses of merchandising, jobbing and contract work.-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	99,758	80,105	-----	-----
Miscellaneous sales expenses.-----	94,439	-----	48,442	4,812	1,805	37,753	488,361	-----
Total sales expenses.-----	5,008,436	-----	1,197,075	26,552	71,145	133,026	2,522,123	-----
Research and development:								
Within the company.-----	119,597	2,148	29,427	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Outside the company.-----	114,225	-----	74,880	-----	9,100	26,217	251,526	-----
Total.-----	233,822	2,148	104,307	-----	9,100	26,217	251,526	-----



STATISTICS OF PRIVATELY OWNED ELECTRIC UTILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES FOR YEAR ENDED DEC. 31, 1968—ELECTRIC OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES—Continued

Item	INDIANA				IOWA			
	Indianapolis Power & Light Co.	Northern Indiana Public Service Co.	Public Service Co. of Indiana, Inc.	Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Co.	Interstate Power Co.	Iowa Electric Light & Power Co.	Iowa-Illinois Gas & Electric Co.	Iowa Power & Light Co.
<b>Sales expenses:</b>								
Supervision.....	\$80,818	\$111,364	\$635,605	\$21,701	\$107,494	\$51,852	\$43,562	\$17,170
Demonstrating and selling.....	717,658	126,107	658,299	81,442	369,236	365,691	124,900	119,973
Advertising.....	472,996	41,267	476,938	82,042	191,856	208,939	51,853	228,190
Revenues from merchandising, jobbing and contract work.....	-176,176	-	-89,769	-	1,099,302	-1,520,321	-876,917	-
Cost and expenses of merchandising, jobbing and contract work.....	154,064	154,064	79,777	-	1,142,601	1,326,052	907,928	-
Miscellaneous sales expenses.....	426,773	19,878	1,235,571	14,193	47,952	491,382	25,045	47,659
<b>Total sales expenses.....</b>	<b>1,698,245</b>	<b>276,504</b>	<b>2,996,421</b>	<b>201,377</b>	<b>759,837</b>	<b>929,595</b>	<b>276,371</b>	<b>412,792</b>
<b>Research and development:</b>								
Within the company.....	20,578	175,181	53,763	26,043	-	-	-	-
Outside the company.....	75,234	27,761	178,117	14,296	17,137	6,102	76,938	30,004
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>95,812</b>	<b>202,942</b>	<b>231,880</b>	<b>40,339</b>	<b>17,137</b>	<b>6,102</b>	<b>76,938</b>	<b>30,004</b>

Item	Iowa		Kansas			Kentucky		
	Iowa Public Service Co.	Iowa Southern Utilities Co.	Central Kansas Power Co., Inc.	Central Telephone & Utilities Corp. (A)	Kansas Gas & Electric Co.	Kansas Power & Light Co.	Kentucky Power Co.	Kentucky Utilities Co.
<b>Sales expenses:</b>								
Supervision.....	\$38,214	\$79,925	\$6,634	\$68,448	\$84,023	\$57,757	\$116,669	\$346,020
Demonstrating and selling.....	184,363	251,321	2,551	129,190	855,649	221,184	426,917	840,021
Advertising.....	145,240	61,234	23,417	105,860	263,386	128,845	131,980	277,947
Revenues from merchandising, jobbing and contract work.....	-4,088	-625,006	-	-154,105	-128,355	-544,180	-	-
Cost and expenses of merchandising, jobbing and contract work.....	4,241	682,985	-	161,432	123,386	509,805	-	-
Miscellaneous sales expenses.....	56,179	503	8,016	74,449	76,230	207,752	372,060	69,914
<b>Total sales expenses.....</b>	<b>424,149</b>	<b>450,962</b>	<b>40,619</b>	<b>385,274</b>	<b>1,274,319</b>	<b>581,163</b>	<b>1,047,626</b>	<b>1,513,902</b>
<b>Research and development:</b>								
Within the company.....	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,384	2,731
Outside the company.....	18,470	1,961	9,289	24,348	99,903	4,960	14,141	44,555
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>18,470</b>	<b>1,961</b>	<b>9,289</b>	<b>24,348</b>	<b>99,903</b>	<b>4,960</b>	<b>54,525</b>	<b>47,286</b>

Item	Kentucky		Louisiana			Maine		
	Louisville Gas and Electric Co.	Union Light, Heat and Power Co.	Central Louisiana Electric Co. Inc.	Gulf States Utilities Co.	Louisiana Power & Light Co. (A)	New Orleans Public Service Inc.	Bangor Hydro-Electric Co.	Central Maine Power Co.
<b>Sales expenses:</b>								
Supervision.....	\$10,176	\$17,552	\$72,280	\$351,946	\$209,953	\$140,436	-	\$43,441
Demonstrating and selling.....	84,729	179,815	255,691	2,044,161	1,390,413	740,071	24,233	1,100,696
Advertising.....	74,738	87,351	159,984	638,985	552,766	268,419	40,853	85,447
Revenues from merchandising, jobbing and contract work.....	-	77	-	706,030	-	608,907	-	-
Cost and expenses of merchandising, jobbing and contract work.....	-	82	-	660,461	-	594,475	-	-
Miscellaneous sales expenses.....	42,358	3,742	127,007	48,847	208,968	94,728	-	-
<b>Total sales expenses.....</b>	<b>212,001</b>	<b>288,465</b>	<b>614,962</b>	<b>3,038,370</b>	<b>2,362,100</b>	<b>1,229,222</b>	<b>65,086</b>	<b>1,229,584</b>
<b>Research and development:</b>								
Within the company.....	29,157	4,053	-	10,144	29,157	10,018	-	-
Outside the company.....	297,432	32,180	21,200	261,898	297,432	147,389	-	24,030
<b>Totals.....</b>	<b>326,589</b>	<b>36,233</b>	<b>31,200</b>	<b>272,042</b>	<b>326,589</b>	<b>157,407</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>24,030</b>

Item	Maine		Maryland					
	Maine Public Service Co.	Rumford Falls Power Co.	Baltimore Gas & Electric Co.	Conowingo Power Co.	Delmarva Power & Light Co. of Maryland	Potomac Edison Co.	Susquehanna Electric Co.	Susquehanna Power Co.
<b>Sales expenses:</b>								
Supervision.....	\$20,713	-	\$176,291	-	\$34,995	\$106,761	-	-
Demonstrating and selling.....	81,504	-	1,471,420	\$80,726	166,950	433,800	-	-
Advertising.....	48,664	-	645,816	13,257	42,972	188,020	-	-
Revenues from merchandising, jobbing and contract work.....	-	-	-9,857,309	-152,873	-234,714	-	-	-
Cost and expenses of merchandising, jobbing and contract work.....	-	-	8,910,430	149,220	242,704	-	-	-
Miscellaneous sales expenses.....	16,926	-	105,161	32	6,369	367,372	-	-
<b>Total sales expenses.....</b>	<b>167,807</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,451,809</b>	<b>90,362</b>	<b>259,276</b>	<b>1,095,953</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Research and development:</b>								
Within the company.....	-	-	940,670	-	-	10,999	-	-
Outside the company.....	-	-	138,000	-	-	76,717	-	-
<b>Totals.....</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,078,670</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>87,716</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>

STATISTICS OF PRIVATELY OWNED ELECTRIC UTILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES FOR YEAR ENDED DEC. 31, 1968—ELECTRIC OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES—Continued

Massachusetts								
Item	Boston Edison Co.	Boston Gas Co.	Brockton Edison Co.	Cambridge Electric Light Co.	Cape & Vineyard Electric Co.	Canal Electric Co.	Fall River Electric Light Co.	Fitchburg Gas & Electric Light Co.
Sales expenses:								
Supervision	\$210,986		\$22,573	\$46,438	\$100,060		\$14,947	\$14,754
Demonstrating and selling	863,505	\$4,190	292,289	150,257	347,691		76,874	72,348
Advertising	641,544		54,741	12,216	19,053		59,011	25,510
Revenues from merchandising, jobbing, and contract work								
Cost and expenses of merchandising, jobbing and contract work								
Miscellaneous sales expenses	337,437		13,875	12,504	36,781		10,280	27,263
Total sales expenses	2,053,473	4,190	383,478	221,415	503,584		161,112	139,875
Research and development within the company	1,063,738							
Outside the company	132,108		6,799	4,897	4,626		3,355	
Total	1,195,846		6,799	4,897	4,626		3,355	
Massachusetts								
Item	Holyoke Power & Electric Co.	Holyoke Water Power Co.	Massachusetts Electric Co.	Montaup Electric Co.	New Bedford Gas & Edison Light Co.	New England Power Co.	Western Massachusetts Electric Co.	Yankee Atomic Electric Co.
Sales expenses:								
Supervision			\$873,275		\$72,328		\$197,573	
Demonstrating and selling			1,243,439		321,449	\$31,261	676,047	
Advertising		\$28,694	443,253		18,198	214	365,747	
Revenues from merchandising, jobbing, and contract work								
Cost and expenses of merchandising, jobbing and contract work								
Miscellaneous sales expenses		12,286	89,660		11,952		309,734	
Total sales expenses		40,980	2,649,627		423,927	31,475	1,569,102	
Research and development:								
Within the company			3,540			18,304		
Outside the company			28,245		6,390	43,314	30,497	
Totals			31,785		6,390	61,618	30,497	
Michigan								
Item	Alpena Power Co.	Consumers Power Co.	The Detroit Edison Co.	Edison Sault Electric Co.	Michigan Gas & Electric Co. (A)	Upper Peninsula Generating Co.	Upper Peninsula Power Co.	Minnesota—Power & Light Co.
Sales expenses:								
Supervision		\$693,556	\$714,192	\$3,779	\$7,375		\$73,077	\$260,825
Demonstrating and selling	\$18,560	2,446,794	3,670,151	91,438	47,638		87,623	371,221
Advertising	3,659	918,964	2,027,409	10,579	35,982		83,217	159,697
Revenues from merchandising, jobbing, and contract work								-511,429
Cost and expenses of merchandising, jobbing, and contract work								596,311
Miscellaneous sales expenses		1,171,940	2,814,383		3,520		55,480	37,518
Total sales expenses	22,220	5,231,254	9,226,136	105,796	94,515		299,397	914,143
Research and development:								
Within the company		1,469,683	676,874		7,467			
Outside the company		697,615	2,829,492		1,375		1,600	15,624
Total		2,167,298	3,506,366		8,842		1,600	15,624
Mississippi								
Missouri								
Item	Minnesota—Northern States Power Co.	Mississippi Power Co.	Mississippi Power & Light Co.	Empire District Electric Co.	Kansas City Power & Light Co.	Missouri Edison Co.	Missouri Power & Light Co.	Missouri Public Service Co.
Sales expenses:								
Supervision	\$337,759	\$38,791	\$182,476	\$48,401	\$96,627	\$2,268	\$13,241	\$1,698
Demonstrating and selling	4,695,421	497,263	927,651	406,386	1,277,493	30,753	80,220	54,375
Advertising	1,683,804	131,431	307,595	62,070	404,072	32,020	89,481	58,782
Revenues from merchandising, jobbing, and contract work	-3,627,880		-657,307	-138,297	-162,977			-99,525
Cost and expenses of merchandising, jobbing, and contract work	3,574,799		656,646	182,170	174,199			112,047
Miscellaneous sales expenses	244,071	67,731	54,910		17,576	16,254	99,918	88,308
Total sales expenses	6,907,974	715,216	1,471,971	560,730	1,806,993	81,295	282,860	215,685
Research and development:								
Within the company	317,016	67,558						
Outside the company	115,293	24,877	128,790	34,029	36,660		4,755	31,689
Total	432,309	92,435	128,790	34,029	36,660		4,755	31,689

STATISTICS OF PRIVATELY OWNED ELECTRIC UTILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES FOR YEAR ENDED DEC. 31, 1969—ELECTRIC OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES—Continued

Item	Missouri			Montana	Nevada		New Hampshire	
	Missouri Utilities Co.	St. Joseph Light & Power Co.	Union Electric Co.	Montana Power Co., The	Nevada Power Co.	Sierra Pacific Power Co.	Concord Electric Co.	Connecticut Valley Electric Co. Inc.
<b>Sales expenses:</b>								
Supervision	\$7,099	\$45,185	\$305,657	\$91,160	\$26,566	\$39,670	\$48,323	\$4,337
Demonstrating and selling	3,189	200,578	3,035,709	257,980	131,497	130,315	46,457	18,922
Advertising	17,536	75,438	767,932	91,655	98,292	94,976	12,520	2,499
Revenues from merchandising, jobbing, and contract work		-36,635		-104,016	-5,516		-436,159	-133,794
Cost and expenses of merchandising, jobbing, and contract work		30,939		98,763	5,413		353,211	127,591
Miscellaneous sales expenses	585	14,948	79,476	47,739	3,708	31,442	11,949	2,504
<b>Total sales expenses</b>	<b>28,409</b>	<b>330,453</b>	<b>4,188,774</b>	<b>483,281</b>	<b>259,960</b>	<b>296,403</b>	<b>36,301</b>	<b>22,059</b>
<b>Research and development:</b>								
Within the company			1,055,663	7,500				5
Outside the company	17,699	9,798	200,808	15,943	16,520	20,045		
<b>Total</b>	<b>17,699</b>	<b>9,798</b>	<b>1,256,471</b>	<b>23,443</b>	<b>16,520</b>	<b>20,045</b>	<b>5</b>	

  

Item	New Hampshire				New Jersey			
	Exeter & Hampton Electric Co.	Granite State Electric Co.	Public Service Co. of New Hampshire	White Mountain Power Co.	Atlantic City Electric Co.	Jersey Central Power & Light Co.	New Jersey Power & Light Co.	Public Service Electric & Gas Co.
<b>Sales expenses:</b>								
Supervision	\$23,042	\$15,052	\$97,402	\$2,086	\$274,438	\$107,601	\$44,759	\$651,968
Demonstrating and selling	47,786	46,437	257,712	14,630	656,235	612,859	360,686	1,963,533
Advertising	13,014	5,485	58,610	2,545	312,512	328,339	146,656	804,302
Revenues from merchandising, jobbing, and contract work	-306,776	-9,385	-2,184,540	-178,251	-309,712			
Cost and expenses of merchandising, jobbing, and contract work	264,719	8,797	1,959,105	167,829	382,584			
Miscellaneous sales expenses	25,188	881	662,567	6,624	841,868	292,096	125,208	129,575
<b>Total sales expenses</b>	<b>66,973</b>	<b>67,267</b>	<b>850,856</b>	<b>15,463</b>	<b>2,157,925</b>	<b>1,540,895</b>	<b>477,109</b>	<b>3,549,378</b>
<b>Research and development:</b>								
Within the company		155	41,894		2,719	104,756	36,650	573,120
Outside the company	1,261	781	26,326		22,828	94,604	14,849	368,054
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,261</b>	<b>936</b>	<b>68,220</b>		<b>25,547</b>	<b>199,360</b>	<b>51,499</b>	<b>941,174</b>

  

Item	New Mexico			New York				
	New Jersey—Rockland Electric Co.	New Mexico Electric Service Co.	Public Service Co. of New Mexico	Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp.	Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc.	Long Island Lighting Co.	Long Sault, Inc.	New York State Electric & Gas Corp.
<b>Sales expenses:</b>								
Supervision	\$30,743		\$16,629	\$105,105	\$342,696	\$202,382		\$298,308
Demonstrating and selling	94,667	\$100,357	211,986	350,846	3,968,906	190,030		999,963
Advertising	28,255	11,117	166,937	247,698	1,881,068	261,533		324,537
Revenues from merchandising, jobbing, and contract work	-114,423					-108,472		-175,394
Cost and expenses of merchandising, jobbing, and contract work	156,499				146	84,418		176,070
Miscellaneous sales expenses	43,208	6,715	134,200	118,065	794,603	265,753		339,397
<b>Total sales expenses</b>	<b>238,951</b>	<b>118,189</b>	<b>529,752</b>	<b>821,714</b>	<b>6,987,418</b>	<b>895,644</b>		<b>1,962,881</b>
<b>Research and development:</b>								
Within the company				871	184,000	156,800		
Outside the company	134	2,008	18,420	243,567	1,234,855	621,355		717,284
<b>Total</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>2,008</b>	<b>18,420</b>	<b>244,438</b>	<b>1,418,855</b>	<b>778,155</b>		<b>717,284</b>

  

Item	New York			North Carolina				North Dakota—Montana—Dakota Utilities Co.
	Niagara Mohawk Power Corp.	Orange and Rockland Utilities, Inc.	Rochester Gas & Electric Corp.	Carolina Power & Light Co.	Duke Power Co.	Nantahala Power & Light Co.	Yadkin, Inc.	
<b>Sales expenses:</b>								
Supervision	\$1,150,003	\$93,102	\$227,267	\$230,841	\$113,848			\$50,786
Demonstration and selling	1,710,716	233,230	425,209	1,827,205	1,745,320	\$996		70,541
Advertising	848,270	83,056	277,507	683,099	1,088,274	4		77,268
Revenues from merchandising, jobbing, and contract work		-1,138,999	-2,132,276	-35,417		-10,035		-780,902
Cost and expenses of merchandising, jobbing, and contract work		1,142,701	2,096,053	34,723		8,664		835,904
Miscellaneous sales expenses	886,834	134,060	143,331	29,561	471,453			111,108
<b>Total sales expenses</b>	<b>4,595,823</b>	<b>547,151</b>	<b>1,037,091</b>	<b>2,770,012</b>	<b>3,418,895</b>	<b>-371</b>		<b>364,705</b>
<b>Research and development:</b>								
Within the company	25,975			430	232,756			
Outside the company	861,923	138,980	596,577	745,700	343,903			
<b>Total</b>	<b>887,898</b>	<b>138,980</b>	<b>596,577</b>	<b>746,130</b>	<b>576,659</b>			

STATISTICS OF PRIVATELY OWNED ELECTRIC UTILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES FOR YEAR ENDED DEC. 31, 1968—ELECTRIC OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES—Continued

Item	Ohio							
	North Dakota— Otter Tail Power Co.	Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co.	Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.	Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co.	Dayton Power & Light Co.	Ohio Edison Co.	Ohio Power Co.	Ohio Valley Electric Corp.
<b>Sales expenses:</b>								
Supervision.....	\$49,048	\$84,484	\$297,087	\$32,035	\$163,112	\$246,521	\$557,010	
Demonstrating and selling.....	249,500	1,123,456	4,109,083	1,353,215	1,624,752	2,112,344	2,203,833	
Advertising.....	310,590	477,070	1,328,035	568,257	552,255	1,268,265	1,100,749	
Revenues from merchandising, jobbing, and contract work.....	-263,643	-29,740			-17,975	-4,002,465		
Cost and expenses of merchandising, jobbing, and contract work.....	283,754	40,404			49,914	4,278,858		
Miscellaneous sales expenses.....	53,024	23,066			50,812	654,630	1,432,676	
<b>Total, sales expenses.....</b>	<b>682,273</b>	<b>1,718,740</b>	<b>5,734,205</b>	<b>1,953,507</b>	<b>2,422,870</b>	<b>4,558,153</b>	<b>5,294,268</b>	
<b>Research and development:</b>								
Within the company.....	81	84,734	269,333		2,729	1,730	463,651	
Outside the company.....	16,451	178,319	210,108	66,120	89,066	140,600	130,239	
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>16,532</b>	<b>263,053</b>	<b>479,441</b>	<b>66,120</b>	<b>91,795</b>	<b>142,330</b>	<b>593,890</b>	

Item	Oregon					Pennsylvania		
	Ohio—Toledo Edison Co.	Oklahoma— Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co.	Public Service Co. of Oklahoma	California- Pacific Utilities Co.	Pacific Power & Light Co.	Portland General Electric Co.	Duquesne Light Co.	Hershey Electric Co.
<b>Sales expenses:</b>								
Supervision.....	\$303,475	\$423,063	\$93,939	\$5,649	\$434,401	\$152,956	\$160,453	
Demonstration and selling.....	896,003	1,688,987	1,807,051	25,384	1,830,758	1,564,927	1,663,044	
Advertising.....	505,862	676,739	451,053	27,260	945,731	357,398	665,475	
Revenues from merchandising, jobbing, and contract work.....	-344,335		-31,433				-243	
Cost and expenses of merchandising, jobbing and contract work.....	300,489		28,492				1,822	
Miscellaneous sales expenses.....	50,625	185,178	81,109	71,210	217,463	128,665	200,381	
<b>Total, sales expenses.....</b>	<b>1,712,119</b>	<b>2,973,967</b>	<b>2,430,211</b>	<b>129,503</b>	<b>3,628,353</b>	<b>2,203,948</b>	<b>2,690,932</b>	
<b>Research and development:</b>								
Within the company.....		28,626	26,015		324,646	276,057	7,174	
Outside the company.....	147,019	208,511	130,790		51,698	177,552	118,358	
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>147,019</b>	<b>237,137</b>	<b>156,805</b>		<b>376,344</b>	<b>453,609</b>	<b>125,532</b>	

Item	Pennsylvania							
	Metropolitan Edison Co.	Pennsylvania Electric Co.	Pennsylvania Power Co.	Pennsylvania Power & Light Co.	Philadelphia Electric Co.	Philadelphia Electric Power Co. (A)	Potomac Edison Co. of Pennsylvania	Safe Harbor Water Power Corp.
<b>Sales expenses:</b>								
Supervision.....	\$308,913	\$292,294	\$52,889	\$523,606	\$761,998		\$29,857	
Demonstrating and selling.....	805,428	1,140,815	318,163	4,081,878	4,485,532		114,378	
Advertising.....	211,852	368,709	208,486	835,179	1,416,297		42,415	
Revenues from merchandising, jobbing, and contract work.....	-344,335	-49,733	-382,176		-7,968,340		-425,745	
Cost and expenses of merchandising, jobbing, and contract work.....	300,489	41,484	413,226		7,783,131		405,801	
Miscellaneous sales expenses.....	199,677	1,037,683	101,065	502,726	603,578		94,541	
<b>Total sales expenses.....</b>	<b>1,525,870</b>	<b>2,831,252</b>	<b>711,653</b>	<b>5,943,387</b>	<b>6,882,196</b>		<b>261,247</b>	
<b>Research and development within the company.....</b>	<b>429,925</b>	<b>194,979</b>		<b>501,831</b>			<b>675</b>	
<b>Outside the company.....</b>	<b>36,068</b>	<b>1,686,918</b>	<b>25,032</b>	<b>78,869</b>			<b>4,400</b>	
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>465,993</b>	<b>1,881,897</b>	<b>25,032</b>	<b>580,700</b>			<b>5,075</b>	

Item	Pennsylvania		Rhode Island		South Carolina			South Dakota— Black Hills Power & Light Co.
	UGI Corp.	West Penn Power Co.	Blackstone Valley Electric Co.	Narragansett Electric Co.	Newport Electric Corp.	Lockhart Power Co.	South Carolina Electric & Gas Co.	
<b>Sales expenses:</b>								
Supervision.....	\$22,367	\$477,005	\$5,204	\$239,092	\$2,992		\$117,305	\$15,214
Demonstrating and selling.....	110,940	2,468,948	374,936	358,998	27,864		451,219	96,118
Advertising.....	90,438	866,343	91,353	216,804	20,524	\$1,324	245,202	63,827
Revenues from merchandising, jobbing, and contract work.....		-200,470						
Cost and expenses of merchandising, jobbing, and contract work.....		230,813						
Miscellaneous sales expenses.....	10,079	132,168	10,169	136,522	60,220		78,768	53,082
<b>Total sales expenses.....</b>	<b>233,826</b>	<b>3,976,807</b>	<b>481,662</b>	<b>951,616</b>	<b>111,599</b>	<b>1,324</b>	<b>892,490</b>	<b>228,241</b>
<b>Research and development within the company.....</b>		<b>122,900</b>		<b>3,702</b>				
<b>Outside the company.....</b>	<b>3,183</b>	<b>197,589</b>	<b>6,570</b>	<b>15,784</b>	<b>2,267</b>		<b>243,520</b>	
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>3,183</b>	<b>320,489</b>	<b>6,570</b>	<b>19,486</b>	<b>2,267</b>		<b>243,524</b>	

STATISTICS OF PRIVATELY OWNED ELECTRIC UTILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES FOR YEAR ENDED DEC. 31, 1968—ELECTRIC OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES—Continued

Item	South Dakota—Northwestern Public Service Co.	Tennessee		Texas				Houston Lighting & Power Co.
		Kingsport Power Co.	Tapoco, Inc.	Central Power & Light Co.	Community Public Service Co.	Dallas Power & Light Co.	El Paso Electric Co.	
<b>Sales expenses:</b>								
Supervision	\$40,114	\$26,891		\$259,284	\$27,956	\$84,615	\$63,380	\$49,617
Demonstrating and selling	136,479	91,474		1,534,600	95,752	1,357,022	187,747	2,008,536
Advertising	40,004	59,093		512,913	533,013	795,427	129,227	1,123,489
Revenues from merchandising, jobbing, and contract work	-642,428			-311,679		-54,222		-387,513
Cost and expenses of merchandising, jobbing, and contract work	665,432			333,659		71,279		463,115
Miscellaneous sales expenses	8,964	37,410		15,081		125,589	86,101	77,930
<b>Total sales expenses</b>	<b>248,565</b>	<b>214,868</b>		<b>2,363,858</b>	<b>656,721</b>	<b>2,379,710</b>	<b>666,655</b>	<b>3,335,174</b>
Research and development within the company		13,360		430		60,078		(1)
Outside the company	30	3,674		745,700	21,459	175,661	21,509	(1)
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>17,034</b>		<b>746,130</b>	<b>21,459</b>	<b>235,739</b>	<b>21,509</b>	<b>414,426</b>

<sup>1</sup> Not categorized.

Item	Texas						Utah—Utah Power & Light Co.	Vermont—Central Vermont Public Service Corp.
	Southwestern Electric Power Co.	Southwestern Electric Service Co.	Southwestern Public Service Co.	Texas Electric Service Co.	Texas Power & Light Co.	West Texas Utilities Co.		
<b>Sales expenses:</b>								
Supervision	\$137,619	\$29,570	\$91,163	\$222,356	\$645,735	\$209,445	\$176,504	\$48,184
Demonstrating and selling	1,238,474	32,311	857,220	3,409,544	2,556,564	480,962	694,282	185,263
Advertising	308,289	50,850	481,861	913,383	746,125	187,371	451,457	24,520
Revenues from merchandising, jobbing, and contract work	-3,507			-196,819	-62,074	-3,016,208		-1,569,433
Cost and expenses of merchandising, jobbing, and contract work	7,763			228,490	70,614	2,884,882		1,559,807
Miscellaneous sales expenses	79,423	18,421	229,916	125,676	509,732	128,743	371,475	16,157
<b>Total sales expenses</b>	<b>1,768,066</b>	<b>121,162</b>	<b>1,660,160</b>	<b>4,704,220</b>	<b>4,466,695</b>	<b>475,195</b>	<b>1,693,220</b>	<b>266,498</b>
Research and development within the company	29,545		12,040	9,150	11,157		53,000	5,727
Outside the company	176,295	2,123	35,648	218,984	197,238	34,352	30,048	915
<b>Total</b>	<b>205,840</b>	<b>2,123</b>	<b>47,688</b>	<b>228,134</b>	<b>208,395</b>	<b>34,352</b>	<b>83,048</b>	<b>6,642</b>

Item	Vermont		Virginia			Washington		
	Green Mountain Power Corp.	Vermont Electric Power Co., Inc.	Delmarva Power & Light Co. of Virginia	Old Dominion Power Co.	Potomac Edison Co. of Virginia, The	Virginia Electric & Power Co.	Puget Sound Power & Light Co.	Washington Water Power Co., The
<b>Sales Expenses:</b>								
Supervision	\$41,733		\$9,477	\$21,029	\$50,255	\$474,022	\$291,980	\$96,949
Demonstrating and selling	71,176		33,620	70,036	155,573	3,923,297	677,442	487,994
Advertising	38,790		4,951	14,263	55,951	1,829,445	490,829	179,290
Revenues from merchandising, jobbing, and contract work			16,339				9,782	60,460
Cost and expenses of merchandising, jobbing, and contract work			18,875				9,902	63,528
Miscellaneous sales expenses	32,899		993	3,582	144,540	197,701	24,863	27,727
<b>Total Sales Expenses</b>	<b>184,598</b>		<b>51,577</b>	<b>108,910</b>	<b>406,319</b>	<b>6,424,465</b>	<b>1,485,234</b>	<b>795,028</b>
Research and development:								
Within the company		\$4,000			938	132,323	48,543	
Outside the company	3,882			1,400	7,426	255,385	139,814	1,596
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,882</b>	<b>4,000</b>		<b>1,400</b>	<b>8,364</b>	<b>387,708</b>	<b>188,357</b>	<b>1,596</b>

Item	West Virginia				Wisconsin			
	Appalachian Power Co.	Monongahela Power Co.	Potomac Edison Co. of West Virginia	Wheeling Electric Co.	Consolidated Water Power Co.	Lake Superior District Power Co.	Madison Gas & Electric Co.	Northern States Power Co.
<b>Sales expenses:</b>								
Supervision	\$428,610	\$338,462	\$46,484	\$76,744		\$20,482	\$7,213	\$127,891
Demonstrating and selling	2,288,871	1,624,794	179,672	155,124		31,110	49,753	461,153
Advertising	891,709	395,625	59,700	82,234		17,284	20,851	180,997
Revenues from merchandising, jobbing and contract work								
Cost and expenses of merchandising, jobbing and contract work								
Miscellaneous sales expenses	2,380,840	580,520	157,092	143,718		9,559	3,439	36,622
<b>Total Sales expenses</b>	<b>5,990,030</b>	<b>2,939,401</b>	<b>442,948</b>	<b>457,820</b>		<b>78,635</b>	<b>81,266</b>	<b>806,664</b>
Research and development:								
Within the company	523,554	10,376	1,042	19,381			5,219	
Outside the company	111,795	59,220	6,787	5,347			5,767	12,365
<b>Total</b>	<b>635,349</b>	<b>69,596</b>	<b>7,829</b>	<b>24,728</b>			<b>10,986</b>	<b>12,365</b>

STATISTICS OF PRIVATELY OWNED ELECTRIC UTILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES FOR YEAR ENDED DEC. 31, 1968—ELECTRIC OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES—Continued

Item	Wisconsin					Wyoming	Alaska
	Superior Water, Light & Power Co.	Wisconsin Electric Power Co.	Wisconsin Michigan Power Co.	Wisconsin Power & Light Co.	Wisconsin Public Service Corp.	Wisconsin River Power Co.	Cheyenne Light, Fuel & Power Co. / Alaska Electric Light & Power Co.
Sales expenses:							
Supervision	\$12,381	\$150,740	\$21,604	\$80,498	\$119,150		\$12,903
Demonstrating and selling	55,211	1,741,875	153,834	928,956	449,465		52,198
Advertising	16,503	1,008,909	65,784	150,979	183,647		31,447
Revenues from merchandising, jobbing and contract work							-69,025
Cost and expenses of merchandising, jobbing and contract work							65,578
Miscellaneous sales expenses	18,117	115,327	20,389	50,595	109,727		4,453
Total sales expenses	102,212	3,016,851	261,611	1,211,028	861,989		97,554
Research and development:							
Within the company		60,600	39	83,743			
Outside the company		111,263	10,650	70,196	33,191		1,535
Total		171,863	10,689	153,939	33,191		1,535

  

Item	HAWAII				Item	HAWAII			
	Hawaiian Electric Co., Inc.	Hilo Electric Light Co., Ltd.	Kauai Electric Co., Ltd.	Maui Electric Co., Ltd.		Hawaiian Electric Co., Inc.	Hilo Electric Light Co., Ltd.	Kauai Electric Co., Ltd.	Maui Electric Co., Ltd.
Sales expenses:					Miscellaneous sales expenses	\$13,552	\$42,436	\$1,362	\$28,474
Supervision	\$35,359	\$11,231	\$482	\$4,120	Total Sales Expenses	1,212,996	110,049	50,298	61,672
Demonstrating and selling	989,520	44,862	36,748	17,203	Research and development:				
Advertising	174,565	11,520	11,705	11,875	Within the company	460,711			
Revenues from merchandising, jobbing and contract work					Outside the company				
Cost and expenses of merchandising, jobbing and contract work					Total	460,711			

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I shall next discuss briefly one facet on utility research and development which is of great significance regarding the quality of life in America. One of the most promising of the emerging energy technologies is magnetohydrodynamics—MHD, a technique of producing energy by direct conversion with a minimum of pollution. The January 24, 1970, issue of New Republic carries an article by Dick Gilluly, "How Much, How Soon for Anti-Pollution?" which succinctly summarizes the MHD story. I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. Gilluly's article at this point in the RECORD:

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

HOW MUCH, HOW SOON FOR ANTI-POLLUTION?  
(By Richard H. Gilluly)

Anti-pollution is the fashion. What we need to know is how much money the Administration (and the corporations) will invest in it. A little known—and little-funded—Interior Department agency, the Office of Coal Research (OCR), has in its files data on a half dozen or more techniques that promise to eliminate major environmental pollution. But OCR has never got more than \$12 million and until recently no one in Interior or the White House has been disposed to ask for more. OCR's technologies remain undeveloped.

Take magnetohydrodynamics, MHD is a way of converting coal and other fossil fuels to electricity almost directly, without intervening boilers, turbines or generators, it is about 50 percent more efficient than conventional coal-fired generating plants—which, in turn, are about 50 percent more efficient than nuclear plants. MHD would significantly reduce the "thermal pollution" created by most present power generation (with the exception of hydroelectric plants, which make up only a small percentage of the total and which sometimes create their own kind of environmental damage). Thermal pollution is the heating of water in streams, lakes or the ocean, often with severe detriment to the balance of life.

MHD also offers great promise for reducing

air pollution. Because it is more efficient, it burns less fuel per kilowatt hour than other power-generating techniques; you get less pollution from producing the same amount of power. The fuel for MHD must be "seeded"; that is, an ionizable substance must be added to it to make hot gases electrically conductive. The seed must be removed from the leftover gases, a necessity which becomes a virtue because pollutants can be removed at the same time.

A major source of air pollution—second only to automobiles—is the fuel-burning, industrial installations, primarily power plants. Almost without exception, they give off sulfur oxide, and a fine, abrasive ash. Although the sulfur oxides or the particles alone may not be harmful to health (there's no conclusive evidence), in combination they are highly destructive to lung tissue, according to HEW's National Center for Air Pollution Control. Sulfur oxides, alone, are harmful to plant life. (The acrid sulfur oxides produce the foul taste in your mouth in highly air polluted areas.) HEW under the Air Pollution Control Act, has set "criteria" for the amounts of these two pollutants that can be emitted from industrial plants. But the criteria, applied by state and local governments, are flexible enough to "meet local needs." HEW's enforcement powers are minimal; the amount of money available here is in inverse proportion to the enormity of the problem.

But the criteria plus the techniques now in OCR's files could get the job done, if the technologies can be turned into commercial hardware. Then, instead of depending for clean air on corporate willingness to obey the law (and the willingness of state and local government to enforce it) the corporations might find it in their interest to adopt the new technologies voluntarily, because of their greater efficiencies.

MHD is not the only technique OCR has in mind. A process for dissolving raw coal in anthracene solvent, which would carry off all the potentially polluting materials, is another. The leftover would be almost pure carbon—in a form that could be extruded, ground, melted, or handled in numerous other ways. Diesel-electric locomotives and perhaps diesel trucks could burn this clean substance. But once again, the potential would be greatest for power production, espe-

cially in congested urban areas such as New York City.

There are several ways, some pioneered by OCR and others by Interior's Bureau of Mines to convert coal into producer or pipeline gas. If coal can be converted to pure methane—or pure hydrogen or pure carbon monoxide—leaving the pollutants behind in the coal residue, then the gas can be burned with little harm to the environment, in almost any kind of fuel-burning installation and with minimal conversion costs.

The Russians plan to have a part-MHD, part-conventional, plant in commercial operation in 1970; the Japanese are also advancing rapidly in this technology.

The President's Office of Science and Technology last June recommended a full-scale MHD research program, as did the Interior Department's own Energy Policy Staff a year earlier. Support for MHD in the scientific community is almost unanimous. Yet, not a penny for MHD was left by the Budget Bureau in OCR's fiscal 1970 budget request. Efforts by Montana Senators Lee Metcalf and Mike Mansfield to get money for MHD into the 1970 Interior appropriations bill failed. The 1971 budget OCR submitted to Interior officials included a miserly \$400,000 for MHD, which was then entirely eliminated by a budget officer. The two Montana Senators asked that the money be reinstated. And last month, the Minerals, Materials and Fuels subcommittee of the Senate Interior Committee, chaired by Senator Moss of Utah, held hearings on MHD, at which scientists gave the new technology strong endorsement. So now the Interior Budget, as it goes to the Budget Bureau, will contain "somewhat more than" the \$400,000 earlier asked, though less than the \$2-million suggested by OST.

Meanwhile, with electrical needs doubling every 10 years, the electric utility industry has indicated through the Edison Electric Institute that it will make some contribution to MHD, at least for research into "peaking" or emergency plants. HEW and the Atomic Energy Commission may also ante up some funds. Meyer Steinberg, a scientist with AEC's Brookhaven National Laboratory, has suggested that giant MHD plants burning coal be built at mine-mouth in thinly populated Western coal states (including Utah and Montana), the power produced to be transmitted to population centers via "super-

conductors" or other ultramodern "electrical superhighways." It is possible that AEC is motivated by its awareness that nuclear plants are a serious contributor to environmental damage through thermal pollution and difficult-to-dispose-of radioactive wastes. Or the well-funded AEC (\$2 billion since World War II to develop nuclear power) may see MHD as a technique applicable to nuclear fuels. AEC's entry could make MHD go, if the President gets solidly behind environmental quality.

Of course, technology alone won't keep our environment clean. Scientists are coming to regard the formerly innocuous carbon dioxide as a pollutant, at least in urban "micro-environments." In these areas, higher levels of CO<sub>2</sub> will soon begin to cause rotting of the mortar in urban buildings. Burning fossil fuel *always* creates carbon dioxide, and the final solution to the CO<sub>2</sub> problem will have to be reduced burning of fuels. Moving industrial plants into thinly populated areas would help. But what would help more is fewer people and a lower per capita rate of consumption, including fewer automobiles or prohibitively high tolls for their admission into urban areas.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, neither the power industry nor the Congress has given MHD the attention it deserves. Nor has either the Johnson or Nixon administrations. We in Congress have voted more than \$2 billion for nuclear power research, but have yet to fund an MHD pilot plant.

A record has been built on the need for expenditures in the order of \$50 million to bring this promising new technology into commercial application. The record was built before the Appropriations Committees in 1968 and 1969, by the Office of Science and Technology, at the Coal Symposium at Eastern Montana College last October and at the MHD hearings conducted in December by the distinguished junior Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss), chairman of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels of the Committee on the Interior.

If this Congress means what many of its Members say about environmental protection, we will include MHD among the priority research and development programs founded this year. And if the power industry means what it advertises about environmental protection it will do the same. Surely my distinguished colleague from Montana (Senator MANSFIELD), Chairman Moss of the Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Subcommittee and the rest of us who have been attempting to encourage the new technology of MHD will be in a stronger position before the Budget Bureau and the Appropriations Committees if the industry itself, which stands to benefit from the process and which can pass on all the research and development costs to its customers, goes beyond its token support for MHD. As matters now stand, the Nation's largest industry is spending more money polluting air waves than cleaning air.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to suggest a change in the regulatory process which will, I believe, benefit the entire country, including the utility industry.

It is useful to bear in mind that the system of regulation of electric utilities was devised by the utilities themselves. Sam Insull, when head of the old National Electric Light Association, predecessor of the Edison Electric Institute,

urged the industry to seek State regulation, as far back as his presidential address to the industry in 1898. His proposal horrified other industry leaders at the time. A few years later they heartily endorsed the idea as a device to stop expansion of municipal electric systems, which from 1902 to 1907 had increased twice as rapidly as I.O.U.'s.

Insull and his colleagues played a leading role in formation of midwestern commissions. That pattern of industry sponsorship of utility regulation has continued with variations up to the current efforts of utilities in Minnesota and South Dakota to set up regulatory commissions designed by utilities in those States.

Free advertising by utilities, under this system, has seldom been challenged. The utilities have used this advertising, with other equally free public relations techniques, to misinform three generations of Americans. Utility regulation, despite its importance to all consumers, simply is not taught in the classrooms. It is taught through the utilities' free advertising. And in this case "teacher" does not tell the truth.

I.O.U.'s advertise that they are subject to unfair competition, when in fact they are assured large profits and are secure from competition, especially in the case of the 77 major utilities which have a monopoly on both electricity and natural gas distribution.

I.O.U.'s advertise that they are owned by plain folks on Main Street, but they in fact are controlled by relatively few men, far away, by exercise of proxies.

I.O.U.'s associate themselves in their advertisement, speeches and stockholder reports with all the symbols of rugged free enterprise. Actually they are sheltered by government, with market, price and profit assured, constituting, as Franklin D. Roosevelt said, a system of "private socialism."

Mention deceptive utility advertising to the Federal Trade Commission and it shies like a yearling colt from a rattlesnake. The Federal Power Commission is pitifully weak in its power to curb the abuse of free advertising privilege. The State commissions typically allow the utilities full rein, unless a particularly odious example is publicly forced on a commission's attention.

Two recent local examples, one in Virginia, the other in Maryland, indicate the vice of the system. As anyone who reads Washington area papers knows, both Virginia Electric & Power and Baltimore Gas & Electric have advertised profusely in the local media. Vepco persuaded thousands of its customers to install electric air conditioning and all-electric homes, citing the benefits of cheaper rates. The company also, according to the \$4.5 million anti-trust suit filed against it by Washington Gas Light, gave kickbacks to builders who promised to lock out Vepco's competitors in the heating market when constructing new housing developments. Now that these additional customers are locked into the Vepco system, the company—despite the fact that it nets 19.4 cents out of every revenue dollar and despite the fact that it registered an-

other earnings increase in 1969—has requested a \$25 million rate increase. Included in the proposed new rate schedule is a planned premium payment during summer months, when people turn on all the air conditioners the company persuaded them to buy. This one rate change alone would cost many customers from \$8 to \$14 monthly.

In essence, through use of free advertising Vepco overadvertised and oversold its product. Now it seeks to soak the customers with the costs of its error as well as the ads.

In Maryland, Baltimore Gas & Electric spent almost \$200,000 assuring the public that its Calvert Cliffs nuclear plant, if built, will be safe and will not damage the environment. Some persons with qualifications in this field and without self-interest in the matter do not agree. They however, do not have access to free advertising to get their story across. The Maryland Public Service Commission has questioned the propriety of inclusion of these ads in the operating expenses. However, the commission's position, as I understand it, is that the proper time to raise the question will be in a formal rate case.

As of last fall, some 160 rate cases were pending before State utility commissions. Few cases have been settled since then and many have been filed. As of mid-December, according to the Wall Street Journal, electric, gas and telephone rate increase requests then pending totaled some \$2 billion annually.

Thus the time is propitious, around the country, for the action suggested by the Maryland commission. The power industry is increasing its advertising and other public relations programs in order to put over the higher rates it seeks. Electrical World, the McGraw-Hill publication which sings harmony for Public Utilities Fortnightly, editorialized last year that the electric power industry "needs a well-conceived public relations program to prepare its own employees and their neighbors, the cop on the beat, the barber, all the citizens on the facts of its needs for higher rates."

The current January 26, 1970, issue of Electrical World carries a five-page editorially supported article on how to combat the threat of "environmentalism," by Peter M. Stern, vice president of Northeast Utilities. Mr. Stern surely must know that research and development into environmental matters, by electric utilities, is primarily a public relations ploy, rather than an engineering fact. Yet he told his interviewer of the "research and development burden that we carry," and advocated, instead of a meaningful research and development program, more public relations. Here are his words:

Right now, too much effort is spent in fire-fighting tactics, and not enough time is spent by utilities in providing lively, lay-language explanations of the technology, planning, adjustments, and R&D burden that we carry, in order to bring the public the power and environment they demand.

Then he called for another stable of, not engineers, but publicists, as the communications media have.

Mr. Stern said:

Perhaps what utilities need are some of those interpretive science writers, who are now reporting for the communications media throughout the U.S.

Let us look at the record of Northeast Utilities itself. It is a new utility holding company, comprised of two Connecticut operating companies, Connecticut Light & Power and Hartford Electric Light, and two Massachusetts utilities, Western Massachusetts Electric and Holyoke Water Power. Those four companies together spent, as their statistics which I just put in the RECORD show, \$7,983,856 on advertising and other sales in 1968. And what was their total "research and development burden"? It came to \$169,757. In other words, the "research and development burden" was about 2 percent of the apparently unburdensome advertising and sales which they want to increase, even though both the Connecticut affiliates are combination gas-electric utilities, with all of the electrical and most of the heating market already locked into the system. In sum, Mr. Stern's remarkable conclusion is worthy of the same two-word commentary which John Wayne exclaimed when he was offered—and declined—the opportunity to become George Wallace's running mate.

Pick up the canned editorials which the utilities distribute free to editors and you will read how the industry pats itself on the back, at the public's expense. One of the January 26 editorials distributed by California Feature Service, produced by Whitaker and Baxter in San Francisco, is entitled "Environment, Technology." Speaking of accommodation between the demands of the environment and the social benefits of technology, the editorial concludes that:

Few better examples of such an accommodation can be found than that offered by the investor-owned electric utilities themselves.

The industry has every legal right to advertise and propagandize, for higher rates or whatever. But that right ought to be applied on the same basis that applies to free enterprise, risk corporations.

For example, oil heat dealers compete with electric utilities—but they are not regulated; they do not operate on a cost-plus basis. They have no commission to fix their price to include profit after payment of all advertising, sales promotion, and other costs.

If commissions simply disallow advertising and other promotion as an operating expense, the utilities will still be able to merchandise their product with no great difficulty, inasmuch as they hold a monopoly on their precious and essential product. I envisage no significant change in the electric and gas utilities' domination of the lighting and heating market if they are simply required to promote their product according to the same rules that their present competitors or other merchants are obliged to follow. Furthermore, benefits may flow from disallowance of these advertising and sales costs from operating expenses. I think it likely that such expenditures would be more carefully scrutinized by management, and reduced. This would make money available

for more important programs such as research and development.

To illustrate how ludicrous and inefficient the present free advertising system is, I shall cite an example regarding Vepco. A few citizens of Herndon, Va., discovered last year that they should have been on a lower rate for several years because their houses included electric water storage heaters. This situation was brought to the attention of Vepco, which verified that the customers had indeed been on the wrong rate schedule. In some cases Vepco made refunds.

Vepco complained that the customers should have read the company's advertisements, and thus learned about the lower rate schedule. The Fairfax County Public Utilities Commission suggested that the company simply include prominent notice of the more favorable rate in a bill stuffer, which of course the company should have done in the first place.

Mr. President, I shall watch with interest the extent to which State utility commissions disallow advertising and other promotional expenditure in pending rate cases, and the extent to which those commissions encourage or require the utilities to engage in research and development of the business for which they received valuable franchises, the generation, transmission, and distribution of energy.

This is an area where the States have an opportunity to exercise responsibilities on behalf of the public—or to forfeit responsibility and invite Federal action.

#### EDUCATION LOBBY AND HEW BILL

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, we are indebted to columnist Joseph Kraft for an embarrassingly timely report on the self-serving lobby which has deluged Members and the public generally in the past few days in support of the controversial HEW appropriation bill.

The connection of America's most effective exponent of creeping socialism with this particular lobby and its concurrent propaganda effort is worth noting.

I include Mr. Kraft's column in my remarks:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Jan. 21, 1970]

COMPLEX FACES A VETO: EDUCATION LOBBY IS NO. 2, BUT TRIES HARDER

(By Joseph Kraft)

WASHINGTON.—Anybody who wants to understand the fight between Congress and the President on the issue of education vs. inflation should talk to Charles W. Lee, a jovial, roly-poly former Senate aide who is the chief Washington strategist of what is, after the military-industrial complex, the second most potent lobby in town—the lobby of the medical-education complex.

"We're second," Mr. Lee acknowledges, "but we try harder." And this year the try on education appropriations was so hard that the Democrats found themselves locked into

a confrontation with the President they may live to regret.

Behind all this lies a decade of development in the politics of education on The Hill. Back in the Eisenhower years, when the issue of federal aid to schools first surfaced, it was relatively easy for the penny-pinchers to hold the fort. They invoked inflation and then divided the supporters of big federal outlays by introducing the issues of racial segregation and support for religious schools.

To move around that blockade, there was developed a bits-and-pieces technique by Wilbur Cohen, a professor at the University of Michigan who, during the Kennedy-Johnson years, served the Department of Health, Education and Welfare successively as assistant secretary, under secretary, and secretary. The bits-and-pieces technique substituted for across-the-board education programs highly specific measures custom-tailored to particular vested interests.

Thus, a bill for buying books would enlist the support of librarians, one for dormitory construction would engage college officials, another for school construction would be backed by local boards of education. In each case, the start-up costs for the program were almost negligible so it was hard to invoke the inflationary argument. The interested parties became organized as potent lobbies—often by being taken on HEW advisory committees. The intensity of their interest, and its narrow focus, enabled them to elude general arguments about race and religion. And thus the ground was laid for the enormous rise in educational programs and appropriations that took place in the Kennedy-Johnson years.

The lobbies whistled up by the bits-and-pieces technique did not die when the Nixon administration took office. On the contrary, they were fused by Mr. Lee into a single mechanism for defending against appropriations cutbacks.

That mechanism is the Emergency Committee for Full Funding of Education Programs. It groups some 70 interested parties—ranging in size from the giant National Education Association to such midgets as the Appalachian Education Lab and the Saranac Community Schools. On key votes, all through last summer, it mobilized a stream of doctors, teachers, principals, nuns, and librarians to work on strategic congressional leaders for full funding of all education programs.

One result was an education appropriation that went way beyond administration requests all down the line. Where the administration requested nothing for school libraries, the House and Senate agreed on \$50 million. Where the administration sought \$85 million for educating the handicapped, the House and Senate agreed on \$100 million. Where the administration asked for \$202 million to help schools in areas affected by federal projects (federally impacted areas), the House and Senate agreed on \$600 million. And where the administration asked a total HEW appropriation of \$2.1 billion, the House-Senate conference agreed on \$3.2 billion.

The second result was that, when the President picked out the education appropriation as a place to stand and fight against inflation, the Democrats were positioned. With the medical-education complex standing behind them, they could not turn around and compromise when the President threatened to veto the HEW appropriation. Instead they have been obliged to stand behind the bill, take a veto, and then go through the effort to overturn the veto.

Some Democrats, to be sure, feel that stand is good politics. And, no doubt, some Republican senators and congressmen who are forced to come out against education will be made to pay for it in the fall elections. But very few, for in the end the veto will probably be sustained, and the appropriations whittled down, with a final difference in outlay

so small nobody will remember what happened.

Moreover, Mr. Nixon is using the issue to swing from a soft-line, low-profile fight against inflation to a tough and highly visible stand. That stance is good economics and even better politics. And the Democrats are probably going to learn once again how cheerless it is to slug it out with a President who is doing battle against inflation.

#### LIBRARY OF CONGRESS FACES ROUGHEST TIME SINCE 1814 FIRE

### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker during the past several years, my efforts in Congress have been directed toward the establishment of a national information system to provide our country with the critically needed tool for advancing knowledge in all fields, increased efficiency is cost and to give credence to basis research that will not be a duplicate effort.

The need for such a national information system becomes even greater when we witness the crisis stage being reached by the Library of Congress because of the information explosion.

The problems facing the Library of Congress, one of the finest in the world, are discussed in an article which appeared recently in the Chicago Sun-Times. They are similar to the problems being faced by government and private industry in our technological society, and I commend this excellent article to my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Dec. 7, 1969]  
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS FACES ROUGHEST TIME  
SINCE 1814 FIRE

WASHINGTON.—Shirley Schwarz was mad. The blond art history graduate student from the University of Maryland stood in the main reading room of the Library of Congress holding 11 book request slips, all marked "book not on shelf."

The books not being on the shelf didn't bother her that much; nor was she particularly riled that it had taken 90 minutes for the requests to come back. What really bothered her was that the books had not been on the shelf for four weeks—and she knew no one else had taken them out.

"Sometimes they just seem to disappear. They're lost to humanity," said Miss Schwarz.

#### INFORMATION EXPLOSION

Long delays and missing books are symptomatic of what is happening in the ornate Library of Congress Building, located directly east of the Capitol dome. The colonnaded, frescoed halls are no longer the secluded refuge of scholars and legislators in the leisurely search for truth and understanding.

Instead, the library has become "ground zero" for the "information explosion." A few statistics tell part of the story. Last year the library added 367,000 books to its collection, making a total of 14,800,000 booklets and pamphlets.

By the time they were classified by author, title and subject, there were 2,000,000 new cards in the library catalog, which already

spills out of its assigned place in the reading room into back hallways and alcoves.

#### BOOKS STACKED ON FLOOR

At the current rate, which is likely to accelerate, the collection would double its present size well before the end of the century.

Books are lined up on the floor at the foot of the library stacks because there's no longer any room on the shelves. Scholars carefully step over and around them.

The library is unquestionably facing its roughest time since the British reduced its collection of books to ashes when they set the torch to the Capitol (where the library was) in 1814.

But library staff members feel that, as in 1814, the nation's greatest library is going to meet the challenge. In the earlier crisis, Congress agreed to accept Thomas Jefferson's offer to sell his personal library of 6,000 volumes for \$24,000 to form the nucleus of a new library.

This time, the library is counting on a new building, automated systems and added staff to solve it.

Congress, after years of procrastination, seems about to give the \$2,800,000 needed to prepare final plans for the proposed James Madison Memorial Library, which would be the new building.

The Madison addition will allow the library to call back its map collection from an office building in Alexandria, Va., and bring together collections from such locations as the Navy Yard annex and an aircraft hangar in Middle River, Md.

#### COMPUTERIZATION?

But finding a place to put books, manuscripts, photographs, motion pictures, microfilm reels, phonograph records, folk song tapes, sheet music and other material is just one problem. Finding the stuff again is the big headache.

Henriette D. Avram, project director in the library's Information Systems office, says the library has now received acceptance from all major U.S. library groups for a computerized library card format.

Mrs. Avram explains: "The current system of finding a book by first locating its card in a card catalog is obsolete. In a few years you might have to walk through three miles of catalogs."

A computer, she says, could look through that many cards in less than a second. Moreover, it could categorize the subjects in a more sophisticated manner.

The library is said to be more accessible to scholars than the world's two other great national libraries, the British Museum Library and the Bibliotheque Nationale in Paris. It is open to all persons above high school age.

The library is candid about the fact that individual students are its fourth order of priority (after congressmen, federal agencies and government-sponsored researchers). Still, there is a staff of some 500 to help trouble-shoot research problems for students.

#### BATTLING DECAY

The library is battling another enemy—decay.

Some 500,000 books, most of them dating from the early days of cheap papermaking in the last century, have become so brittle they have to be kept in a special collection, where humidity and ventilation are rigidly regulated and access is sharply limited.

The library is microfilming these books as fast as it can with the money it gets. But the current pace—about 10,000 volumes a year—doesn't make much headway.

Even more danger attends the collection of early films which, experts say, are so fragile they can deteriorate almost overnight into an unusable state. The library is working as fast as possible to transfer the old reels to more stable film.

#### GRAZING FEES—VII

### HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, my mail on the question of whether the fees for grazing on the public lands should be increased includes letters from ranchers favoring the increase.

One such rancher sent along a copy of a letter he received from the Montana Public Land Council using the post office box of the Montana Stockgrowers Association. I ask unanimous consent that his letter and the enclosure be printed following my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. President, Secretary of the Interior Hickel has before him the question of whether he should increase grazing fees for 1970 by 13 cents per animal unit month—AUM. Should he do so, he could, under existing policy, put one-third of that amount, or 4½ cents, back on the land for conservation, thereby not only protecting and developing the land but also providing for more grazing.

But the stockmen, at least in Montana, are asking all ranchers who use the public lands to chip in 5 cents per AUM to fight improving the public range. This money is being sent to Washington, D.C., to pay for high-powered special representatives.

The rancher to whose letter I direct the attention of my colleagues was one of those who said he would rather put his money into a fair grazing fee and back on the land.

I find it interesting that as of December 30, when the Montana Public Land Council letter was postmarked, they were already claiming credit for persuading Secretary Hickel on the issue. They were claiming that their lobbying had cut grazing fees for 1970 by \$163,000 in Montana alone.

It is odd that the council claims that the court suit, which the stockmen lost, persuaded Mr. Hickel not to raise the fees in 1970. In view of Secretary Hickel's November 25 letter and subsequent declarations of his intent, I would like to know exactly who advised him and what advice they gave him.

As far as I have been able to ascertain, the Secretary of the Interior has been sadly misled into even proposing a moratorium on the grazing fee schedule.

And conservationists, among whom I count President Nixon, will do well to note carefully the kinds of pressure that are brought to bear on the Secretary of the Interior and the Public Land Law Review Commission—PLLRC. I note that the Montana Public Land Council, which shares the same mail bag as the Montana Stockgrowers Association, says:

We hope these benefits will be further magnified when the time comes for PLLRC to report to Congress. It will be then when skilled representation will be vital to the stockman's future.

What they are saying to conservationists about the \$163,000 "saving" in grazing fees is: You "ain't" seen nothing yet.

This administration has the issue squarely in its lap. It has a choice to make—improve the range, conserve the soil, restore the environment, or peel the fragile headwaters and let the streams run brown with mud. It may increase the grazing fees and plow more of the revenue back into the depleted range, or starve out the livestock and the game on the eroded range.

Among other things, this issue will be a test of what this administration intends to do about pollution.

I came to the Senate to represent all of our people, and their interest in all of our resources. In this case, conservation is best for the rancher, who rents the public land, and for every family downstream. Well-managed rangeland with a good cover of grass is a basic investment in controlling erosion and water pollution.

I have yet to see a cow that could live on paper money or silver dollars, and \$163,000 will buy only 6,000 tons of hay. As my Montana rancher friend writes: "An increase in fees is justified—long overdue."

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

JANUARY 8, 1970.

SENATOR LEE: Thought you might be interested in the enclosed. These fellows are opposing not only the current grazing fee increase on Federal lands, but will oppose anything that doesn't maintain the status-quo.

We have . . . acres in all—an increase in fees is justified—long over due.

This AUM permit is a very valuable asset to those who are fortunate to have it. It is worth at least \$1.50 AUM when you consider private land owners receiving from \$3 to \$4.50 per AUM. This does not take into account, salting, maintaining water supply etc. as they would like many to believe.

Sincerely,

MONTANA PUBLIC LAND COUNCIL,  
Helena, Mont.

Many of us who use the public land in Montana for livestock grazing have contributed 5¢ per AUM to the Montana Public Land Council in order to finance the employment of special representation in Washington, D.C. According to the information we have, we don't believe you have sent in your contribution as yet.

Public lands have become of increasing interest to many segments of our society which serves to point up the need for an organization such as this to represent those whose livelihood comes from grazing all or a portion of their stock on public lands.

The effectiveness of the council's work to date was recently displayed when Secretary of the Interior Hickel announced a moratorium on further grazing fee increases for BLM lands until such time as the public land law review commission had completed its studies. For example, the savings to Montana stockmen using BLM lands in 1970 as a result of the Secretary's order amounts to about \$163,000. It is doubtful if he would have taken such action were there not a public land council organized and providing financial support for a court test of the original decision. We hope these benefits will be further magnified when the time comes for the PLLRC to report to Congress. It will be then when skilled representation will be vital to the stockman's future.

Based on the AUMS of BLM or forest service land allotted you it would seem that your

contribution should be \$— (5¢ per AUM). Won't you take time to make out your check payable to: Montana Public Land Council in order that this work may be continued without again collecting from those who have already supported the organization once? It is planned that this contribution will support a five-year program after which time the PLLRC studies will be completed and when a decision can be made as to future operation of the council.

Sincerely yours,

Chairman, Montana Public Land Council.

## DO WE REALLY WANT AN ALL-VOLUNTEER ARMY?

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said in recent years about the possibility of an all-volunteer Army. Some excellent thoughts on this subject were expressed recently by Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, U.S. Army, retired, in an article for the November-December 1969 issue of *Armor*. I am pleased to include in the RECORD the article by this distinguished soldier so that everyone might have the benefit of his knowledge and experience:

### DO WE REALLY WANT AN ALL-VOLUNTEER ARMY?

(By Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, U.S.A., retired)

Today there is much discussion about whether our country would be better served by an all-volunteer Army than by one which includes volunteers and inductees. Many of the viewpoints advanced are solidly based, while others give the appearance of being catchy slogans backed by little more than good intentions.

At first glance, the all-volunteer Army concept appears to be an attractive alternative. By permitting the elimination of Selective Service, it would do away with a target of criticism by some Americans. It is asserted that an all-volunteer Army would retain its members for longer careers thus becoming more "professional" and proficient while at the same time reducing high training costs occasioned by rapid turnover.

There are, of course, other favorable arguments for an all-volunteer military force.

My purpose here is not to attempt to destroy these arguments nor to intimate that the entire proposition does not deserve consideration. On the contrary, it seems appropriate now to introduce some further points for consideration by thoughtful military men and by American citizens generally.

At the risk of sounding less than becomingly modest, I believe that some 40 years of military service including three wars and command at nearly all levels might persuade some that what follows has a basis on fact and hard-earned experience.

If the United States adopts a policy of an all-volunteer Army in the face of the present world conditions, we may well be in for some real problems.

First off, we want a democratic Army of, and close to, our people. We want an Army that is representative of the best of all those diverse nationalities, races, creeds and conditions which make good our motto "E Pluribus Unum"—(out of many—one).

A purely professional force tends to isolate itself, and to be isolated, from the mainstream of national life. It has very little positive impact on our American society

and tends to be neglected by the people and their elected representatives. When this happens, adverse effects on morale rapidly reduce the effectiveness of the Nation's defense.

We want and need an Army of men meeting the required high moral, mental and physical standards. When undue enlistment and reenlistment pressures are brought about, standards tend to be lowered in order to fill quotas. For example, during one year while I was in command in Europe, 91% of the soldiers we eliminated from the Army as unsuitable were Regular Army, and most of these were on their first enlistment.

Furthermore, there is no place today in these times of rapidly evolving military technology for an army having any aging professional privates.

Today, the draft encourages many to voluntarily enlist, enroll in the ROTC, join the National Guard and the Reserve and to consider attending one of the service academies. This results from focusing national attention on service needs for quality manpower as well as from the threat of the draft.

And now comes the very practical matter of maintaining the combat elements of the Army and the Marine Corps without Selective Service. Simply stated, the problem essentially is to get officers and men whose job it is to close with the enemy and defeat him on the ground.

The hardships and hazards of duty are not equal among the Armed Services, nor are they equal among the various branches of the Army. The Infantry of the Army and the Marines incur, by far, the greatest risk. Overall casualties of the Korean War are illustrative. For the Army these were 27,604 (of which 84% were Infantry), for the Marines 4267, for the Air Force 1200 and for the Navy 458. During World War II, 89% of the Army people killed were Infantrymen and during the Korean War 92%. While these figures are not in the minds of Americans in general, their overall import is commonly understood.

Between World War II and Korea, we tried to maintain the Army without Selective Service. And, we made an all-out effort to do this. This resulted in so much stress on enlistments in the administrative and technical elements of the Army in order to learn a trade that enlistments in the combat arms were inadequate to maintain them at authorized strength.

While an important incentive, pay alone is not the answer. In this respect, one has only to look at the recruiting picture in some of those countries which pay well considering their economies and go begging for military manpower. Or, closer to home, consider the police recruiting problems of some of our leading, modern police forces where salaries and other benefits appear to be most attractive.

Now, even assuming that we could somehow build and maintain a large all-volunteer force (an assumption which I consider to be of the type that might properly earn a "U" on a staff study at one of our service schools), what happens if a crisis demands expansion? One can but imagine that the Selective Service system would have deteriorated so far that rapid response to vital national need would be impossible. This must not be permitted to happen. This system must be maintained fully and effectively even on a stand-by basis.

Having said all of this, it is important not to forget that we very much need to maintain a sizable and high quality volunteer career group in our Army.

And this seems a good place to point out that there are a number of things designed to increase career attractiveness which can and should be looked into:

Pay inequities.

Increase of war risk insurance (the present \$10,000 figure was evolved in World War I).

More benefits to surviving wives and minor children.

More realistic educational benefits for veterans.

Retirement benefits for those completing 10 years service.

Recomputation of retired pay, on a current pay basis, to insure that inflation does not reduce to penury those retired for long honorable service.

A discharge bonus of about \$1000 per year paid after completion of three years enlisted service. This might well be paid in U.S. Savings Bonds.

Other service benefits should be examined in the light of present-day economics as well as the current practices of business and industry. Those things which might be increased or improved includes:

On-post housing.

Medical and dental care.

Post exchange goods and services.

Commissary services.

Rental and ration allowances.

And, we would be well advised to put more thought and effort into how we handle our officers and soldiers so that when they leave the services, they will be "alumni boosters." The veteran with a favorable impression is our best recruiter.

Morale is that great intangible which separates effective armies from the poor ones. The officer-enlisted man relationship in the Army is most important. Over the past years, when we have had a proper balance of professional and citizen officers, non-commissioned officers and men, we have had a fine Army. Both volunteers and selectees have made this true.

It hardly seems the time to break up a winning combination. Rather, it seems wise to reinforce success.

## THE FORGOTTEN PATRIOT

### HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, a highly informative and interesting account of "the forgotten patriot" of the American War for Independence, John Dickinson, and his homestead appeared in the New York Times of January 11.

John Dickinson often has been termed the "Penman of the Revolution." His homestead happens to be in the State of Delaware, which was the first State of the Union, as we all know. However, because of the historical interest and nationwide plans to commemorate the 200th year of our freedom in the decade of the 1970's, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

This excellently written account is under the byline of John Koenig, Jr., a former Associated Press correspondent with whom, I know, many of our friends in the Senate Press Gallery are acquainted. He is a gifted writer who now authors articles about the preservation of historical sites.

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

[From the New York Times, Jan. 11, 1970]  
DICKINSON HOMESTEAD IN DELAWARE RECALLS  
"THE FORGOTTEN PATRIOT"

(By John Koenig, Jr.)

DOVER, DEL.—The wind blows across the open flatlands south of this capital city, and

the trees and the reeds bend with it. The area is very reminiscent of the Netherlands, which sent the first settlers to the region in the 17th century.

This is where John Dickinson, the "Penman of the Revolution," had his home. The Dickinsons were not Dutch, but Quakers who had emigrated from England to Virginia in 1654. Samuel Dickinson, John's father, settled in Delaware in 1740.

John Dickinson later had other, more luxurious homes in Philadelphia, the American Colonial metropolis, but it was to his boyhood home here in Dover that he came in times of trouble. His house in the country was a place for him to think things out.

#### ESTEEMED BY CONTEMPORARIES

Perhaps it holds the key to the character of this great man of the Revolutionary War period. Although Dickinson was regarded by Jefferson and others of the time as one of the greatest among them, in recent years he has been looked upon as the "forgotten patriot."

Like its owner, the Dickinson mansion was nearly forgotten. It was rescued from a state of dilapidation by the Colonial Dames of America; the organization raised \$25,000, purchased the mansion in 1952 and presented it to the State of Delaware, which has assumed its maintenance.

When he was 18, Dickinson went to Philadelphia to study law under John Moland, the King's attorney for Pennsylvania. After four years of additional study in London and several years of private practice, he entered politics as a member of the Pennsylvania and Delaware Assemblies. In 1765, he was a delegate to the Stamp Act Congress in New York and prepared the "Declaration of Rights Adopted by the Stamp Act Congress."

#### "1776" REVIVES FAME

Dickinson's fame has been revived by the hit Broadway musical "1776." The show largely concerns the antagonism between Dickinson and John Adams on issues confronting the Continental Congress prior to the Declaration of Independence.

He opposed violence as a means of righting the ills the Colonies suffered at the hands of the British Government. He was schooled in British constitutional law in the Middle Temple in London, and he believed there still was room for conciliation.

Dickinson favored a confederation of the colonies to deal with King and Parliament, and opposed the timing of the Declaration. He declined to sign, but accepted the will of the majority at the Continental Congress, and within a week had gone to Elizabethtown, N.J., to head a regiment of Pennsylvania militia.

Lawyer, legislator and writer, Dickinson was responsible for the text of practically all the important documents of the Continental Congress up to the Declaration, and he drafted the Act of Confederation. His "Letters From a Farmer in Pennsylvania," published in The Pennsylvania Chronicle in 1768, pointed out to the colonists their rights as free men and helped solidify public opinion.

Dickinson moved readily back and forth between Delaware and Pennsylvania, serving in the Legislatures of both; prior to the Revolution, the two colonies had a common Governor, although they had two separate Provincial Assemblies. After the Revolution, Dickinson served as president of the supreme executive council of both states, first of Delaware and then of Pennsylvania.

#### INHERITED COUNTRY HOME

His wife was Mary (Polly) Norris, daughter of Isaac Norris the younger and granddaughter of Isaac Norris the elder, both of whom served as Speaker of the Pennsylvania Provincial Assembly in Philadelphia. The Dickinsons inherited Fairhill, the Norris's country home on the northern edge of Phila-

delphia, which was burned by the British during the occupation of the city. A town house that Dickinson built near Independence Hall was turned into a hospital before he and his family could move in.

So it was the Delaware homestead to which he had to turn and which is the only one that has survived.

Dickinson's boyhood home took on particular importance in 1776, when he moved his family there from Philadelphia. He did this because it appeared likely that the British would take that city. Five years later, a group of 16 Tories from New York landed in the village of Kitts Hummock on the Delaware, a couple of miles from Dover, and looted the Dickinson home.

As a delegate to the Constitutional Convention from Delaware, Dickinson succeeded in securing the provision that there would be two Senators from each state, and he was instrumental in making Delaware and Pennsylvania the first states to ratify the new Federal Constitution.

Dickinson lived his last years in Wilmington, dying there in 1808, and was buried in the Friends Meeting Yard at Fourth and West Streets. But the Dover farmhouse was his real home, and the hub of his fortune. Above all, it was his sanctuary and is the most fitting Dickinson shrine for present-day Americans to visit.

Besides the Dickinson mansion in Delaware, John's father had owned land in Maryland, and for 30 years had lived at Croisadore on the Eastern Shore. By 1729, Samuel's wife and all but two of his nine children had died.

Samuel started all over again, taking a second wife, Mary Cadwallader, a Merriam, Pa., Quaker. He moved to his Delaware holdings, leaving Croisadore to the children of his first marriage. John Dickinson, born of the second wife in 1732—the same year as George Washington—grew up in Delaware.

#### GRAVE BEHIND FARMHOUSE

Samuel, who became a Delaware judge in addition to managing his large properties, died in 1760. His grave is in a brick wall-enclosed plot in the herb garden behind the Delaware farmhouse and can still be seen.

In the master bedroom of the house is a small wooden cradle that was used for John and his brother Philemon, who later attained political and military prominence in New Jersey.

The Dickinson house, strongly built of brick, faces south and was connected by a lane through the broad fields, with a landing on the nearby St. Jones River; this provided easy access, via the Delaware River, to Wilmington and Philadelphia. A sizable garden, featuring large boxwoods and believed to be in the style of Dickinson's time, now graces the south facade of the house. Its paved paths of brick provide a pleasant walk.

A disastrous fire in 1804 destroyed much of the interior woodwork of the house. The damage was repaired by John Dickinson. In the drawing room, there is a clock that belonged to him and was acquired from Dickinson College, an institution he helped found in Carlisle, Pa.

In the first-floor library is a Dickinson chair, and in an upstairs sitting room a Dickinson desk. Samuel received suggestions from the young Dickinson, then studying law in London, on a dining room wing he built in 1752 and a kitchen addition in 1754.

#### SOME FAMILY HERLOOMS

Some Dickinson family silver is in the dining room, along with a teapot bearing the names of John and Mary Dickinson. A portrait of John by an unknown painter hangs on the wall.

The home is open daily to the public, and there is no admission charge.

It is not hard to find. Follow U.S. 113 for five miles southeast of Dover; turn to the

left at Kitts Hummock Road. The house and garden stand alone in the fields that formed the Dickinson plantation two centuries ago.

The country below Dover Air Force Base on the southern edge of town, appears almost unchanged from the days when the early Dutch explorers sailed up the Delaware River and founded the first settlements. It still is a land where a man can seek, and find, solitude.

### THE THREAT FROM THE NEAR EAST

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, during the recess of Congress, three members of the Committee on Armed Services undertook a mission to the Near East.

As a result of this experience, I am more concerned than ever about the threat to peace caused by stepped-up activity on the part of the Soviet Union and the increased militancy of radical dictators in the countries of Egypt, Libya, Iraq, Syria, and the Sudan.

Johnny Johnson, editor of the Danville, Va., Bee, has written an objective editorial on the subject which I include in the RECORD:

[From the Danville (Va.) Bee, Jan. 23, 1970]

#### NEW ARAB THREAT

As if there already had not been enough to worry about in the Mid East, Libya bears watching. And so does its relationship with other countries.

Six months ago, under King Idris II, Libya was considered among the more moderate of the Arab states—something of an anchor on its neighbor to the east, Egypt. It was a deterrent on Nasser's desires of organizing all Arabs for total war against Israel.

American oil interests there were considered secure. There was talk that the agreement under which this country operates the giant Wheelus Air Force Base outside Tripoli might be continued beyond its expiration date this year.

On the theory that Libya had to have strength to avoid Egyptian domination, this country had promised to add 10 supersonic F5 fighter-bombers to the 10 already delivered to that country. Britain planned to sell King Idris heavy tanks, self-propelled guns and an air-to-ground missile system at a cost of \$400-million.

Then came the military coup of September 1, led by 27-year-old Muammar Mohamed Kadafi, who is passionately dedicated to the Arab cause and who proclaimed "liberation of Palestine" among top priorities of the new regime.

At first, nationalization of American companies was feared in retaliation for any hold-up on military aid. However, the semi-official newspaper, Al Ahram, stated that nationalization would give "imperialization justification for open intervention against the revolution" . . . and would be impractical because Libya does not have the means to exploit its oil resources alone.

However, the new regime made it clear that the agreement on operation of the giant Wheelus base would not be renewed. To some, this didn't seem very important. For several years only portions of the sprawling facility have been used—primarily for training NATO pilots. And this could be done elsewhere.

Besides, Libya has no really effective air force. And British Aircraft Corporation slammed the door on a multimillion dollar deal to supply a complete "defense" system.

The 1954 Wheelus agreement stipulates that, with its termination, all permanent installations such as buildings, runways and roads will become Libyan without compensation to the United States. Only aircraft would be needed to make it an operative Arab base for strikes at Tel Aviv 1,200 miles away.

Now entering the scene: France.

The French government had agreed to sell 50 Mirage jet fighters to Israel . . . but is continuing to withhold delivery. On the other hand, France announced this week it intends to sell 30 Mirage jets and 20 training planes to Libya in addition to the 50 other Mirage fighters the revolutionary Arab state has just ordered.

Within 24 hours, the British resumed talks with Libya on the sale of more arms.

And the Soviet Union stands ready to supply heavier warplanes and technicians to operate Wheelus for Libya should the call come.

Yes, there is ample reason for concern over Libya.

### CLEANING UP THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, one of the greatest problems which we are currently facing is that of cleaning up our environment.

This was the subject of a speech which was recently delivered by Mr. Scott Reed, one of the leading conservationists from my State of Idaho, to a meeting of the First District Idaho Wildlife Federation in Coeur d'Alene, Idaho.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks a portion of the speech, which appeared in the December 25, 1969, issue of the St. Maries, Idaho, Gazette-Record.

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

#### WHAT IS THE COST OF GROWTH?

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Following is a portion of a speech given by Scott Reed of Coeur d'Alene before the First District Idaho Wildlife Federation meeting there this month.)

Recently I have been reading a book published in 1903 entitled "History of North Idaho". The book was financed by the worthy residents of the area who paid to have their biographies and sometimes their pictures published as part of the history. I have never encountered so many virtuous, staunch, upright and progressive citizens or seen so many hairy faces. The history recites the enthusiasm of the time and growth and development: money raised to bring in railroads, mines encouraged, lumber mills sought, roads built, reservations taken from "shiftless and nomadic people" and opened to hard working pioneers. The theme resounding through the book reflects the spirit in the west in the 19th and early 20th century. Open up and exploit the land! Bring the people in! There is a missionary zeal. It is an article of faith that growth is good.

This zeal and faith are still part of our thinking in the west. From our local chambers of commerce to the legislature and the governor, the theme is still that growth is good. Open up and exploit the land! Bring in the people!

In my view we have reached a time here in Idaho, in the nation and in the world when that theme must be questioned and analyzed. Should the government, that is, we the people, promote growth, encourage industry, invite immigration, solicit tourists?

Let us put the matter in perspective. William A. Clebsch, professor of Religion and Humanities at Stanford, recently wrote:

"The continuation of our present path gives us a choice between four different ruins—crowding ourselves off this planet, polluting it into an unfit place to live, slaughtering one another in racial hatred, or blowing ourselves off the face of the globe."

There is an increasing and spreading recognition of the perils of reckless disregard of environment. Those who are oriented primarily to the preservation of hunting and fishing and are finding new support and help in many places and in time, are finding themselves concerned in areas not directly related to rod and gun, such as air pollution and population explosion.

What I wish to suggest to you is the use of another tool in examining governmental promotion of growth. This tool is economics. A question we have not been asking often enough is, "What will it cost?" In our defense against accusations of being preservationists or birdwatchers we have come up with dollar values for hunting, fishing, camping, and the like. But we have not been using economics as a method of attack. We have not been asking those who want governmental assistance to open up and exploit the land to prove their case economically.

A transportation fiasco is taking place on the Snake River. The Corps of Engineers is building a series of dams to bring slack water transportation to Lewiston. We know the loss of fish, upland bird hunting and recreation values. The question that has not been asked often enough is what does slack water transportation cost. The figures based upon the estimated costs of the dams yet to be built come out to about one million dollars per mile. That makes even an interstate look cheap. It is said that barge transportation is more economical. In this jet age do we need another Erie Canal? If it is cheaper, let the barge companies build the dams. You know how far slack water transportation would go if the million dollars per mile were being paid by private companies instead of the public taxpayer.

As another example, consider this comparison. Which will provide more economic opportunity value and utility to the citizens of North Idaho over the next fifty years: Dworshak Dam or Farragut State Park? And how do you imagine the initial cost of developing each will compare?

The economic test should be applied to the mineral development in the White Clouds. It must first be recognized that we the people are being asked to provide something of value to the mining companies. Land for roads, land for mines and water for the mining are all being given to the companies. Idaho farmers pay heavily for the land and water which would be a gift to the miners.

The great tax and employment benefits mentioned need serious analysis. First of all mining is speculative. The west is littered with "good" claims that have been abandoned. No one cleans up unprofitable mining ventures. Governor Samuelson's continuing escalation of the prospects of ASARCO looked as if he were selling stock in the company but significantly for all his enthusiasm the price hasn't risen. The investors are apparently more skeptical than the governor.

The long range economic costs are the serious question. At the same time that the governor was talking up ASARCO, Attorney General Robson was demanding action to clean up the South Fork of the Coeur d'Alene

river. Even if public officials won't listen to conservationists, at least they ought to listen to themselves. Why is the South Fork dirty? Mining. What will it cost to clean it up? Millions. Can the land and the water be restored to the condition existing before the mining started? Never. Much has been made of the fact that the mining companies have now ceased to dump their residue in the South Fork. The cities and villages are still dumping the raw sewage in the river. The major reason they haven't stopped is because control is so expensive. Anyone who thinks mining uniformly produces prosperous workers and progressive communities should drive the back roads in Shoshone County to Burke, Gem, Wardner, Murray, Silverton, or Page. In order to finance the sewer district needed to clean the river poverty stricken people living in shacks in the back areas will be asked to pay \$11 to \$15 per month for sewage hookups.

The cry is made from the highest level of government that we must attract and invite industrial expansion to bring in the people and enhance the tax base with the promised result of lowering the taxes for everyone. Is this true? The plain fact is that people cost money. Take taxes on city dwellers for example. The taxes in Coeur d'Alene are higher than those in Rathdrum. In Boise, higher than Coeur d'Alene. In Spokane, higher than Boise. In Seattle, higher than Spokane. In Detroit, higher than Seattle. In New York, higher than Detroit. It does not necessarily follow that it is better to live in the small town than the big city but many public problems such as law enforcement, garbage and snow removal and transportation are much more costly in the bigger cities. In New York City the average speed of traffic in downtown Manhattan was 11 miles per hour in 1900. In 1969 it is 6 miles per hour. Perhaps one of the unrecognized advantages of living in Coeur d'Alene is that it is still possible to be arrested for speeding on Sherman Avenue.

Congress is hopefully going to appropriate \$1,000,000,000 to help fight water pollution. It isn't enough. The pollution was caused by people and industry. Would it not be cheaper to prevent pollution in the first place?

Must the state government subsidize and invite industry to bring in the people? The stream of people moving into Idaho to live has been growing steadily. We call these people Californians although they come from all over the United States. Are these people moving to Idaho because they want better highways, bigger factories, larger schools? They are coming for exactly the opposite reasons. They will tell you frankly that they are refugees from the metropolises. One of these living near me is a pilot from Pan American flying to the Orient. He finds it is as easy to commute from Spokane as from San Jose, and much more pleasant. In many instances we have not planned for and are not ready or able to provide adequate public services for those who are coming.

The State of Oregon which has the finest park system in the country is now worried and concerned about the influx of campers. Oregon officials are considering cooling their tourist promotion. Governor Dan Evans told the Olympic Rotary Club recently: "The time when we may have to ration our trails, lakes and wilderness is perhaps not so far in the future". In reporting the speech, the Seattle Argus said of Washington's Department of Commerce and Economic Development that "... Tax supported tourist promotion makes about as much sense as buying air pollution in bags."

My approach is solid conservative free enterprise economics. Although it may be desirable, the public mood is not yet ready to restrict and prohibit new industry and development. But the government city, state and federal should stop making handouts and subsidies. To every proposal for a new

industry, housing development, highway, Dam or other project requiring public financial assistance or approval by zoning or otherwise, I would propose the asking of four questions.

1. What does it cost? Let us have the actual dollar figure including the realistic amount of public money being contributed.

2. What does it cost the rest of us? Is the highway taking lakeshore land? Is the Dam destroying fishing? Will the factory pollute the air or water? Who will pay for the new schools, roads and sewers?

3. What will it cost in ten or twenty years? This land is our land but it is also the land of our children and our children's children. What are the long range economic implications?

4. What will we receive as economic benefits from the project? Let us view this from the perspective of the community, the county, the state, the nation and the world.

Suppose a proposal is made to build a large pulp mill in Kootenai county or near Sandpoint or Bonners Ferry. The instinctive reaction or the business community could be to welcome what might for example be a \$5,000,000 plant to enhance the tax base and 500 new employees to spend their money in the area. Growth is good.

What is the actual cost? Will new public highways be required to service the plant? If the mill is near a city, will city sewer lines be provided and what will be the effect upon the present sewage disposal plant? Can the school system take care of perhaps 1,500 more children? The kids usually arrive about two years ahead of the increase in tax revenue. The new schools need new bond issues. Can the city provide the fire and police protection, sewers, water and roads to the new residents? It is customary to locate mills outside the city limits, so the city services must be provided without the enlarged tax base.

What does it cost the rest of us? At the present time there is no satisfactory manner to prevent air pollution from a pulp mill. The treatment for water pollution is inadequate. Any lumber mill town has a good deal of smoke in the air. At certain times of the year this smoke hangs in the valleys around all our lakes. If odor is added to that smoke it becomes intolerable. The effect of a pulp mill upon the tourist industry and upon the happiness, comfort and sense of well being of the residents in the area would be devastating in dollars. The supply demands of a large pulp mill might create excessive cutting in our forests and raise the price of logs to sawmills and plywood mills possibly to the point where they could not be competitive.

What will it cost in ten or twenty years? We do not know how close we are to the tolerance level in air pollution. We do know that some of our lakes and rivers are polluted and an increase in pollution may permanently destroy these waters. Our children may have to clean up the mess and close the pulp mill but it may then be too late.

What economic benefits will be received? Balance the tax revenues and the derivative income against the potential losses. The negative economic impact will be apparent.

Each of our northern counties should take legislative steps now to prohibit the construction of new pulp mills. This is not to say that there should not be any pulp mills anywhere. It is simply to say that a new large pulp mill is too costly in this place and at this time. At a different location or at a future time with technological improvements. A pulp mill might be economically advantageous.

The old west is dead. We do not have unlimited resources in Idaho. We do not need boosters and Babbitts to build our country. Human survival is too important to be bartered away by politicians. Price is not the only test nor is it even the most important. But before we as a people permit our natural heritage to be given away by glib salesmen or

short sighted office holders, let us know the actual cost. There has been too much "free" in the free enterprise system.

Dr. Krutilla has written:

"Natural environments will represent irreparable assets of appreciating value with the passage of time."

In this capitalistic society, don't let us be spendthrifts to leave our children in environmental bankruptcy.

#### MARY McLEOD BETHUNE MEMORIAL

#### HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, almost 10 years ago Congress passed a joint resolution authorizing the erection of a monument to Mary McLeod Bethune. The monument was to be erected by the National Council of Negro Women in Lincoln Park.

The national council had set for themselves a large but meaningful goal, and they went about it in their usual efficient manner. They had not reckoned with the changing priorities of black Americans that was to come in the early 1960's though. The major emphasis of most groups, the national council included, was to be on civil rights. The national council, aware of the needs, expended the largest portion of their resources and energies in that area.

They did not stop work on the Bethune memorial, but they did have to assign it a very low priority. In 1965 at the end of the original 5-year period, they were able to secure a 2-year extension. Unfortunately, it simply was not enough time.

There were many things that had to be done: Hiring a sculptor and an architect, securing the approval of the final plans from the Secretary of the Interior, the Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Capital Planning Commission. Above all there was the need to raise the money. This project is to be completed without costing the Government one single cent.

The national council, in the spirit of their founder, Mary McLeod Bethune, who started a million dollar school with \$2 is now prepared to finish the memorial by the end of 1970. For this reason, and because of the new consciousness and awareness among Americans to contributions of minority-group people, I and 23 of my colleagues are introducing today a joint resolution extending the extension granted in 1967 by 4 years.

Dr. Bethune justly deserves this recognition as a black, as a woman, and as a human being dedicated to helping others.

Colleagues cosponsoring: Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MIKVA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PREYER, Mr. RHODES, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SISK, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. WIDNALL.

## IMPORTANCE OF DIRECT ISRAELI-ARAB PEACE NEGOTIATIONS

### HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the New York Times of January 27 published an excellent editorial on the importance of direct Israeli-Arab peace negotiations. I concur with their belief and hope that the President's recent remarks have eased the unfortunate apprehensions in an effort to strengthen the partnership between the United States and Israel and the cause of peace.

I submit this editorial to the RECORD and request my colleagues' unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 27, 1970]

#### THE UNITED STATES AND ISRAEL

President Nixon's message of reassurance on the Middle East to American Jewish leaders is, like Secretary of State Rogers's December speech, a simple restatement of longstanding American policy. The two statements are perfectly compatible with each other and with the position taken by the previous Administration following the 1967 Arab-Israel war.

The President said that the United States believes peace in the Middle East "can be based only on agreement between the parties and that agreement can be achieved only through negotiations between them." This is the philosophy of the Nov. 22, 1967, Security Council resolution that the Johnson Administration helped to draft and consistently supported. It was reiterated by Secretary Rogers in his Dec. 9 address when he said: "An agreement among the powers cannot be a substitute for agreement among the parties themselves."

This basic principle of American policy is in no way inconsistent with the Nixon Administration's efforts to facilitate negotiations by working with other permanent members of the Security Council to strengthen the mediation mission of U.N. Ambassador Gunnar Jarring. In the absence of progress toward a settlement by the parties themselves, the world community is entitled—indeed, obliged—under the U.N. Charter to seek to promote peace and prevent a new war that threatens all nations.

President Nixon's promise that the United States is "maintaining a careful watch on the relative strength of the forces [in the Middle East] and . . . will not hesitate to provide arms to friendly states as the need arises" is similar to a pledge President Johnson made to Levi Eshkol, the former Premier of Israel, two years ago. There has never been any reason to doubt that the new Administration would honor that pledge. Certainly there is no evidence from the fighting fronts to indicate that Israel's military position has been allowed to deteriorate.

Surely Israelis and their most ardent supporters here must recognize, as Washington has done, that arms alone cannot insure Israel's security in the long run. If the United States and Israel are to be partners in Israel's defense as they must be as long as the Arabs and their arms suppliers pursue a policy of war, they should also be partners in an unrelenting search for peace. If Mr. Nixon's statement has eased unfortunate—and we believe unjustified—apprehensions

over Mr. Rogers's proposals, that partnership and the cause of peace will have been strengthened.

## DOES FOREIGN AID REALLY AID?

### HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the February issue of the Atlantic magazine carries an excellent article by Washington Post correspondent Bernard Nossiter entitled, "Does Foreign Aid Really Aid?" Mr. Nossiter covered India for the Post in 1967 and 1968 and brings to this article his experience in that developing country.

From this perspective, Mr. Nossiter undertakes a critical analysis of the recently published Pearson Commission report, "Partners in Development," a study done for the World Bank. The report enjoins the rich nations to increase their assistance to the poor nations. Mr. Nossiter, on the other hand, attacks the assumption that there is a direct link between aid and growth, and goes on to assert that "aid has spared the Indian Government from making the harsh decisions that would do most to further economic development." After citing several examples to substantiate this contention, Mr. Nossiter comes to the following conclusion:

I suggest that it is no longer clear that a massive increase in aid, without a concomitant hardening of soft states, will yield any great consequence for the economic development of the poor. Indeed, the one might very well frustrate the other.

Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. Nossiter has raised a provocative and controversial question which is critical to our overall foreign assistance policy. I would hope that we in the Congress will come to grips with this question as we plot a foreign aid policy for the future, and I would also hope that this point will be dealt with by President Nixon's Task Force on International Development, which will submit its report to the President sometime in March. At this point in the RECORD I include Mr. Nossiter's article and commend it to the attention of my colleagues. The article follows:

[From the Atlantic, February 1970]

#### DOES FOREIGN AID REALLY AID?

(By Bernard Nossiter)

In May of 1968, the hot season was on us in full force at New Delhi, and I had been a correspondent in that troubled capital for eight months. Late one afternoon, I sought relief over tea in the home of a wise and skilled-Indian journalist. My host led me to a high-ranking official in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture, a shrewd career official. I told him I brought some unpleasant news: the ticker had just reported from Washington that a House committee had further reduced the President's modest request for foreign aid.

"Good," he said, to my surprise. "I am only sorry they didn't cut it off entirely. Then perhaps we might do some of the things that need doing."

I was reminded of that tea party by the

October release of "Partners in Development." This is the portentous report of the Pearson Commission, enjoining the rich nations to do more for the poor. It asserts that the world is a global village in which none can be indifferent to the fate of others, and that the security of the affluent in Neuilly and Grosse Pointe is somehow tied to the Kutcha hovels of Calcutta. It deplores the declining course of foreign aid, particularly in the United States, and urges a sharp reversal of this trend. More specifically, it calls on the rich to double their transfer of resources, public and private, to the poor, from \$12.8 billion in 1968 to \$23 billion by 1975. For the same period, the report proposes nearly a tripling in official aid, from \$6.4 billion to \$16.2 billion. Achievement of these levels, the document proclaims, would launch the poor on something called "self-sustaining growth."

#### WELL MEANING

Predictably, right-thinking persons have solemnly applauded the Pearson report, and is almost certain to become a measure of how badly the rich are failing the poor. The New York Times described it as a "persuasive picture of what can be accomplished by foreign aid—and how."

Certainly the report was issued with all the proper credentials. Its origin lies in a deep concern of George Woods, the former World Bank president. He saw that rich governments were becoming increasingly disenchanted with development aid, that political support could be found only for funds that subsidized the exports of the wealthy or gained them a substantial measure of political influence over the poor. Woods called for a "grand assize" on the question and charged Lester Pearson, the Nobel laureate and former Canadian Prime Minister, with the task.

Pearson chose fellow commissioners whose reputations for sobriety and calculated vision matched his own. Among them were Roberto Campos, the brilliant Brazilian economist who had labored heroically to impose a measure of respectability on the inflation-ridden economy run by his country's military dictators; Robert Marjolin, the cool Parisian economist and administrator, who had vainly attempted to bring the same degree of coherence to the plans of the six nations in the Common Market that he had achieved among the European recipients of Marshall Plan aid; and C. Douglas Dillon, a rare American finance minister because he had a feel for policy beyond an accountant's ledger and the bond market.

Their professional staff was of the same impeccable caliber, and the Commission produced 399 pages of unlovely committee prose, the hallmark of any serious international document. Reading through this high-minded effort, however, I was increasingly struck by nagging doubts and contradictions, some in my own mind and some that were evidently in the minds of the commissioners.

On page 78, for example, the report declares that "the interests of both rich and poor require that developing countries advance at the most rapid feasible rate, but, in fact, many of them face the prospect of cutting back on their planned rates of growth because they must now assume significant reductions in aid." This, of course, is the Commission theme writ large, that there is a direct relation between the volume of aid and the pace of development. But back in the appendix on page 235 the Commission observes: "Oversimplifications led both industrial and low-income countries to over-emphasize aid flows and per capita GNP growth, a habit which is only slowly giving way to the realization that the impact of aid flows on GNP depends largely on the efficiency with which the recipient uses domestic resources and on the over-all economic

and social policies which he pursues." Or, more plainly, there is no simple link between aid and growth. This notion, of course, puts in question the recommendations for a big increase in aid and was properly buried in the appendix. To be sure, the main body of the report does note that "the correlation between the amounts of aid received in the past decades and the growth performance is very weak." But this is explained away on the grounds that slow growers got the wrong kind of aid and fast growers received lots of private capital.

The Commission was understandably anxious to overcome the belief that aid is money down a rathole, that the larger poor countries in particular are making a botch of things. Thus, it asserts that "the growth record has been good" and calculates that the rate of output between 1960 and 1967 was around 5 percent, precisely the target set by the United Nations for the sixties, the so-called "Development Decade."

I was at once reminded of another ponderous report that had turned up in Delhi, one prepared by the secretariat of UNCTAD, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. This organ, created by the poor to air their grievances against the rich, shares many of the Pearson Commission goals, but its clientele requires a different tactic. In season and out, UNCTAD is obliged to emphasize how badly the poor are faring (due, of course, to the selfishness of the rich). Thus, its report began: "Growth achievements by the developing countries in the early years of the Development Decade have been disappointing, and the likelihood is very slight that the minimum 5 percent growth target . . . will be reached." For that 1960-1967 period, UNCTAD computes the growth of the poor at about 4.6 percent.

#### GETTING BY ON FAITH

The answer, of course, is that neither and both, UNCTAD and Pearson, are right and wrong. The computation of a single growth figure for widely different economies is a game that can be played to yield almost any result the players want. For one thing, the underlying statistics that compose gross product in poor nations are not worth very much. A block development officer in a remote district of Uttar Pradesh is not likely to make a close count of the millet crop in his region; he will probably send in a report that best satisfies the peculiar needs of his immediate superiors. For another, economists who translate the domestic market value of a given nation's output at the official exchange rate for dollars—which appears to be what the Pearson Commission has done—engage in a large measure of poetic license. (Officially, the rupee is 13.3 cents, yielding an income per person of about \$60 at the official rate. If Indians or anyone else tried to live on the purchasing-power equivalent of little more than one American dollar a week, they would all be dead. Obviously, the rupee goes further than its 13.3 cent official rate suggests.)

Apart from these difficulties, there is the fearsome problem of weighting. In calculating a comprehensive growth rate for a group of nations—the poor in this case—what portion of the whole should be attributed to each country? Should its weight reflect its population, its output, or what? Indeed, the "disappointing" figure UNCTAD announced at its New Delhi meeting improved in the next two years. This does not mean that growth among the poor suddenly took off but that the UNCTAD aggregate heavily weights India's performance. The fact is that after two years of drought, India enjoyed two years of rains.

As a sometime India Hand, I was particularly interested in how the Commission would square the circle for the World Bank's biggest client. How would it attempt to reassure the fainthearted and still make the

case for heavier doses of aid to Delhi? The report, of course, hailed what is now called the "Green Revolution," the introduction in Asia of high-yielding wheat and rice seeds. The document triumphantly observed that India's food output in the year ending June 30 was 97 million tons, 8 million more than the record four years earlier. It carefully did not note that this amounts to an annual gain of about 2 percent, or substantially less than the yearly increase in mouths to feed.

It is true that in a few districts, notably in the Punjab and Tamilnad, some farmers have achieved some remarkable yields and rupee millionaires are being created. But again, one has to turn to the appendix and page 290 to discover that "the new technology affects only a small percentage of the rural population, those with adequate holdings and access to water." Less diplomatic observers might have said that the Green Revolution is largely a matter for celebration among the happy few with the political clout or cash to bribe officials controlling the new seeds and all-important chemical fertilizer.

The Pearson document also praises India's economic planning. However, the report does not mention the fact that India has been operating without a plan for three years because the Planning Commission was faced with the Hobson's choice of proclaiming targets that were wildly unrealistic or painfully depressing. In fact, the Plan, like so many other paper schemes, bears only a marginal relationship to the way farmers, businessmen, and even the government conduct their affairs. At best, it is a guide to budget-makers in the Finance Ministry, and it is not clear how much attention they pay to it.

Perhaps the most triumphant note in the Pearson report is its announcement about birth control. "The development of intrauterine contraceptive devices (IUD's) and of oral pills has amounted to a major breakthrough in family planning techniques." This statement is separated from the report's special discussion of India and for good reason. An effort of sorts was mounted to distribute IUD's in India; for a variety of reasons, the rate of rejections has probably been as high as the insertions. Indian women just won't have them. As for the pill, apart from its expense, it requires a degree of numerical sophistication that is still beyond most villagers—and it is in villages that the bulk of India's population lives. Family planning authorities in Delhi, with a very imperfect grasp of what happens to their schemes in the field, are now quietly waiting for a miracle injection to solve their problem. The explosive birthrate remains virtually unchanged.

Most telling of all is the discussion (in the appendix) of the negative consequences of food aid. The gifts and near-gifts, donated partly for humanitarian reasons and partly to work down American surpluses, became what the Pearson report accurately describes as a "crutch." Thanks to this grain, the Indian government was able to postpone politically difficult policies to spur domestic farm output. It is too bad that this discussion is buried in the section after the report. For it raises a question that should trouble all right-minded persons. If food aid tended to impede domestic agricultural development, what of aid in general? Is there something in the argument usually ascribed to the illiberal and narrow-minded? Or, in the jargon of the bureaucrats, is aid counter-productive?

#### HERESY

All of which brings us back to my Indian official at the Food and Agriculture Ministry and his paradoxical delight in the aid cut. The Pearson report notwithstanding, he and some other heretics suspect that aid

has spared the Indian government from making the harsh decision that would do most to further economic development. For example, many development theorists agree that investment—the plowing of resources into the means of production for future income—is the single most important ingredient for growth. Investment requires savings; someone with money income must refrain from spending it on consumption so that resources can be employed to produce investment goods.

This seems like a fearful burden to impose on impoverished nations. But there is a substantial source of income in India that goes untapped: the incomes of the new rupee millionaires and other successful farmers. Because farmers are politically powerful, the Indian government places no income tax on their earnings. Thus, India is unique among poor countries, for in India, industry subsidizes agriculture rather than vice versa. Without foreign aid, this odd state of affairs might not last.

Again, India has embraced a peculiar system of food zones. Under this arrangement, one or several of its seventeen states together prohibit the sale of food grains outside their borders. States that lack food must buy what they need from the central government. Delhi, in turn, tried to build up a stock by purchases from states with a surplus. In fact, the central government picked up very little and fed the deficit states largely with grains brought in through aid. In other words, under political pressure from the states, it created separate, balkanized markets with all the inefficiencies that this implies. Without food aid, the pressure to reverse this course might have been irresistible.

Again, the Congress Party in New Delhi and the state political parties attempt to woo vocal and articulate city voters by keeping down the price of food. Thus, the national government is reluctant to raise farm price supports to a level that would encourage more output. A price-support program that spurred farm output might, in time, turn India into a food exporter, actually earning the foreign exchange with which to buy machines and parts needed for industrial development. But aid provides foreign exchange and removes some of the pressure for a higher and more productive support policy.

The examples could be multiplied, but the point remains the same. Aid is not necessarily an engine of development, at least in India. The biggest obstacle to growth is probably what Gunnar Myrdal has called the "soft state," a concept to which the Pearson report pays only glancing attention. Development in India is frustrated by a government unwilling to make hard choices or impose its will. At the crudest level, it is a Hindu police force looking the other way in Gujarat while Muslim shops and people are set upon by mobs. It is the great paper plans for birth control at New Delhi and the lack of disciplined cadres in the villages. It is the ability of the powerful and politically connected to grab off the credit, fertilizer, and seed required for a real leap in farm output.

To be sure, I have based this critique exclusively on India, the poor country I know best. But India contains more than a fifth of the population of what is optimistically called the developing world, and as the Pearson report says, "India is a major test of whether development can be significantly accelerated through external assistance."

The authors of the Pearson report are decent and able beyond question. They did note in passing that the effectiveness of aid depends in large measure on how well it is used. But this ritual bow does not interfere with their clarion call for more aid. My tour in India, however, has left me wobbling in the ranks of the right-thinking and pro-

foundly impressed with Myrdal's notion of the "soft state." I suggest that it is no longer clear that a massive increase in aid, without a concomitant hardening of soft states, will yield any great consequences for the economic development of the poor. Indeed, the one might very well frustrate the other.

### MUTUAL FUND REFORM BILL

## HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we have had before our committee a so-called mutual fund reform bill for several months. Because of the testimony and hearings, I believe the SEC is now reevaluating their position and making additional studies. I am happy to see that additional studies are being made because I have absolutely no intention of supporting measures which are antismall business, antisalesmen, or antishareholders, and precisely this is what the so-called mutual fund reform bill is.

Congress has for years adopted programs to encourage small business and at a time of inflation I cannot support any measure which will adversely affect the profitability of small business, injure its competitive business or reduce the income of the salesmen who are out on the firing line trying to earn a living. There are 4,000 securities dealers in our country which employ 152,000 salesmen who serve the interests of over 5 million mutual fund shareholders. The success of mutual funds depends on top-grade management and adequately paid salesmen. Mutual fund shareholders are entitled to determine for themselves how much they want to pay for the services which mean success or failure for their investment.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps an article which appeared in Barron's January 26, 1970, issue, most nearly states the case against this so-called reform bill as I see it. I am inserting the full text of the article at this point into the RECORD:

#### UNCONVINCING CASE: MUTUAL FUND "REFORMS" WOULD DO MORE HARM THAN GOOD (By Henry G. Manne)

One of the many myths that grew up around the 1929 debate was that the development of irresponsible investment trusts and mutual funds in the Twenties had contributed to the crash and indirectly to the Depression. Another hazy idea was that funds further separated the ownership interests of investors from the control of their corporate assets... an idea popularized by Adolf Berle and Gardiner Means in "The Modern Corporation and Private Property." Consequently, when the Securities Exchange Act was adopted in 1934, the SEC was given the task of designing additional legislation to cope with the special problem of investment companies.

The unhurried result was the Investment Company Act of 1940, undoubtedly the most detailed piece of regulatory legislation ever adopted. But, as is so often the case with such law, the Act largely mandated the forms and practices already employed by the well-established firms in the industry. Thus, in 1940 the unspectacular and slightly mori-

bund mutual funds managed withal. The problems began as change and competition arose. Then the tailor-made legislation no longer fit, and compensating adjustments had to be developed by the industry.

#### VAST NEW PUBLIC

Major innovations in the mutual fund industry began in the marketing end of things about 15 to 20 years ago. In spite of regulatory inhibitions, a vast new public was made conscious of this form of investment in corporate securities, and a wide range of financing arrangements was made available to them. Naturally these information-spreading services had to be paid for. But because they had to be performed within the constraints established by the 1940 Act (and, incidentally, by the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934), it appeared to the SEC that the industry was charging too much for its services, gouging the public and growing rich at the expense of innocents.

What was happening in fact was that entrepreneurial vigor was reshaping the industry and many new fortunes were, quite properly, being made. This process should always continue until the last bit of innovation and new entry have occurred and the industry has become stable or stagnant. The latter conditions, however, are usually found only with the extremely mature industries... or well-regulated ones.

The SEC's misreading of the success of mutual funds set the stage for the campaign launched several years ago to slow down this development. Ironically the Commission claimed that new legislation was necessary because the industry had grown so large that it had the market power to affect stock prices in some undesirable fashion. Just why a fund would do anything undesirable with its power has never really been explained, nor has the argument that the aggregate size of the industry makes any difference at all.

But what the SEC really feared was a market crash, not market power. Severe declines in stock prices demonstrate the SEC's helplessness to control the economic forces which give major directions to the stock market. And scare talk about mutual funds controlling the market keeps that scapegoat alive in the case it is ever needed. Current SEC proposals for mutual fund legislation owe far less to any economic theory than to normal bureaucratic fears of change in a regulated industry.

#### END TO INSTALLMENT BUYING?

Perhaps the most urgent current demand by the SEC is for the total abolition of front-end load plans, even though the scheme is fundamentally identical to that long used, and never condemned, in life insurance. The agency's criticism is that some purchasers of these plans lose too much money paid in as fees when a discontinuance occurs for any reason. But the SEC seems to lack the analytical apparatus for sorting out the relevant market aspects of the phenomenon in question. For example, front-end plans allow monthly installment payments of as little as \$25, whereas the minimum for other kinds of funds is generally \$500 or \$1,000. Thus the less affluent members of society, for whom contractual plans are often the only feasible approach to stock investments, no longer would enjoy that choice if the SEC has its way. How can the latter be so sure that it is preventing more harm than it is causing?

Management fees, both the flat percentage variety and performance arrangements, also have come under attack. The SEC seeks to arrogate to itself, perhaps using courts and civil suits as a screen, the right to regulate management fees. The Commission has taken the dubious economic position that, since it "costs" no more to make an investment decision for a billion-dollar fund than for a \$10-million one, there is no basis for the end fee

being 100 times more in one case than the other. But in competitive markets, costs do not determine prices in the short run. Supply and demand make prices as much for mutual fund services as for hay.

#### WILLINGNESS TO PAY

If the public continues to choose, and entrepreneurs to offer, large funds with the same percentage service fee as for smaller ones, there must be a reason, whether the SEC understands it or not. Perhaps the higher effective compensation per investment decision reflects the public's willingness to pay for demonstrated success, since size in mutual funds is at least some indication of management's ability to win and hold customers. Information and confidence cannot be had gratis, and any effort to interfere with free pricing of these items can only harm those firms which are most responsive to investor needs.

But the hazards of managing large sums are greater than for small sums, and the SEC, which has so strenuously encouraged the use of civil liability as an appropriate policing device, should realize this. Furthermore, the device of percentage pricing is very familiar in other areas, like brokerage commission for stocks or real estate, legal fees and corporate management compensation. The kind of barriers to competition which support the usual arguments for rate regulation do not exist in the mutual fund industry. And surely no relevant data have been offered to support the belief that rate regulation here would be in the public's interest.

Performance fees (management fees based usually on doing better than some market index) were a principal concern of SEC Chairman Budge in his recent testimony to the House Commerce subcommittee holding hearings on the Senate-passed Mutual Fund Bill. He termed such arrangements a "one-way street," with no loss to managers, if the fund fails to outperform the index. But his concern would seem misdirected: the crucial factor remains the degree of competition in the industry. Performance fees have survived the stiff competition from other forms of management compensation, thus showing some consumer preference for this arrangement. To justify a change, the Commission should have something more than an impression that fees are too high. Incidentally, recently approved mutual fund registrations suggest that the SEC has already begun requiring the possibility of a lessened fee if performance is poor, though no announcement has been made of a new rule to that effect.

#### DEALS WITH POLITICS

But the most interesting part of Chairman Budge's recent testimony did not concern the economics of the industry. Rather it seemed to deal with politics, of all things. The Chairman spoke with some feeling about an "agreement" which the Commission had negotiated with the Investment Company Institute and of ICI's repudiation of the pact on the eve of his House appearance. Furious that the agency's "agreement" with the industry had "come apart" somewhere between Senate and House; "dismayed" that industry acceptance had changed; and obviously frustrated by an unexpected challenge to the Commission's political power, the Chairman's tone bespoke revenge as he urged the House to adopt the Senate-passed bill without modification.

If the mutual fund industry were monolithic, perhaps the agreement would have held. It is much easier for an agency to deal with a few firms than with many, even if the public's interest is better served by greater competition. One of the anti-social results of government regulation is the tendency for all the firms in a regulated industry to look and behave exactly alike. But the mutual fund industry is not like that at

present. There are many and varied interests which are intruded upon by the bill, and they are not all affected by it identically. Conflicts exist, of course, in any industry, but once the industry becomes politicized by regulation, the battleground becomes the halls of Congress or the Commission rather than the open market. Chairman Budge's pique tells us more about the nature of federal regulation than it does about what is best for the mutual fund business or the public.

Nonetheless, it is disquieting to be told by an SEC chairman that the Commission engages in the questionable practice of negotiating agreements with an industry it regulates. To the uninitiated, it should be made clear that this is not consultation, research or polite conferring. It is negotiation on the contents of a statute to be adopted by Congress for the presumed general welfare of us all. What was that about conflicts of interest?

#### DIVERGENT INTERESTS

No one should be too surprised at what happened to the SEC-ICI agreement. Divergent industry interests were making themselves felt politically. A new and more moderate mutual fund bill had been introduced by Congressman Stuckey (D., Ga.). The ICI could not have represented every industry interest in its negotiations with the SEC. A new association, the Independent Broker Dealers' Trade Association, representing broker-dealers without membership on the Big Board, had become active, and they were unhappy with ICI's agreement. IBDTA had recently completed a survey of its members on the subject of mutual fund legislation, the results of which strongly supported the view that current SEC practices and proposals benefitted established member firms and harmed the small independents.

For instance, 89% of those responding to the IBDTA survey thought that the SEC was anti-small business, while 69% felt they weren't "part of the industry" or well posted on new regulations and legislation. Comments were common that costs engendered by regulation were growing too large for small firms to bear, and that the SEC seemed to prefer controlling a few large firms without numerous small competitors.

Comments by IBDTA members told how many small businessmen had been servicing a market with financial counseling and a personal touch missing from both their competitors' efforts and the SEC's conception of the industry. Their remarks showed nicely how the free market assures that even highly specialized public demands and needs are met when businessmen can make a higher return in that activity than through an alternative use of their time.

#### GREATEST OUTCRY

By far the greatest outcry from the independents, however, related to the demise of give-ups and the attempt to set sales commission maximums at 5%. It is hard to understand why the SEC wants to hurt those people who will only be dealt with at commissions over 5%, but that is the necessary effect of such a limitation. It makes about as much sense as rent controls during a housing shortage or usury laws during a period of tight money. The least attractive risks will simply not be dealt with at all. And, as one dealer asked, "if the commissions are so much of a mountain of objection, why haven't the no-load funds already consumed all of our customers? How much financial advice have you ever received from your postman?"

The give-up matter is a bit more complicated than the sales commission, but it is worth understanding. As former SEC Chairman Manuel Cohen has stated: "Almost every regulatory problem we have concerning the securities markets is related in some way to the level or structure of rates prescribed by the minimum commission rules of the New

York Stock Exchange." And while this might have been somewhat exaggerated, it is not too wide of the mark in connection with mutual fund legislation. The ironic, suspicious and disheartening thing is that none of the Commission's current recommendations will lessen the anti-competitive effects of the Big Board's pricing system; indeed, the SEC condones the NLSE's most recent effort to prevent competitive pricing in the form of give-ups.

Surely by now everyone has heard that give-ups were a manifestation of something the New York Stock Exchange eschews, price competition for brokerage services. In effect, mutual funds, as very big customers, were benefiting from a kind of free-market price discrimination. Since SEC-approved exchange rules already outlawed a simple lowering of price by brokers to get this business, a new way was found for exchange members to offer more competitive prices. Firms executing stock orders for the funds were required to give up part of their commissions to independent (or other) firms who, by dint of sales effort, actually sold mutual fund shares. Thus the give-up connoted (1) lower commission rates for the service provided to funds by exchange member firms; (2) compensation to a sales force which was independent rather than actually employed by the mutual fund.

In a completely free market, with no regulatory need for subterfuge, the mutual funds would (a) have joined the exchange; (b) transacted their own trades; (c) bargained with member brokers for lower commissions. And they might have paid directly for efforts to sell their shares.

#### CONSUMER CHOICES

The consumer, whose techniques for protecting himself against fools and scoundrels in the business world are immeasurably better than his techniques for coping with the government, would also have had choices. He could buy mutual fund shares with no commission if he knew about no-load funds and did not want the various benefits made available by fund salesmen. Or he could pay to have his financial hand held (which, SEC please note, "costs" the hand holder the amount of money he could make in some alternative opportunity) and be reassured on the telephone daily that the world was not coming to an end with the Dow below 800. Or he could pay for his shares under a variety of schemes, some of which seem almost incomprehensible to the unimaginative administrators. In the end, the honest, energetic and useful providers of services would have profited handsomely. The dishonest, lethargic and unproductive (unless employed, subsidized or protected by the government) would have fallen by the wayside.

The lesson, alas, is hard for everyone to learn, the independent broker-dealers, for instance, recognize the social harm in certain forms of regulation and the utility of other forms. Yet they too demand that Congress forbid banks to sell mutual fund shares. Their own position demonstrates the silliness of such restrictions. How long do they conceive that they can be insulated from this or other equally pressing competition? If there is economic room for banks to enter the business, there is room for someone else as well, and if profits are to be had, someone will claim them.

Businessmen should see by now that a "system" of regulated markets is not in their interest, even though a particular bit of legislation may appear to be. So long as businessmen accept nonsense notions like "mixed economies" and "regulation in the public interest," there is little chance to stay the inexorable pressures for more arbitrary economic regulation, with now one interest and then another in the saddle. It is not business that needs the "dead hand of regulation" lifted from it; it's the public.

MIAMI, FLA., VETERANS' HOSPITAL LACKS STAFF FOR PROPER PATIENT CARE

## HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1970, I inserted in the RECORD a recent article from the Washington Post about the medical care budget squeeze which is being experienced by the Veterans' Administration. This article briefly mentioned a resident physician at the Miami VA hospital, Dr. Douglas J. Stewart, who has been pleading for more staffing at the 688-bed Miami hospital.

Dr. Stewart appeared before a Senate subcommittee yesterday and enlarged upon his earlier statements. I believe Dr. Stewart's testimony will be of great interest to House Members who are receiving complaints regarding VA hospitals in their areas. The full text of his testimony follows:

#### TESTIMONY OF DR. DOUGLAS J. STEWART

Senator Alan Cranston of California has asked me to appear before this Senate subcommittee hearing to discuss the problems that exist at the Miami Veterans Administration Hospital.

Presently, VA Hospitals are not merely inferior to their "University counterpart", but to most good community hospitals. Personnel policy and funding preclude a staff-patient ratio of greater than 1.5 to 1.7 in a VA Hospital. There is not a community hospital in our area where staff-patient ratio is less than 2.5. At this time a failure to meet patient care commitments can be documented for the Miami VA and traced directly to personnel ceiling and inadequate funding.

I have surveyed the recent intra-hospital Resource Requirements Reports from the various departments, the Hospital Director's report to Congressman Olin E. Teague (Chairman of the Committee on Veterans Affairs), and spoken with the Chiefs of the Nursing Service, Surgical Service and Medical Service. With the information obtained from these sources, along with my own personal experiences, I will show the gross deficiencies that exist in the delivery of adequate health care at the Miami Veterans Administration Hospital.

The Radiology Service has a critical shortage of clerical personnel. This lack of clerical personnel has resulted in many X-rays being lost or misplaced, causing considerable delays in diagnosis by physicians, the rescheduling of X-rays and reexamination of seriously ill patients.

The Ward Administration Department, responsible for transcribing physicians' orders for treatments, X-rays, and laboratory procedures and maintaining accurate, up-to-date charts of patients, suffers from an appalling lack of personnel. This frequently causes delays of 12-24 hours or more before a physician's orders for an important laboratory procedure or X-ray is removed from a chart and subsequent delays in the filing of returned reports. The institution of appropriate diagnosis and therapy of seriously ill patients is often hampered by these delays. The Ward Administration Service, with a present total of 47 secretaries, would require an additional 25 to supply adequate coverage, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

The Miami VA Hospital presents daily a need for the performance of some 700 inhalation therapy treatments or services for 65-70

patients, which to perform would require the services of 26 technicians. At present, there are but 3 Inhalation Therapists to perform these duties. They are unable to do the job, or even a modest fraction of the job. Breathing circuits must be replaced at intervals of 8-12 hours with sterile equipment or patients may become infected and develop purulent tracheobronchitis and pneumonia. Automatic lung ventilators, upon whose performance the lives of patients depend, must be inspected at hourly intervals and readjusted to the patients' ever-changing requirements. Omissions of this surveillance may result in failure of the system to ventilate or cause overdistension of the patients' lungs.

The Inhalation Therapy Service estimates that they are able to perform only 1/4 of the ordered intermittent positive pressure treatments required to prevent pneumonia or partial lung collapse and 1/2 of the needed inspection of the automatic lung ventilators and artificial respirators. The remainder of these services are being performed by nursing personnel, who are usually not trained to perform these techniques, or they are not performed at all.

The Laboratory Service, a large, modern, and well-equipped facility, is theoretically able to perform all the requested examinations and analyses without delay. However, during the night shift there is only one lab technician on duty. This has resulted in considerable, dangerous delays in the performance of many emergency procedures, with further delays in initiation of needed therapy by physicians. The Laboratory Service estimates that an additional 50 technologists would be needed to bring the laboratory to optimum level.

The Surgical Service, in its recent annual narrative report, states that the nursing shortage as related to Surgery is quite dangerous:

"The number of operations performed by the Surgical Service has increased by a spectacular 25%. This particular increase in activity has resulted in a clear demonstration of several deep-seated problems. The most important of these is the lack of nursing personnel. There is insufficient personnel both in the Operating Room Suite and on the wards. In fact, the increase in the numbers of the surgical procedures has bent the operating room morale to dangerous levels. Nurses and scrub technicians have worked overtime to support the increase in both regularly scheduled and emergency cases. In the Intensive Care Unit there are insufficient nurses to cover even vacation schedules. It must be appreciated that this condition is a dangerous one with respect to patient care."

The Chief of the Nursing Service has listed some of the important functions that *cannot* be performed due to a shortage of nurses:

1. Inability to staff the Operating Room with sufficient staff 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.
2. Inability to provide adequate personal hygiene to patients.
3. Acutely ill patients on ward units requiring a "Special Duty Nurse" are cared for by the limited number of ward personnel.
4. Inability to answer patient call light in a reasonable period of time.
5. Inability to make adequate observation of patient relative to his symptoms, reaction to treatment.
6. Inability to do vital signs, IPPB treatments, blood pressures, pulse, respiration, etc., as frequently as ordered by the physicians and as required by the patients' condition.

The lack of sufficient support personnel presents many sources of frustration to the ward physician, who is the person who bears the final patient responsibility. There have been multiple occasions that I have been faced with situations in which I was unable

to offer appropriate, effective care for my patients. I have often stood at a patient's bedside, watching him vomit large amounts of blood and attempting to keep him alive while waiting for transfusable blood unnecessarily delayed in processing due to a lack of clerical help, transporters and laboratory personnel. I have waited as long as 3 hours for blood that in an adequately staffed hospital is made available in 30 minutes. I have written orders for my patients' therapy, not to have them transcribed from the charts for 12-24 hours or more. Once transcribed, many of the orders had not been carried out, treatments performed, or vital data recorded.

I have been called to see critically ill patients whose blood pressure and pulse have not been taken at the ordered intervals and found them to have suffered a dramatic change in their condition. I know that frequently complications could have been averted had I been notified of the changes earlier. I have had many patients with heart attacks situated in rooms with the latest, modern devices for monitoring heart beat, rhythm and rate, but have seen this possibly life-saving equipment left unused due to lack of personnel.

There is often only one nurse responsible for 40 acutely ill patients if an emergency situation develops, the other 39 patients may go unseen for an hour or more. To have two emergency situations develop on a ward at the same time, a not infrequent occurrence, can only be described as utter, tragic chaos.

I and the other ward physicians at the Miami Veterans Administration Hospital *cannot* in good conscience continue to practice this quality of medicine and offer this level of compromised medical care.

#### THE CABINET EDITORS

### HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the Vice President's recent harsh words regarding the apparent lack of impartiality and fairness by this Nation's news media still echo and there is little doubt that his implied threats have had a profound effect on the ability and the willingness of news commentators and observers to freely discuss their views.

Apparently, Mr. Speaker, the Vice President's desire to act as an "editor" of the news media has proved to be catching. A recent news item in Newsweek magazine—the Periscope, January 26, 1970—revealed that Secretary Finch of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has also taken on some editorial duties. The article follows:

H.E.W. Secretary Robert Finch last week quietly ordered Senator Edmund Muskie's name removed from all H.E.W. pamphlets and the former Vice Presidential candidate's picture sliced out of thousands of feet of H.E.W. film. The first result of the order was the recall of a Tuberculosis and Respiratory Disease Council pamphlet with the Maine Senator's picture on the cover. Finch's order appears to be a step in an Administration drive to undercut Muskie's stature as an environmentalist and thereby blunt a possible Muskie Presidential drive in 1972.

Mr. Speaker, I think this action by Secretary Finch is quite consistent with the views on impartial press coverage expressed by the Vice President in his crit-

icism of the Nation's press, radio, and television news services, if not to the ideals expressed by this Nation's Founding Fathers.

One further comment, Mr. Speaker, if the administration is planning to remove names and pictures of "environmentalists" from Federal publications because of political affiliations—I foresee many of these publications having great gaps—as there are few "environmentalists" sharing the same political philosophy as the administration.

#### CAN A BLACK MAN FLY?

### HON. EDWARD W. BROOKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, much has been said in recent times about the lack of job opportunities for black men in America.

One area where discrimination has been most evident is in the training and hiring of aircraft pilots.

A foundation has recently been established in my own State of Massachusetts to provide funds for the training of young Negroes as pilots and instructors. This foundation seeks to overcome some of the problems described by a group of four Negro pilots in a recent article entitled "Can a Black Man Fly?" published in Flying magazine. I commend the efforts of this organization, founded by F. Lee Bailey and S. Douglas Bailey, and ask unanimous consent that the informative and direct account of these four pilots be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

#### CAN A BLACK MAN FLY?

(By Keith Connes)

Anyone can fly, say the ads. "The only requirements are that you be in reasonably good health and possess the simple coordination necessary to drive a car." The ads do not go on to say that it is extremely helpful to be white.

How often do you see a Negro climbing out of the left seat of an airplane?

Okay, so what? If you are not a Negro, what does that mean to you?

Several things.

We'll skip the sermon on human decency. You've heard it expressed eloquently enough, and you've either gotten the message or you haven't.

From a strictly practical point of view, when you exclude a group of people from a field of endeavor, you lose out on the contributions the members of that group would be making.

In this case, contributions as pilots. Instructors. Fixed base operators. Customers. Supporters of aviation.

So let's say we have a vested interest in seeing how the black pilot is making it.

The history of the Negro in aviation, as everywhere else, is filled with chapters of rejection, frustration and the need for doing more than a man should have to do to prove himself. But that's history. The real question is, what's happening now?

To get a realistic answer, I brought four

men together in the FLYING conference room: David E. Harris, captain, American Airlines; S. David Bailey, director of training for International Aviation Industries, Inc., at New York's Westchester County Airport; Pat Connell, CBS announcer and airplane owner; and Edward A. Gibbs, former fixed base operator at Wilmington, North Carolina.

These men represent different segments of aviation, but they have one thing in common. They are all black men.

Let's start with Ed Gibbs.

Ed, you've been in aviation more than 25 years, and you've gone the whole route. You have even been one of the relatively few Negro fixed base operators. How did you get into aviation?

GBBS. I got my first real break when the Civilian Pilot training came into being. I was attending college at Hampton Institute in 1940. I got my private license at Newport News and at that time I felt as if I were Lindbergh. Then a year later, I went through an aerobic course, again through CPT.

Were you planning on a career in aviation?

GBBS. Actually, I was studying to be an accountant. I changed my mind when I found that after a couple of years I could look forward to making \$200 a month—provided I worked for a Negro college or Negro newspaper. So this drove me to my other interest, which was aviation. I was lucky in that I was able to get into another CPT group taking an instructor's course at Haarlem Airport in Oaklawn, Ill.

Haarlem Airport?

GBBS. Yes, the operator was Fred Schumacker, a Dutchman. Don't forget, Haarlem was originally a Dutch name. So I went out there and looked around, and noticed right off that there were no other fellows with my hue or anything close to it, and I said to myself, "Oh boy, I'm out." Well, the chief pilot took me up and wrung me out, and when we got down, he went into Schumacker's office and they argued back and forth for quite a while, and the walls were bulging. Then, much to my surprise, Schumacker pointed at me and I was in. So I got my flight instructor's and ground instructor's ratings.

CONNELL. Were you the first black man to get an instructor's rating?

GBBS. No; in fact there was a fellow at that same field who'd been there about 30 years running a school of aeronautics. Name was Cornelius Coffey.

But let me go back a bit. When I took my flight instructor's test, I went up with this examiner, and I was pretty sharp that day. I gave him a damn good test and in about 45 minutes I was down. Then he began questioning me. "Why do you want to fly?" he asked me. I told him I enjoyed it and thought I'd like to pursue it as a livelihood. Then he asked, "Where do you think you're going to get a job?" At that point, my good old West Indian blood came up in me, and I told him I didn't think it was his concern where I was going to get a job; the only question was whether I showed proficiency on the flight test or not. Needless to say, I busted the ride.

Schumacker was furious and complained to the CAA, and a few weeks later they sent another inspector to give me another ride. We went up and came down and the fellow said "What was the matter with your last ride?" I played it cool and said, "I don't know, sir," and he shook his head a little and signed my ticket. I started instructing for Schumacker that very day.

Did you have any trouble?

GBBS. Not with the students. But Schumacker had this contract with the government for the war training service program, and one day this official came to look me over and he saw me teaching white girls. He didn't like that, and he began putting pressure on Schumacker. He finally got me

out of there and I wound up at—where else?—Tuskegee. I stayed there for about three years until the program got cut back and I was released.

Where did you go from there?

GBBS. Well, I figured I'd had it with flying, so I left for the Bronx and went into a little business. But I couldn't stand it. Those four walls began closing in on me, and I became ill—physically ill. So one day I found myself at Zahns Airport on Long Island. I went up to one of the flying services there and told the man I'd like to rent his Cub for a while. He looked me over and said you need a license to fly, and I told him I'd heard about that. Well, I showed him my license and we went around the pattern once, and pretty soon I was instructing there. Business grew, and I began putting through his new flight instructors, one after the other. But when the time came to appoint a chief pilot, he brought in another guy.

Did you feel that this was because of your color?

GBBS. Well, let's say he thought the other fellow could bring more business in. Anyway, I didn't feel that I could stay there under these circumstances. Then I heard of this opening at Atlantic Flying Service in Wilmington, N.C. They were looking for a black instructor because their white students were petering out under the G.I. Bill, and they felt that there was an untapped market in the black population down there.

Well, I took that job, and then an interesting thing happened. The flying school was owned by two partners, and they were having problems with each other—allowing the wives to meddle in the business and so forth. I saw my opportunity, took one of the partners aside and offered to buy his share. He was delighted. He thought it would be a great way of getting out from under and crossing his partner up at the same time. It worked fine. When the partner learned what was going on, he offered to sell me his share too. So I wound up owning the business.

I ran it accident-free for three and a half years.

But you went out of business.

GBBS. Yes. Here's what happened: The World War II G.I. Bill allowed a veteran only partial subsistence for aviation training. You could take a course in barbering or sewing and get full subsistence, but not in aviation. This caused a hardship for the aviation schools, since the GIs would tend to go where they could get a full buck. So I decided that the key to it was to come up with a curriculum that the state board of education and the CAA would approve and get the VA to write a contract. So I submitted a plan, and it got bucked around, and I finally got approval from the state board and the CAA. Then I went to the VA for a contract, I'm still waiting. Even worse than that, when I applied to the VA for this contract, they realized for the first time that the complexion of the school had changed. Right after that, their voucher payments began getting slower and slower. I was getting squeezed out.

Were all the white people down on you?

GBBS. Hell, no! The Pennington Flying Service on the field offered to give my boys gas; the County Commission complained to the VA that they were discriminating against me because of my color; and when word got out about the kind of training we were offering, I got some white business too. But it wasn't enough to keep me going with all the pressure that was being exerted from the VA. It was a real shame, because I was getting letters from black boys all over the country who had this desire to fly.

Ed, this is astounding. You've told us of two instances in your career where the public was on your side—including white stu-

dents, white airport operators, white city council members. But the people who drove you out of business were the officials of the U.S. Government.

GBBS. That's right. And it drove me out of aviation. I was so bitter that if I was driving along the road and saw an airport sign, I'd take another road. I didn't want to hear about aviation from that point on.

Ed, did it ever occur to you to get back into aviation business up North?

GBBS. Keith, the discrimination is just as bad up North. Worse, because it's more subtle. Down South, at least, you know what you're in for.

Well now, Dave Bailey, you seem to be making it as International Aviation's chief pilot at Westchester County Airport in New York—any problems?

BAILEY. Plenty. I got my wings in the service—in Tuskegee. I wound up in the first Air Force integrated unit. It was an experimental group, and I taught the white boys to fly and flew some missions myself. I was separated from the service in May, 1946, after three and a half years. I was all for getting a job with the airlines—flying those DC-3s. But I got one door after another slammed in my face. Other black pilots were getting the same treatment. Including one chap I knew who got the highest score anybody had ever gotten on the psychomotor and psychological examinations. He couldn't get an airlines job either.

Did you apply to all the airlines?

BAILEY. I didn't even get to apply. I'd get as far as a receptionist, and as soon as she found out I wasn't looking for a porter's job, she'd tell me there wasn't anything available. I wasn't even allowed to fill out an application form. And this was in the North, not the South.

And you feel sure that you weren't allowed to apply because you were black?

HARRIS. I'd like to interrupt, if I may. Keith, we can't always pinpoint every instance of discrimination. But as black men, we have to live with it constantly. For example, I've had to find housing at airline bases all over this country. Many's the time I'd telephone about an apartment that was advertised, and they'd say, "Certainly Captain Harris; come right up." Then when I'd get there it would be "Sorry, someone just rented it." You don't need to be told it's because you're black.

GBBS. Another thing; it took quite a bit of pressure for us to get the Air Line Pilots Association to remove the restrictive clause barring Negroes and Jews from membership.

They excluded Jews too?

GBBS. Yes, but you can always change your name. It's not so easy to change your color.

Dave Bailey, let's get back to what happened to you when you couldn't get a job with the airlines. What did you do then?

BAILEY. Well, after about six months of trying, I was like Ed Gibbs about aviation—bitter. So I took a G.I. Bill course in mechanical engineering. But while working as a draftsman, I had an unpleasant experience and quit. Then I took up music and found that this was the one field where there was no immediate discrimination. Well, after about two years of professional playing, I found myself stopping by airports and watching the planes. Then, when I was playing the Newport Jazz Festival with Johnny Hodges, I wandered over to a little airport and took a plane up. At that point, I knew I had to get back into aviation again. So I went to Westchester County Airport and began taking instruction to get my ratings back.

What ratings do you now hold?

BAILEY. I now have all the ratings on up through ATR. And I attend the courses at Ohio State University every year. But I'm

getting ahead of myself. For a time, I was renting airplanes from International Aviation and during the rest of my free time I'd hang around operations. Finally one day the owner, Bill Nichols, a Southerner, by the way, approached me and offered me a job as an instructor as soon as I got my rating. Well, I got my rating and started right in with International the very first day. And this man Nichols, realizing that I was still continuing as a professional musician, had enough confidence in me to ask me to build up the flight school so it would run whether I was there or not. So I became director of the flight school. I set up a VA program, and that took six months. We are now approved by the state board of education, the FAA and the VA for every rating from private pilot to ATR.

Have you had any problems with your students because of your color—any particular resentment?

BAILEY. No.

Well, you seem to be making it pretty well in general aviation. And Capt. Dave Harris, you have made it with the airlines. How did you do it?

HARRIS. Well, partly because of the sweat and toll of these other gentlemen here. Because without them, we'd still be opening those doors. I came out of Ohio State in 1957. It's a land grant college; they have an ROTC program there. After my first two years, when it became time for advanced ROTC, I went knocking on the door. Well, I knocked three times. They kept trying to show me different reasons why I shouldn't go on with it, but I kept beating on the door, and they finally let me in. I got to the rank of Cadet Colonel, and I should have been Wing Commander of the outfit, but they gave me a few reasons why I should be satisfied with the group commandership.

When you say they gave you a few reasons, was it laid on the line?

HARRIS. No, it was subtle.

BAILEY. Northern style.

HARRIS. That's right, Northern style. I went to Bartow, Florida for my primary training. Only black officer in the class. Then to Big Spring, Texas. I had an interesting housing situation there. The only place available to me was a lean-to on a concrete block. Well, from there I went to SAC bases in Plattsburg, New York and Springfield, Massachusetts. My big problem continued to be getting decent housing. The North was just as bad as the South in this respect. I wanted to get out of SAC anyway. The duty was too rough for a family man.

Then the airlines started advertising in the *Air Force Times*. Two carriers listed their prerequisites, all of which I met. A white buddy and I wrote to both carriers on the same day. I closed my letters with the statement that I was married, had two children and was a Negro. One of the carriers, TWA, fired me back an application within a week. I never heard from the other carrier. My white buddy got applications back from both carriers. I choose to believe that my application did not get lost in the mail.

Why did you state that you were a Negro?

HARRIS. To save myself a trip. I didn't want to run all over the countryside for them to look at me as they looked at Marlon Green at Continental and say maybe we made a mistake. So I told them who I was, and what I was.

CONNELL. How was it in the service? You say you were the only Negro in your class. Did they bring you up tight, too? Did your instructors exert more pressure on you than they did on the white students?

HARRIS. No. I don't think so. But this was on my back all the time. I was constantly thinking: now am I going to have to perform better than my white counterparts? Anyway, I looked at a number of carriers. One of them gave me a little Mickey Mouse test—

the kind they give to all employees whether they are being hired to sweep the floor or whatever—and they told me I flunked that one. Well, I landed with American, and it's been a beautiful relationship. They may have been as bigoted as any airline in the past, but when they came around, they went all the way. It's not just tokenism. Just recently they were looking for 260 pilots, and a public relations man in N.Y. contacted me and said, "look, we're making every effort to find qualified black pilots. Pass the word around, and if you know anybody who fits the prerequisites, please get their names to us."

Did TWA offer you a job?

HARRIS. Yes, they did, but by that time I had joined American. I should mention that I made doubly sure that they knew who I was and what I was, because I'm a light-skinned Negro. So I told them I was black, and they said we don't care whether you're red, yellow or chartreuse. If you can fly the airplane and meet the prerequisites, we want you.

But how about ALPA?

HARRIS. We don't belong to it. We have a different union at American—Allied Pilots—and there isn't any discrimination there.

I've been told that American and TWA each have 10 black pilots as of now. Pan Am has eight and United has seven.

HARRIS. The problem now is finding black people who can meet all the prerequisites.

Have you had any problems with your fellow pilots? Any resentment, for example, from a first officer toward you as captain?

HARRIS. No, now I'm domiciled in Boston. I don't know how it would be if I were based in Dallas.

What about your passengers?

HARRIS. I haven't seen anybody get off the airplane yet. Now, I'm light-skinned, but there's a pilot named Jim Tillman who's black as the ace of spades, and he says the same thing. People buy a ticket to get from Point A to Point B, and they figure if you're up there, you know what you're doing.

Pat Connell, you're in aviation as a consumer, an aircraft owner. Have you been discriminated against in aviation?

CONNELL. If I hadn't been, I might be a professional pilot today instead of an announcer for CBS. I was crazy about flying ever since I was a kid, but I couldn't even get a job sweeping the planes for Western Airlines in Montana, where I lived. The other kids could get these jobs, but my brother and I couldn't. I've had the usual discrimination. Tried to fly in the service, but I was thwarted one way or another. Finally, in civilian life, I bought an old Ryan PT-22 that I learned to fly in; then I got a Waco UPF-7, and now I've got an AT-6. But I always wanted to be a professional pilot. And I'll bet I would have been a damn good one, too.

HARRIS. If you can get an AT-6 off the ground and on again, you're a pilot.

Ed Gibbs, you founded a group called Negro Airmen International. What's that all about?

GBBS. Well, this group was started in February, 1967, to help black people move forward in aviation, to create job opportunities, and encourage more Negroes to go into the field.

How many members do you have?

GBBS. Right now, 167. We have regional directors for all parts of the country, plus the Bahamas and Caribbean. Each region is expected to get its own projects under way.

What sort of projects?

GBBS. Well, for instance, many programs for the underprivileged are concerned with teaching people to mop floors and run elevators and do other menial jobs. But I'm talking to a college president about the possibility of helping 30 Negro high school students get their private tickets. And we do

things like take a bunch of kids on a tour through the NAFEC facility at Atlantic City, take them on rides, and so on. We often prevail upon Capt. Dave Harris here to talk to them. That really turns them on—when they can meet a black man who's made it as an airline captain. One more thing we're doing right now is sending a questionnaire to general aviation operators in New York State, asking them if they have Negro employees now, or if they would hire them, and in what capacities.

What do you think the results will be?

GBBS. It's hard to say. I'm hoping.

These four men, and others like them, are doing more than just hoping. They've gone ahead, in the face of bitter humiliations only a black man can know, to make a place for themselves in aviation. The ironies are shattering.

Consider: A black man runs a flying school in the South with the cooperation of the municipal government and even his white competitors. And he is driven out of business by an official of the U.S. Government.

Consider: When qualified black pilots who had seen service with the Air Force in World War II were trying to get aviation jobs, the doors were closed. Now that the doors are opening, these pilots are too old, at least for the airlines. American Airlines has 10 black pilots out of a complement of 3,100, and is trying to hire more. But most of today's service-trained black pilots are flying helicopters in Viet Nam.

Consider: From a business point of view, the Negro represents a substantial market. He spends over \$32 billion a year. Many industries are now soliciting him—as a consumer and as an employee in a responsible job.

But general aviation seems to be lagging behind.

Maybe it's time general aviation caught up.

#### EAGER PENSIONER'S PENALTY

### HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, 1969, I introduced H.R. 4873 to amend the Social Security Act to increase to \$3,000 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit a recent editorial from the Columbus Dispatch which I consider to be a most astute analysis of the present situation concerning outside earning limitations placed on social security recipients. This editorial points up the need for congressional action in this area.

The editorial follows:

#### EAGER PENSIONER'S PENALTY

Inconsistency in the federal government's thinking is obvious when, on the one hand, it says the average retired couple needs a minimum of \$3,400 a year for a modest living and, on the other hand, denies the Social Security beneficiary the chance to earn that minimum without penalty.

Average Social Security benefits are now about \$1,200 a year and under the system's "retirement test" a recipient can earn only up to \$1,680 as a part-time employe. After that, he is penalized through reduction of his pension.

Earning just \$60 a week will reduce the old age benefit by \$840 a year under the government's formula—\$1 and \$2 earned over

\$1,680 and a dollar-for-dollar reduction for earnings over \$2,880.

Once the pensioner reaches age 72, he is freed of this penalty. And if he had during his working years acquired rentals or securities which now yield income, he pays no penalty at all regardless of age.

The National Federation of Independent Business, a grouping of nearly 800,000 small businessmen, reports 76 per cent of its membership approves a congressional proposal raising the earnings ceiling to \$4,800.

The federation obviously has a self-interest. Its members need part-time help and senior citizens are likely prospects.

But there is a deeper significance in this problem. The percentage of our population in the age 65-plus category is growing steadily. A high percentage of these pensioners is capable, talented and eager. They can make a definite contribution to their community and to themselves even though forced into retirement.

To stifle this source of energy is shortsighted.

But to force an eager segment of our population into an economic straitjacket by an inconsistency in federal government evaluation seems wholly incongruous.

We would urge that Congress give priority to a study-in-depth of this problem.

#### UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1970, marked the 52d anniversary of Ukrainian independence, a day on which we pay tribute to the valiant Ukrainian people. It is appropriate that this country, founded on the principles of freedom and liberty for all, honor the courageous people of the Ukraine on the anniversary of the day the Ukrainian nation declared its independence.

Fifty-two years ago, on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian Rada declared the Ukraine to be an independent republic. Fifty-one years ago, on January 22, 1919, the union of both west and east Ukraine was proclaimed. For a brief period from 1918 to 1920, the Ukraine stood against a host of enemies including the Russian Bolsheviks, the Russian White armies, and the Germans. Unfortunately for the Ukrainians, their independence and freedom was short lived. In 1920, the country was attacked by the Red army, overrun, and the Ukrainian Republic vanished as quickly as it was born 2 years earlier. Subsequently, the country was incorporated into the Soviet Union, and to this day it remains a part of that union.

Over the ensuing years, the flame of national independence has continued to burn in the hearts and minds of free men everywhere in the never-ending search for national sovereignty. Each year those of us in the free world who have called attention to their oppression have helped to keep their hope for eventual freedom alive. It is up to us, as free Americans, to continue to support in whatever appropriate manner we may, the struggle of the people of the Ukraine to regain control of their own destinies so that they may live in peace and freedom in their homeland.

#### FIRE AND RADIATION HAZARDS IN COLOR TELEVISION SETS

### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I have been concerned for some time that our Federal regulatory system is no match for the industries which must be regulated to protect the citizen's interest in safety, health, and economy in the marketplace. Too often we find that Federal agencies designed to protect the consumer's interest, for example, are under the influence of the industries which, under their legitimate concerns for profits, may threaten or ignore those interests.

The color television receiver is a good example of a product which was presented to the public in the marketplace only to find, much later, that certain safety problems existed which should have been evaluated and eliminated before its public sale. X-radiation and fire hazards are the two principal identified problems with color television receivers.

Ralph Nader recently wrote to Senator MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, about congressional oversight of the Federal consumer protection mechanism. His letter expresses concerns which others have raised in recent months about both these hazards in color TV sets.

Congressman KOCH and I held several meetings last year, for example, with both industry representatives and with the Public Health Service on X-radiation. The Product Safety Commission is still studying the fire hazard of new and existing color TV sets. But, sadly, we find these protests necessary today because we failed to act promptly and wisely to anticipate these public health problems.

I am preparing legislation which will give the Public Health Service authority to prevent future problems of this kind before the products reach the marketplace.

Mr. Nader's letters and his report on X-radiation in color TV sets follow:

JANUARY 3, 1970.

Senator WARREN MAGNUSON,  
Chairman, Senate Commerce Committee,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: The Radiation Control Act of 1968, administered by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, is not working to protect millions of unsuspecting television viewers from unacceptable levels of radiation emissions. Despite the hearings conducted by your Committee in 1968 and the temporary attention given the radiating color TV set problem in that year, the forces of industry and bureaucracy have prevailed. The fact is that, with over 20 million color TV sets in operation in American homes, millions of people are being exposed to risk of physical, genetic and eye damage because millions of these sets exceed the present, weak standard of 0.5 MR/hr during all or significant part of their operation. All color TV sets give out some radiation, all of which can be avoided by present technology. The risk to children in later life of cataract damage, owing to their particular eye sensitivity to radiation and their practice of setting so close to the TV set,

deserves special concern. The harm from such radiation exposure may appear years or decades later—such is the nature of this kind of violence—which requires the immediate application of preventive rules.

Instead, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare proceeded to appoint an advisory committee, composed of none of the specialists whose criticism before Congressional hearings helped pass the bill in 1968. This committee then weakened the initial proposal for a color TV standard of 0.1 MR/hr in favor of a 0.5 MR/hr which was accepted by the Department. Moreover, as discussed in the attached report "Government Regulation of Radiation from Color Television" by Dr. Margot Onek, a Washington, D.C., physician, the standards provide no pressure or inducement for rapid application of new technology or existing shielding advances. Dr. Onek's report, prepared at my request, also documents the Department's failure to do anything about the color TV sets that emit excessive radiation and were produced before the regulations went into effect. As she points out, the basic weaknesses in the Radiation Control Act of 1968, facilitate the present weak posture of government protection.

It is clear that the government has chosen to assume the role of protecting the electronics industry's investment vis-a-vis the offending color tv sets now in American living rooms. Instead of requiring corrective action to be taken and repeated "to the customer" warning by the manufacturers, press releases are issued in a manner that not one of 100,000 viewers would get the message.

On September 5, 1969, the Federal Trade Commission issued a release which stated, "Both the Commission and the Public Health Service recommend that viewers (1) sit no closer than 6 to 10 feet from their sets and avoid exposure to the sides and rear of the set in operation and (2) have color tv sets serviced only by competent personnel." I am confident that you will agree that this is almost a mockery of the responsibility entrusted to government by various statutes—a mockery of communication and policy. Is this same procedure going to be repeated for microwave ovens which will probably become a major household appliance in the Seventies and which offer possibly greater hazards than color tv sets? Here also, HEW is relying heavily on meetings with representatives of the Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers.

According to material gathered by the National Commission on Product Safety, color tv sets are presenting their owners with a significant fire hazard. Cases collected by the Commission show instances where houses were burned down and their occupants fatally burned. Once again, instead of recommending strong, repeated, warnings by the manufacturers to their customers pursuant to taking corrective action, the Commission offered the following advice to consumers: take the plug out at night, make sure the tv set is cleaned in the rear and placed in a way that allows ventilation, avoid putting the set close to drapes or other possibly flammable materials. Assuming that one of 100,000 color tv owners received this message, to follow the advice of pulling out the plug every night would weaken the plug components which are not designed to be handled in this way daily. More important, this advice illustrates the government's practice of urging the consumer to adapt to the hazards, not the manufacturer to correct these hazards and give the consumer fair value. This is particularly dismaying because the fire hazard proceeds from an attempt by manufacturers to cut their costs so as to increase their profits. Inasmuch as the Commission has declined to disclose its studies showing which brands and models represent the most hazard, I have made a formal request under the Free-

dom of Information Act for the release of such studies and engineering reports. (attached)

Against the background of events over the past year, it is necessary for the Commerce Committee to commence oversight hearings regarding the administration of the Radiation Control Act. I believe these hearings would perform a most helpful purpose in determining where the act needs to be strengthened and how its enforcement can be enhanced by more adequate funding and procedures. The color tv situation allows a good opportunity to render solid judgments about the adequacy of the statute and the mission as performed. With its powers and authority, the Committee is in a position to obtain information from industry which the public must have for its safety.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH NADER.

GOVERNMENT REGULATION OF RADIATION FROM  
COLOR TELEVISION

(By Dr. Margot Onek)

This paper is a study of our nation's effort to deal with the problem of radiation emissions from electronic products, with particular emphasis on color television. It is hoped that such a study will yield insight into the broader question of how we can achieve effective control of the harmful by-products of our modern technology.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Radiation from color TV, when combined with radiation from medical and other sources, may have catastrophic long-term genetic consequences. Radiation from color TV may also cause significant somatic damage, such as cataracts of the eye.

Despite these dangers, control of radiation was for many years left to industry self-policing. But the revelation in 1967 that thousands and probably millions of color television sets did not even meet industry's own standards made clear that self-policing was inadequate.

The Radiation Control Act of 1968 gave the federal government power to establish radiation standards. The government's enforcement powers were limited however: it could not seize defective products, it could not use criminal sanctions against offenders and it could not inspect manufacturing premises except under narrow circumstances. Significantly, the Act did not apply at all to products which were already manufactured, including some 20 million color television sets. The users of these sets were left without any governmental protection.

The Radiation Safety Advisory Committee established by the Act retained the industry standard for radiation from television, although it did insist that this standard must be met under all operating conditions and even after a component or circuit failure. The Committee contended that the present state of technology made stricter standards impossible, but it generated no pressure or inducement for the industry to apply a more advanced technology more rapidly.

It is clear that color television was released on the market before adequate technological methods were developed to control radiation emission. The result may be a substantial increase in cataracts of the eye or in genetic defects. Because of their higher eye sensitivity and their practice of sitting closer to the TV set, children will have a higher risk of developing cataracts than adults. And there is every reason to believe that other products, such as microwave ovens, are also being released before their potentially harmful effects have been sufficiently studied and controlled.

RADIATION EXPOSURE: GENERAL  
CONSIDERATIONS

The biological effects of ionizing radiation have been appreciated almost since the dis-

covery of the x-ray by Roentgen in 1895. Briefly, these can be divided into somatic effects and genetic effects. The immediate somatic effects, cell necrosis and the acute radiation syndrome, have been well characterized through our experience with the effects of atomic bombs, accidental exposure to fallout, laboratory accidents and chemical radiotherapy. The delayed or chronic somatic effects of radiation have also been well defined—cancer, cataracts, degenerative disorders, non-specific shortening of life, etc. Again, much of our knowledge has come from tragic experience with radiation from man-made products, increased incidence of skin cancer in pioneer radiologists, increased incidence of thyroid neoplasms in children treated with irradiation to the thyroid or thymus gland, bone sarcomas in radium watch dial painters, liver carcinoma in patients treated with thorotrast, increased incidence of cancer in children exposed to x-ray in utero, to name just a few. The medical data on somatic effects are based on fairly acute exposures to high radiation energies (greater than 100-200 rads). The outcome of any radiation exposure will vary with certain characteristics of the radiation—its specific type of energy, its magnitude, the dose rate—as well as with host characteristics—sex, age, specific tissue exposed, area of tissue exposed, general state of health. Unfortunately, we lack precise information on just how these variables effect the outcome of an exposure.

The genetic effects of radiation are also well known; radiation can produce mutations of genes and the majority of mutations are harmful. But genetic effects are difficult to quantify or qualify. Rarely is the genetic result of a radiation exposure expressed as an immediate, visible event; rather it may take many, many generations before the genetic effect is expressed and the expression often takes rather complex and subtle forms such as decreased vigor, lowered life expectancy, decreased fertility, general increase in physical and/or mental disease. There is little existing evidence on which to establish a theory of the exact relationship between genetic damage and radiation exposure. It is generally assumed that genetic damage occurs at all levels of radiation exposure and that the effects are cumulative. Although some recent experimental data suggest that perhaps not all genetic effects are cumulative, cumulativeness is still regarded as a reasonable hypothesis and certainly one which we would be prudent to accept, especially as against the momentous risks involved in adhering to an alternative view.

RADIATION EXPOSURE FROM COLOR TELEVISIONS

Radiation emitted from color TV has special characteristics—relatively low energy and low intensity. Moreover, the exposure curve is one of low dose over a long period of time. The state of the art of evaluation of the risks from this type of exposure to this type of radiation is in its infancy. Although there is no hard scientific data to establish a direct cause and effect relationship as far as somatic damage is concerned, there is no data to disprove it. The scientific community has expressed special concern about possible effects on the lens of the eye (cataracts) since there is substantial evidence that early aging of the lens may be correlated with radiation exposure. As for the genetic hazards of chronic exposure to low-energy, low-intensity radiation again we lack hard data. However, it is generally assumed that even small doses to the glands prior to reproduction might result in deleterious genetic mutations and that therefore, exposure must be kept as low as possible.

It is true that there is no documented case of radiation-induced injury from color TV. However, in the words of former Surgeon General Dr. William Stewart, "Since we can-

not always offer positive proof of hazards associated with long-term exposure to low levels of a particular environmental agent we often must act upon circumstantial evidence", and in the words of former HEW Secretary John Gardner, "We are never going to be able to wait for all the evidence if we want to protect people, particularly when they are subjected to extremely complex dangers which they are now subject to from our advancing technology."

Above all, we must remember that the radiation dose from color TVs is superimposed on other exposures and that in our increasingly "radioactive" society, exposure will tend to reach calamitous proportions unless we actively seek to control it. And being a relatively recent phenomenon, color TV's impact will be an increasing one, unless preventive measures are taken.

HISTORY OF THE CONTROL OF RADIATION  
EMISSION FROM ELECTRONIC PRODUCTS

The history of our nation's attempts to control radiation emissions from electronic products provides a good, if unfortunate, lesson of what can happen when the potential dangers of our advancing technology are not recognized and vigorously dealt with from the onset. We have had 75 years of experience with ionizing radiation and increasing numbers of electronic products polluting our environment—yet private standard setting groups have only been in existence for some 35 years, and governmental power to set and enforce standards has only been in existence for one year.

Prior to the Radiation Act of 1968, standards governing radiation emission from electronic products were suggested by a private organization, the National Committee on Radiation Protection and Standards (established in 1929 and in 1964 given a federal charter and renamed the National Council on Radiation Protection and Standards, NCRP) which had no power to enforce its proposed standards. Industrial adherence to proposed standards was entirely voluntary. In addition, industry was entirely self-policing, using the private Underwriters Lab, Inc. to inspect their electronic products and to stamp them with compliance tags. Although the federal government was charged with a few specific regulatory powers—(e.g., control of gamma irradiation of bacon by the Department of Agriculture, control of radiation exposure in uranium mining by the Department of Labor, etc.)—and advisory and research federal organizations were established (e.g., Federal Radiation Council to advise the President, National Center for Radiologic Health in DHEW to conduct research, etc.)—none of these held responsibility for general standard setting and enforcement. The void left by the federal government in this area of consumer protection could have been filled by the state governments. However the state governments proved inadequate to the task—witness the continued legal use of fluoroscopy by salesmen of children's shoes in 1967 in some 18 states. In summary, the history of radiation health control in this country is one of inadequate, poorly defined, fragmented responsibility dispersed among the various federal agencies, local governments and specially established quasi-official and private groups. There has been no governmental power of enforcement. Industry has been left to follow (or not) policies of voluntary compliance and self-policing.

HISTORY OF STANDARDS

The potential dangers of x-ray exposure from electronic tubes were recognized for many years prior to the development of standards. The first standards were proposed with the aim of controlling occupational exposure; by 1946 the maximum exposure standard was 12.5 MR/hr at the surface of the tube—the equivalent of 100 MR per 8 hour day. Prior to 1959, the principal source of

radiation from household products was the picture tube of the black and white television. The advent of color TV brought higher voltages and thus greater radiation emission—and now from shunt regulator tubes and high voltage rectifier tubes in addition to the picture tube. In response to this danger, the NCRB in 1959 recommended an exposure standard for color TV—not to exceed 0.5 MR/hr at any accessible point 5 cm (approximately 2 inches) from the surface of the set. In arriving at this standard, the NCRP aimed "to insure that the TV contribution to the population gonad dose will be only a small fraction of that due to natural background radiation." Assuming an average TV viewing time of 20 hours per week, the 0.5 MR/hr standard gives a yearly dose of radiation from color TV of 0.5 R/year which is equivalent of 5% of the yearly dose from natural background. The 5 cm distance in the standard was selected because it was considered to be the shortest practical distance at which the effective center of the measuring device could be placed for accurate measurement. The 0.5 MR/hr standard was reaffirmed by the NCRP in 1968. It should be emphasized that this was the recommended standard—it carried no force of law and industrial adherence to it was strictly voluntary. In fact, Underwriters Lab, Inc., the testing organization for TV manufacturers, used a standard of 2.5 MR/hr (which corresponds to the 100 MR/week dose for radiation workers recommended by the NCRP in 1957) until 1967 when after persuasion from Congress it adopted the 0.5 MR/hr standard.

This then was our system of standards and control of radiation emission from electronic products until 1968. Increasingly the defects of this system were becoming clear; there was absolutely no guarantee that the public health would be protected. However, it took a blatant example of irresponsible and unacceptable behavior by private industry, exposing the public to a serious potential danger to generate substantial pressure for governmental enforcement of radiation standards.

#### THE GENERAL ELECTRIC CASE

The General Electric (GE) case speaks for itself: In October or November, 1966, GE discovered that a production line model involving 150,000 sets contained a type of shunt regulator tube capable of emitting x-rays at clearly excessive levels. GE discussed the problem with the Public Health Service (PHS) and not until pressured by the PHS and a New York Times article did it issue a public statement. It was not until 8 months after the initial discovery that the Surgeon General issued a public warning advising owners to turn off their sets. Meanwhile, GE continued producing the defective sets for 3 months after the initial discovery and continued selling them for 6 months. As late as 9 months after the initial discovery it was still possible to purchase defective tubes.

Clearly private inspection with voluntary compliance were not providing the public with adequate protection.

#### OTHER STUDIES: WAS THE PROBLEM INDUSTRY-WIDE?

The GE case led to four regional studies undertaken by local government and health departments in conjunction with the PHS and industry to assess the scope of the color TV radiation problem. In evaluating the significance of these studies several general comments can be made. First, conclusions cannot be drawn about brand names as the numbers are much too small to be statistically significant. Secondly, these studies are not representative of the country as a whole because of variations in local power supplies, servicing factors and interchangeability of TV parts. With these limitations

in mind, however, the studies suggest that x-radiation from color TV is an industry-wide problem.

#### THE SIZE OF THE PROBLEM

There is a 5-20% non-compliance rate with the 0.5 standard (5% Montgomery County and Prince Georges County; 6% Washington, D.C.; 20% Suffolk County; 29% Pinellas County). In terms of numbers, this translates to between 1 and 7 million TV sets. Averaging 3 viewers per set (Wash. study) we get a population at risk of 3-21 million persons. Given the growth of the color TV industry—the population at risk reaches huge proportions (particularly when account is taken of possible genetic damage).

#### THE SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM

Offending TV sets were found among a variety of makes and models. The problem is clearly industrywide.

#### THE HEART OF THE PROBLEM

The studies confirmed previous conclusions that there are 3 sources of x-ray from colored TV—the picture tube, the rectifier tube and high volt shunt regulator tube—with the shunt regulator tubes being the major offenders. Emission was found to occur from all sides of sets, not just from the bottom as in the original GE sets. In addition to the above component factors, it was found that certain operating parameters greatly influenced x-ray emission—especially the voltage. Service factors were also found to be important. Repairmen can increase the voltage to very high levels; they monitor the increase by the brightness of the picture rather than by any safety factor or voltage reading. Indeed they do not carry equipment to read voltage. Repairmen frequently replace components emitting at excessive levels with equally faulty components. Most repairmen are not aware of the risk to themselves due to such repeated, close exposure. (In the Washington study some components had to be replaced 2-3 times), since they have no way of knowing whether the component will emit x-rays.

Significantly, not one study reported a single case of a set which could not be corrected by service adjustments—i.e., component replacement, voltage adjustments, etc.

#### THE RADIATION CONTROL ACT

The legislative response to the revelations about radiation from color TV was the "Radiation Control for Health & Safety Act of 1968" (PL 90-602). This act vests in HEW responsibility for protecting the public from unnecessary radiation from electronic products—specifically by the development and administration of performance standards and by the development and support of research and investigation into the effects and control of radiation emission.

Although this legislation has been described by many persons concerned with consumer protection as the best consumer legislation to date, it is not nearly good enough. Several important amendments and provisions were deleted from the bill—largely due to active, electronics industry lobbying.

(1) Government power of inspection is minimal. HEW only has the power to review and evaluate industry records and the industry's description of its product testing program. The manufacturer's premises and operating product testing program may be inspected by the government only if the manufacturer's product has been found to be in violation of the performance standard. Thus, the primary responsibility to detect and report noncompliant products lies with the manufacturer and he is relatively immune from government control supervision within his manufacturing facility. In this area then the Radiation Control Act has done little to

move forward the cause of consumer protection—the system of product compliance and testing still largely revolves around an assumed "good faith" of the manufacturer—the only difference is that now industry must have a program of testing and must submit records of this testing program to the government. The government has no way of knowing how the testing program works under operating conditions. It is true that the government does have the power to buy products on the open market, test them for compliance in its own labs and take legal action on the basis of its own tests. However, the cost of a government conducted product-by-product testing program is so high it is unlikely government would embark on such a program (see section on implementation). Moreover, the existing funding for the administration of the Act is grossly inadequate. Surely, a more practical and realistic system would be for the manufacturer to have the primary responsibility for product testing and for the government to have powers of on-the-premise inspection of testing programs, procedures and results.

(2) The government has no power to seize defective products: Industry is charged with the responsibility of recording sales and distribution and then notifying purchaser, distributor and HEW of any noncompliant products. Industry is then responsible for replacing its product with one that meets the performance standard. The recall provision is excellent as far as it goes. However, there may be an unavoidable delay between the time that a product is found to be noncompliant and the time it takes industry to repair it, or industry may be delinquent in meeting its legal obligations. In the meantime there is no way in which the government can protect the public from exposure to these dangerous, noncompliant products except by issuing a poorly distributed public statement that these products should not be used. Clearly this is not the most satisfactory way to combat a public health hazard.

(3) There is no provision for standards to provide protection for the worker on the assembly line.

(4) There is no provision for compulsory education and training of repairmen as to the potential dangers of the electronic products which they service. The Act merely requires that appropriate warning be affixed to components. This is not enough. We must have a guarantee that the products which are marked as in compliance as they leave the manufacturer remain in compliance throughout their lifetime. Surely proper training and alert repairmen is one easy and necessary way to approach this.

(5) There are no criminal penalties for noncompliance. According to the Act enforcement is to be through court injunction (to restrain sale of defective products) and civil penalty (not more than \$100 per violation with maximum of \$200,000).

(6) And finally, there is no provision for legal redress for people subjected to radiation. The consumer is left without a remedy in the event of noncompliance by industry.

These are the major weaknesses of the Radiation Control Act as they apply to electronic products manufactured after the passage of the Act. Blatantly absent from the law is any provision for the public health problem represented by some products manufactured prior to the Act's passage. There are some 20 million pre-Act color TV sets. These sets have a noncompliance rate of from 5% to 20% with the old standard, and the non-compliance rate with the new standard (see below) can be expected to be even higher. The individual owner has no way of knowing whether his particular set is in compliance or not. Clearly, neither industry nor the government has met its responsibility to the individual owner or to the society in general.

On the whole, industry does not even acknowledge that the existing color TV sets represent a public health problem, repeating the refrain—"there is no documented case of radiation-induced injury secondary to TV x-radiation". Many government officials readily acknowledge the problem but claim there is no practical way to attack it. They claim that the PHS has neither the staff nor the equipment to survey 20 million sets and that industry refuses to take the responsibility. They further argue that the cost of such a survey would be prohibitive and that even if a set were made compliant at the end of the survey there would be no way of knowing what radiation it would emit in the future with changes in operating parameters, changes in parts and service adjustments. But where does this leave the consumer? The consumer is essentially being told by both industry and the government, "we do not know what you can do to make sure that your TV is not potentially dangerous and moreover, we do not intend to look further into this question—we wash our hands of all responsibility."

Although the answers are not easy, we cannot afford to ignore the problem. Industry pushed color TV on to the market prematurely, fully appreciating the potential radiation problem but ignoring it for commercial considerations—and government let this happen. Now we must find some way to clean up the resulting mess.

Possible approaches to this problem include:

(1) Radiation emission survey of all sets not covered by the Act. Bureau of Radiation Health officials state that the cost to conduct such a survey would be "prohibitive"—however, cost analysis to substantiate this claim apparently had not been done. The government should supply the public with a cost analysis rather than merely handing out phrases like "prohibitive cost". Consideration should be given to sharing the cost between government and industry.

(2) Education of repairmen about the potential dangers of color TV, high voltage, etc., should be compulsory and undertaken.

(3) Repairmen should be supplied with voltmeters—if this is too expensive for the individual repairman the cost should be met at least in part by the manufacturer.

(4) Research into the development of an instrument which gives repairmen a "rough indication" of radiation emission should be supported.

(5) As color TV components with little or no x-ray emission (i.e., better shielded tubes, tubes made with a new type of glass, solid state parts, etc.) are developed the manufacturer and the government should jointly undertake a program to insure that the old components are immediately replaced by these improved components. At the very least, the manufacturer should be required to notify owners of color TV sets that these new and safer components are available.

#### IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RADIATION CONTROL ACT

The Radiation Control Act was passed in October, 1968. It was not until some seven months after its passage that Secretary Finch announced the formation of the 15-member Technical Products Radiation Safety Standards Committee, as required by the Act. The delay in the formation of this important committee was excused by the "change of administration", however, the events surrounding this delay are unclear. And meanwhile color TV sets which would not be subject to the new standard continued to be manufactured at a rate of approximately 600,000 per month. There are now about 24 million color TV sets in American homes.

In June, 1969, the Bureau of Radiation Health proposed a new standard for radiation emission from color TV—0.1 MR/hr "at

any point accessible to an individual under any condition of operation", to be effective by July 1, 1969. One of the first actions of the newly formed Committee was to reject this 0.1 MR/hr standard; the old standard 0.5 MR/hr was accepted for an indefinite period of time—but subject to the following new conditions:

(1) Sets manufactured after January 1, 1970, must meet the 0.5 MR/hr standard with all user controls adjusted so as to produce maximum x-radiation emissions from the set.

(2) Sets manufactured after June 1, 1970, must meet the standard with both all user controls and all service controls adjusted so as to produce maximum emissions.

(3) Sets manufactured after June 1, 1971, must meet the standard even after a component or circuit failure which maximizes emission.

What does this new standard represent? First of all it represents a compromise. Bureau of Radiation Health officials state that the 0.1 MR/hr standard was selected as a "talking point" with industry. They feel that it is more important to control radiation emission under all operating conditions than to obtain an absolute lowering of the standard—thus they were willing to sacrifice the 0.1 MR/hr standard for a 0.5 MR/hr standard subject to the provision that it apply under all operating conditions as described above. This approach may be explained on several grounds. First the household surveys found that excessive radiation emission was most often related to adjustments by servicemen, changes in circuitry, etc., and the new standard must apply to sets adjusted to give maximum x-radiation emission. Secondly, the standard applies to component parts and hopefully this will provide some control of the problem of excess radiation emission following servicing of the set by repairmen. And finally, government officials feel that the new standard will force industry to come up with new design criteria—i.e., shielding, new glass, etc., and eventually solid state parts so that the radiation emissions from color TVs are minimal.

This approach that the Committee has taken is certainly good; however, it is not enough: What about the absolute standard? It must be recognized that there is nothing magic about 0.1 MR/hr or 0.5 MR/hr. We do not know that above or below any particular level of x-radiation from color TV is harmful or safe. We merely know that any level might be potentially harmful. Industry minimizes the problem by pointing out that radiation exposure from color TV is minute compared to exposure from medical and dental procedures. That is just the point: exposure from TV is superimposed on exposure from many other, often unavoidable, sources. Also, exposure from color TV is much more persistent over time even though it is at lower levels than medical x-rays. To say that medical and dental exposures need better control does not excuse us from the responsibility for trying to establish maximum possible control of color TV exposures. Our goal must surely be to reduce radiation emission from color TV to a level as low as possible. Has this been done? Commissioner Chris A. Hansen of the Environmental Control Administration, writes in the *Federal Register*, "a lowered standard is not practical because it is not possible to make reliable measurements of levels substantially below 0.5 MR/hr at the present time." According to Bureau of Radiation Health officials an instrument to measure for a 0.1 MR/hr standard would be prohibitively expensive, need constant recalibration and highly trained personnel to operate it and therefore is not "practically" suited for household survey or production line usage. One private engineer stated that while the instruments are available, it would take trained professionals to obtain and interpret meaningful data from these instruments.

Accepting the government's premise that technology is a limiting factor, the problem still merits more careful consideration. First, what would it cost for industry to have trained professionals to use existing instruments to measure at a 0.1 MR/hr standard? What would it cost to develop instruments which measure for a 0.1 MR/hr standard at acceptable levels of sensitivity and accuracy? These programs should be costed out. Secondly, there is no pressure for industry ever to develop the technology to measure for a lower standard. All the new standard says is that the standard will be reviewed as technology improves. But why should industry make any effort to develop new instruments when they can so comfortably sit behind the phrase "not practical"—a position which is supported by government statements. Further, there is no time specification as to when the standard will be reviewed, no insurance that the problem will receive constant reevaluation. Finally, and perhaps most important of all, industry claims and the government agrees that we presently have the capability of producing color TVs which emit at levels less than background radiation. If we can do this, it is criminal that we are not doing it merely because our technology to measure X-ray emission lags behind our technology to produce safe products. As we understand what design criteria provide for minimal x-ray emission perhaps these design criteria should be required by law—this would be one approach to assuring maximally safe products in spite of a technical and financial inability to measure on a product-by-product basis.

#### CONCLUSION

The Radiation Control Act did not grant the government adequate enforcement powers, and left users of existing products completely unprotected. Implementation of the Act with respect to color television has been less than vigorous. The Radiation Safety Committee has been too willing to emphasize limitations in present technology rather than to demand advances in technology, too focused on measurement capability, and too blurred on existing shielding capability.

It seems clear, therefore, that our society is not yet sufficiently committed to controlling radiation hazards. Industry will continue to release products such as color televisions and microwave ovens, before they have been rendered completely safe. The consequences, in terms of genetic and somatic damage, may be catastrophic for many human beings, including those yet unborn.

#### A BILL TO PREVENT THE OPERATORS OF PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS OR FORMS OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION FROM REFUSING ADMITTANCE TO DOG GUIDES FOR THE BLIND

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which would prevent the operators of public accommodations or forms of public transportation from refusing admittance to dog guides for the blind. Although many States have statutes making this provision, some do not, and some of the statutes which exist are not strong enough to preclude difficulties for dog guide users.

When this bill was introduced in the 88th Congress, it received the unanimous

endorsement of organizations for and of the blind. The need for such legislation is no less great today. The extraordinary ability of many blind people to cope with their disability does not lessen our responsibility to facilitate as much as possible their pursuit of a normal life. To exclude dog guides from public accommodations is to exclude the people dependent upon them. Surely a dog which has been trained by a recognized dog guide school and is properly harnessed and controlled, as stipulated by my bill, cannot justifiably be the cause for exclusion of any blind person from a public accommodation or mode of public transportation.

The bill which I am introducing would, without undue inconvenience, provide a valuable assurance to the blind that they can travel throughout this country without concern about inadequate protection in any State.

#### BUSINESSMEN AGAINST POLLUTION

### HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, while it has suddenly become politically fashionable to give top priority to saving our environment, I think most of the Congress and the executive branch would confess that we do not have many specific solutions to the problems of air and water pollution, excessive jet noise, and the need to preserve our dwindling open space.

Solutions to these problems will require the assistance and cooperation of businessmen as well as the idealism of students and the recently increased sensitivity of politicians.

A significant suggestion along these lines has just appeared in the February 2 issue of Newsweek magazine. In the Periscope section, it is reported that leading businessmen have asked the President for assistance in setting up a national business council on pollution. This would be similar to councils set up for minority employment and enterprise, as well as the attack on urban problems. Implementation of such a suggestion would also coincide with the recent creation of an Environmental Quality Council at the White House level under the National Environmental Quality Act of 1969. The Newsweek article follows:

#### BUSINESSMEN AGAINST POLLUTION

Leading businessmen are pressing the Nixon Administration to help them set up a national business council on pollution. Like the National Alliance of Businessmen, which tries to find jobs for the hard-core unemployed, the group would act as a volunteer adjunct to the White House. It would sponsor regional offices across the country to gather information, data and complaints. This would help provide businessmen with enough expertise to deal on equal terms with both officials and environmentalists. Establishing a connection with the White House would give businessmen a voice in the formation of anti-pollution measures.

#### TIME IS RUNNING OUT

### HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished, beloved, and honorable chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, WILBUR MILLS, delivered a very timely and outstanding address recently in New York City.

Chairman MILLS addressed the Market Committee of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute at their annual dinner on January 22, 1970.

I commend his splendid remarks to the attention of my colleagues and to the people of our country:

#### ADDRESS BY MR. MILLS

It is a privilege to be here this evening to address the Annual Dinner of the Market Committee of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute. I am familiar to some extent with the half century of traditions surrounding the annual dinner of the textile merchants of Worth Street. I am honored by your request to address you. It is a personal pleasure to meet with you; I have many close friends in the textile industry, many of whom I see here this evening.

I would suppose that talks being given to business groups this month usually start out by referring to the beginning of a new decade. Unlike many such speakers, I do not intend to attempt to foretell what the decade of the 1970's will bring. I am no expert in this field, thus, I have to rely on the advice of economists from time to time. Sometimes I have found that not all forward estimates are accurate.

I hasten to add that despite some comment and political expectations to the contrary, I do attempt to see further than the proverbial "next election." For this evening I believe that the here and the now and a little bit beyond are sufficient, and I would like to share with you a few thoughts on some of the economic problems which we will be dealing with in the Congress in the months ahead.

First, I would like to recognize the importance of your endeavors and those of your associates in the textile and apparel industries. I know of no group of producers and merchants who are more competitive, who have faced greater changes in technology, in new materials, in new products and in new market forces than the businessmen in the audience this evening. Nor am I aware of any group which has adapted better to these challenges than the enterprises represented here.

In an industry in which the after-tax profit margin is just over one-half of that for all manufacturing, and in which labor is highly intensive, I am sure that inflationary tendencies in the economy have presented you with very real problems. However, from all I see, inflationary forces are still very much with us. As indicated in the President's State of the Union Message today, and as will become more evident as further proposals are sent to the Congress, we are faced with very difficult economic choices this year.

My position as Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means affords a constant challenge to hear and to analyze the problems and prospects of our industries as they are affected by governmental policies, particularly economic policies involving taxes and other factors affecting competitive abilities. This past year, of course, has been

no exception. The Committee on Ways and Means spent many hours this past year attempting to shape the various provisions of our tax law into a more equitable and a more balanced tax system.

The tax reform provisions go a long way in restoring fairness of tax burdens. The tax relief provisions provide needed adjustments in the tax base, and I would hope preserve for the taxpayer and for the private enterprise sector some return on the future growth in our economy.

In the past, the increase in the cost of old government programs and funding of new government activities have tended to prevent the average taxpayer from obtaining relief in his tax burden from the benefits of increased economic activity. The thought that increments to tax revenues stemming from overall growth in our economy should be shared with the taxpayers rather than be devoted solely to increased government expenditures was basic to the tax laws enacted in 1964 and 1965. The inordinate increase in government expenditures experienced after those tax reductions necessitated a reversal of that policy. It is my hope that, in the future, tax and expenditure policies will be better coordinated so that our tax revenues may be related to a fully ordered priority of expenditure needs.

All of us realize that our economic, social and defense needs are great and in many areas appear to be growing faster than the resources available to meet them. The Committee on Ways and Means is already engaged in an examination of the President's welfare proposals looking toward a full reorganization of our somewhat fragmented health and welfare programs. It would appear that any revision of these programs to meet yet unmet needs will be very costly. The President's program, we have found, involves at least \$5.5 billion additional costs.

In addition, the rebuilding of our cities, the refurbishing of our transportation system, and the variety of other programs will be costly. For example, a number of programs are aimed at ending pollution of our environment. Many of them involve direct burdens on our industries. Certainly pollution control programs pose costs for affected industries such as the textile industry. Such costs are usually unrequited by comparable increases in productivity and lower manufacturing costs. How these burdens of research and capital investment in pollution control will be borne has yet to be finally decided. Tax incentives may be a temporary palliative, but such a tax "expenditure" route for supporting programs which have totally desirable social objectives in themselves is a road fraught with questions. If spread to the many areas proposed for tax incentive treatment, the entire basis of our tax system can be seriously eroded.

The extent to which additional costs in these and other economic and social programs will be borne by industry pose difficult problems as industries such as your own seek to improve their competitive position, to reduce cost and maximize returns. To some extent these additional costs are closely related to another area which the Committee on Ways and Means will consider and that is foreign trade and tariff policy.

Within the next two or three months, I am hopeful that the Committee on Ways and Means can take up the President's trade proposals submitted to the Congress last November and other trade proposals the Committee may wish to consider in light of developments at that time. You may recall, the Committee held extensive hearings on tariffs and foreign trade in June of 1968 but was unable to take action before the 90th Congress adjourned.

Thus, it has been seven years since the Congress as a whole has had the opportunity for an overall review of United States

foreign trade policy. Indeed, the President has been without tariff negotiating authority since June 30, 1967.

In the past, the periodic extension of the President's trade agreement authority has presented the opportunity for Congress to review foreign trade and tariff matters and the operations of the trade agreement program. The last such review, which resulted in the enactment of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, laid the groundwork for the Kennedy Round of Trade Negotiations. This Act proposed by President John F. Kennedy was carefully studied and modified in the Congress to meet the economic challenges to the growth in world trade as they were viewed at that time.

The ultimate success or failure of the great efforts initiated by the Trade Expansion Act will depend on how the United States and its major trading partners handle the existing and emerging challenges to international cooperation and expansion of world trade.

As you know, I have long been a supporter of the reciprocal trade agreements program initiated by President Roosevelt under the leadership of Cordell Hull. Along with other postwar policies, the reciprocal trade agreements program has made possible an unprecedented growth in world trade. Somewhere along the line we seemed to have dropped the word "reciprocal" in describing the trade agreements program. The approach that has been taken in dealing with some of the foreign trade problems of our domestic industries in recent years has led me to believe that we also sometimes forget the need for adhering to the idea of reciprocity.

The reciprocal trade agreements program began as carefully negotiated, bilateral trade agreements between the United States and certain of our trading partners. These agreements covered a selected list of products upon which tariff concessions were exchanged. The agreements also contained rules of conduct to protect the validity of the tariff concessions and to assure a mutuality of interest between the two countries in their trade relations.

With the end of World War II and the emphasis on international economic cooperation, the trade agreements program became multilateral, as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade was negotiated and as further rounds of tariff negotiations increased both the extent of United States tariff concessions and its international commitment to rules which would guide its conduct in international trade.

It is important to note that the articles of the GATT were adopted at a time when the predominance of the United States economic strength was in contrast to the need to encourage economic recovery and export opportunities for other trading nations.

I think it is obvious that basic economic conditions have changed. Certainly as the general level of tariffs has fallen, the so-called non-tariff barriers have assumed a greater importance as impediments to trade. It may well be that some of the articles of the GATT need to be revised or extended to other conditions of trade. For example, the situation with regard to the GATT rules covering the treatment of the impact of internal taxes on imports and exports—the border tax issue—must somehow be resolved to remove existing inequities.

I am more concerned in the immediate future, however, with the failure of our safeguard provision for domestic industry. Even prior to 1962, due to the importance of the United States leadership role in trade matters, on almost every occasion that domestic industries sought to obtain relief from injurious or unfair import competition, it was made to appear that the foundation of the United States policy of trade expansion was being threatened. Thus, at a time when most other countries were employing residual

balance of payment quantitative limitations on selected items, the United States permitted itself little flexibility to respond to competitive hardships. This was true even after the producers involved had demonstrated such a need in procedures provided by the Congress.

Moreover, petitions for actions under other provisions of trade law, not actually involving tariff concessions obligations, also tended to be treated in the same light. I have in mind the treatment given petitions by domestic producers for action under the anti-dumping law, the countervailing duty provision, laws governing unfair competition or similar measures of domestic law concerning conditions of trade. Possible actions under such provisions have tended not to be weighed in terms of the requirements of domestic statutes. Rather, they have tended to be considered primarily in relation to the possible trade problem raised with the country or countries involved.

In retrospect, these difficulties in obtaining relief from import competition appear to have been compounded in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, due to the formulation of the criteria for tariff adjustment and adjustment assistance provided for in the Act, and the subsequent unfortunate interpretations given the wording of those provisions.

I do not mean to give the impression that each complaint by a domestic producer that he is being put out of business by imports has validity. I am suggesting that our trade laws and the interpretation of those laws have not been responsive to the needs of some industries. In part this has been due to a failure to recognize the dynamic growth and diversified development that has taken place abroad. I would add that the repeated rebuffs that domestic industries have experienced in seeking temporary assistance in dealing with what they consider to be injurious import competitive situations has its effects on the expectation of foreign producers who produce with an eye to the United States market.

These expectations as to selling without reasonable restraint in the United States market are related to one profound development of direct interest to your industry. This is the tremendous increase in productive capacities abroad, particularly in industries adaptable to mass production techniques and technological advances.

Some years ago, United States producers for the most part competed with imports on a limited number of products within a product range. Import penetration was necessarily limited in product scope by the productive capacity abroad, market entrance costs and other factors. This is no longer true for some industries. The concern now is with significant and growing import penetration across the whole range of an industry's products.

The strength and depth of foreign productive capacity and competitive market abilities are far greater than in former years.

Finally, an aspect of the competition is the low labor cost base upon which many of these technologically advanced mass production plants were imposed. At this point I have the feeling that all this is somewhat familiar to you.

At any rate these developments and the very spectacular economic growth abroad have had their impact on the United States economy. Between 1962 and 1968, the Gross National Product of the United States increased 80 percent. Exports increased 106 percent and imports increased 112 percent. Significantly, exports have maintained a stable relationship with the gross national product over the past decade of just under 4 percent. Imports in relation to GNP have risen from about 3.0 percent to 3.8 percent. This 0.8 percent represents \$7 billion in terms of today's GNP, and this is what has happened to our favorable balance of trade in the past several years.

I have followed closely over the past two or three years the fluctuations in our trade balance. It would appear from some analyses that either industrial strikes, dock strikes or inflation have accounted for all of the downward trend in our favorable trade balance. Such analyses overlook the fact that imports are gaining a greater basic access in the United States markets.

Let me hasten to add that while I am concerned with the current need to maintain an export surplus in face of the requirements of our international payments position, I see nothing wrong in increased imports—as a natural development of economic growth both abroad and in the United States. What does concern me is the rate of increase in imports in certain sectors of our economy at rates that exceed the growth in domestic consumption. What concerns me further is the expanding capacity abroad to continue such rates of increase in exports to the United States. Finally, what concerns me is the lack of concern abroad when a continuation of such increases in imports would necessitate economic adjustment in American industries which are as unacceptable as they are undesirable.

Our provisions for dealing with injurious import competition in existing trade law are obviously not adequate to meet these challenges in a way that will preserve both sound trading relations and sound domestic markets.

These matters will take some time to work out. Meanwhile, the special trade problem of textile imports, as has been noted by the President on a number of occasions, requires a much more immediate solution. As you know, I have firmly supported Secretary of Commerce Stans and other members of the Administration in their efforts to obtain a solution through a reasonable, comprehensive international understanding.

I understand negotiations are underway with some governments, but that others have refused to negotiate. One unfortunate result of the delays in reaching a workable solution has been a continuation of rapid increases in imports and a compounding of the already adverse impacts being experienced by the textile and apparel industry and its workers. The textile exporting countries must realize that further delay in reaching a comprehensive international solution can only deepen the problems and necessitate stronger solutions. Time is running out, and if concrete results are not forthcoming soon, the Congress will necessarily have to respond to the special needs of the textile industry at the time it considers overall trade legislation.

These are some of the problems that the Committee on Ways and Means will be dealing with in the coming months. There are other developments that must be considered as well.

There is the impact of increased operations of the multinational firms on trends in international trade and international investment. The issue of tariff preferences to developing countries has been brought to the fore by President Nixon's announcement last fall, although no concrete proposals for carrying out such tariff adjustment have been submitted to the Congress as yet. The non-tariff barrier discussions have resulted in little if any progress, but progress is essential if United States export interests are to be met.

The United States has profited greatly, as have our trading partners, from the growth in international trade that has taken place in the last quarter century. I am proud of the leadership that this country has displayed in furthering that expansion. It is my firm belief that we will continue to support expanded international trade through cooperative efforts with our trading partners. In doing so we must closely examine our own

policies as well as those of other countries and see what changes are made where necessary in order that our own producers are not unfairly disadvantaged either in the conditions of trade or the regulations and practices supporting them.

#### VIOLENCE PANEL HAS PRAISE FOR CHICAGO POLICE

### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Police Department, one of the finest in the country, has received praise and recognition by the National Commission on Causes and Prevention of Violence.

In an article written by Carleton Kent of the Chicago Sun-Times, he discusses the findings of the Commission regarding demonstrations in Chicago and the appropriate handling of these demonstrations by the Chicago police.

The correct stance taken by the Chicago police reduced violence and they have been duly praised for their efforts.

I commend Mr. Kent's article to my colleagues.

#### VIOLENCE PANEL HAS PRAISE FOR CHICAGO POLICE

(By Carleton Kent)

WASHINGTON.—The Chicago police have made "encouraging progress" in their handling of anti-war demonstrators since the riotous protests during the Democratic National Convention in August of 1968, the National Commission on Causes and Prevention of Violence has found.

In its latest report issued last week on group violence, the commission headed by Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower found that "the prompt, prudent deployment of well-trained law enforcement personnel can extinguish a civil disorder in its incipency. But history also demonstrates that excessive use of force is an unwise tactic for handling disorder."

And it contrasted the "official response" to the 1968 demonstration in Chicago with one mounted by the same groups in Washington at "counter-inaugural" in January, and with the march organized in Chicago last October by Weatherman, the extremely militant faction of the Students for a Democratic Society.

Of the "before" phase in Chicago during the Democratic convention, it has this to say:

"In Chicago, the authorities were restrictive in granting demonstration permits; some of the police, deliberately goaded by verbal and physical attacks of small militant groups, responded with excessive force not only against the provocateurs but also against peaceful demonstrators and passive demonstrators.

"Their conduct, while it won the support of the majority, polarized substantial and previously neutral segments of the population against the authorities and in favor of the demonstrators."

#### COMMENT ON WEATHERMAN DEMONSTRATION

Turning to the "after" facet, that of the Weatherman demonstration 14 months later, the commission commented:

"Permits for peace marchers were sought and granted in October, 1969. . . . In the course of the demonstrations, Chicago police had to face four days of intense provocation and wanton violence. This time, however, the

police acted with calm and restraint. No injuries to residents, bystanders or newsmen were reported; on the contrary, the police took steps to safeguard bystanders from the violence.

(1) "As a result of the professional conduct of the Chicago police, violence was effectively contained, and blame for the damage and injuries that did occur fell squarely upon the violent group among the demonstrators, many of whom were arrested."

It also noted that in between these two events occurred the anti-war demonstrations at the time of President Nixon's inauguration, of which it said:

"In Washington, demonstration permits were liberally issued. Although there was also provocative violence by some of the demonstrators, the police used only that force clearly necessary to maintain order.

"As a result, there was little criticism of police behavior. Our analysis leads to the conclusion that the amount of violence that occurred during these demonstrations and the resulting effects on public opinion were directly related to the kind of official response that greeted them."

#### ENDORSEMENT OF WALKER REPORT

The latest report on violences amounted to tacit, belated endorsement of the controversial report on the Chicago convention-time demonstrations issued a year ago by a special panel headed by Daniel Walker, Chicago attorney, which the Eisenhower commission had published without evaluation or comment.

The Walker panel concluded that the actions of some police, under "exceedingly provocative" circumstances, led to disorders amounting to a "police riot" that outweighed the anti-war demonstrations as the source of violence in Chicago.

The construction of the new Eisenhower report indicates the commission felt the handling by Washington police last January of the "counter-inaugural" demonstration contributed to Chicago's handling of the Weatherman march of two months ago, cited as an example of "intelligent and restrained official response."

The commission, obviously impressed with the Washington handling of demonstrations, said officials here carefully evaluated intelligence reports, sorting out "genuine threats from theatrical exaggerations." Troublemakers were identified and watched closely, but no attempt was made to interfere with the activities of a majority of peaceful demonstrators.

"Authorities negotiated conscientiously with protest leaders and arrived at agreements on the scope of permits for parades and meetings that were acceptable to all parties. The protest leaders, impressed with the reasonableness of government spokesmen, made substantial efforts to co-operate with officials and ensure peace."

Summing up its section on the Chicago and Washington demonstrations, entitled "Strategies of Control," the Eisenhower commission urged city governments to establish "formal, dependable communication links with dissident groups," but noted that few have done so, or have adequate plans for dealing with disorders.

"We therefore urge police departments throughout the nation to improve their preparations for anticipating, preventing and controlling group disorders, and to that end to study the approaches that have been employed successfully on the three most recent occasions in Washington and Chicago," it said.

The third, and most recent, occasion, was the handling of the Nov. 15 Peace Moratorium parade and rally in Washington, which the commission called "the largest single protest demonstration in history (in which) the overwhelming majority of the partici-

pants behaved peacefully. Their activities were facilitated rather than restrained by the police.

"When the few extremists did attempt violent attacks on two occasions, the police responded firmly but, on the whole, without excessive force. As a result, order was maintained, the right to protest was upheld, and it was possible to judge both the peaceful and the violent aspects of the protest in their true proportion."

#### MASS MAILING OF UNSOLICITED CREDIT CARDS MUST BE STOPPED

### HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago I introduced legislation which would slash the number of unsolicited credit cards flooding American homes.

My bill would make it mandatory that credit cards be sent by registered and insured mail and delivered only to the addressee. And envelopes containing unsolicited credit cards would have on their face, in large letters: "Unsolicited Credit Card—Addressee May Refuse." Those requested by the recipient would have only the designation "Credit Card" on the envelope.

As a further deterrent to those stuffing the Nation's mail boxes with unsolicited credit cards, this bill also calls for the sender to pay an additional charge for any mailing returned.

Today, it was my pleasure to testify on this matter before the Postal Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which I am a member.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to my colleague's attention my statement on a business which has caused many heartaches across the Nation. I know of instances where families have gone on wild spending sprees after receiving unsolicited credit cards in the mail and it took them many months, even years, to straighten out their finances. This must stop.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. GLENN C. CUNNINGHAM  
Mr. Chairman, I am the author of H.R. 14897 which I introduced on 20 November 1969.

My bill provides that credit cards shall only be forwarded in the United States Mail by Registered Mail, and insured mail, restricted in delivery to the addressee only. Violations of the sections of this legislation could result in a \$1,000 fine and/or imprisonment for not more than one year.

I believe that this legislation is necessary because the credit card explosion is a permanent feature in our economy and the burdens from the fraudulent use of credit cards fall on the individual cardholder whose credit standing is endangered. The individual must turn to Congress and ask for its help against what is now a 13 billion dollar industry. In addition, it seems to me that credit cards will be used by the banking industry to replace checks, as checks have replaced cash in the market place. If this is the case, it certainly seems reasonable to me that a balance be struck between the interests of these giant credit card companies and individual consumers.

Today in our cashless society, groceries, weddings, church dues, trips around the world, and in Phoenix, Arizona a Master Charge Card can be used to arrange ball. I would also like to point out that you can pay your Federal Income Taxes by credit card in the states of California, North Carolina, Washington, Oregon, and Arkansas. All this can be done for the payment to Credit Card Companies of 18% a year on the debt drawn up with the credit card company. Gangsters will also accept credit cards in payment of loan shark debts.

There is great urgency upon the part of those banks who have not yet cut into this 18% loan business to engage in mass mailings of unsolicited credit cards. Mail patrons get credit whether they want it or not. Why? The credit card issuers can not convince merchants that they have to join credit card plans in order to protect themselves against competitors who do, unless the bank or other issuers can show that an overwhelming number of customers in the merchant's area have the cards. The bank knows that it can not convince people to join the plan voluntarily. A survey by the Marine Midland Bank of New York showed that less than one percent of consumers responded to requests to join credit card plans but where unsolicited credit cards are forced into the mail box, 19% of the mail patrons contacted used the card within six months. It takes six months and only 19% respond through inflationary impulse buying but at least the card plan becomes active. The merchant doesn't know how many cards are in use. He is told only about the thousands and in some cases millions of cards have been sent through the mail and are in the possession of mail patrons. When the merchant joins the plan, he must pay the credit card people from 3% to 7% for discounting the debt run up in his store. He can only get this amount back by raising his prices. The merchant is not guaranteed any exclusive territory, so he finds himself raising prices without any competitive advantage. His only satisfaction is knowing that he has protected himself against a competitor, who is protecting himself against the first merchant. This fear psychology wouldn't be possible without the mass mailing technique which the banks and other credit card issuers want to make use of in selling their plan.

Individual consumers have to pay 18% on the unpaid portion of the debt they owe over thirty days. If the unsolicited credit card doesn't reach a mail patron he may be surprised to find himself being billed from a credit card company. These companies have a very weak position legally since their negligence in engaging in the mass mailing of credit cards which bring from \$50 to \$500 in the black market, brought about the loss. There has been testimony here that credit card companies are good guys and they are so nice, they don't sue the unfortunate consumer who doesn't owe them anything in the first place. They may not bring suit or if they do they may drop it once they do because of public relations considerations. But these considerations don't stop them from threatening collection action which would ruin the credit standing of an individual. Nor does it stop them from trying to collect from an individual's employer. What is more, the fiction of writing off \$100 million worth of fraudulent debt a year, means that they only pass that loss on to their other customers or to the merchant members of the plan.

Two years ago banks had about \$815 million out in credit card plans. Today through the use of the mass mailings of unsolicited credit cards, that business has reached a \$2 billion mark and is climbing. There are estimates that the entire credit card industry has a \$13 billion business going for it.

The answer of the industry and the Federal Reserve Board to pleas for support of regulatory legislation is that \$100 million a year loss in fraud doesn't hurt the industry. Credit cards are good for the money changing and bill collecting business. It may be good for their business but it is not good for the families of America and their budgets. It is not good for the merchants who have to turn over a large share of their profit on sales. Most important of all, it is not good for the country. An Evans and Novak column which appeared early this fall, had this to say on the subject of inflation:

"There is a considerable body of opinion which feels that, while the present tight money policy is crippling the housing industry, it has done nothing to curb consumer credit aggravated by the proliferating credit cards."

In reference to the Federal Reserve Board's tight money policy clamped on the country by Mr. William McChesney Martin who is now leaving the Board, I think it is very odd that this same man can urge credit cards spending which adds up to 25% in charges on to consumer spending at the same time he pushes interest rates even higher in a so-called clamp down on other kinds of borrowing. This means to me that the credit card companies are busy tearing down the President's program against inflation.

This is the people's business and the business of the Congress. I believe that my bill will protect credit card mailings in that they will go through the mail in locked mail bags. I believe that a \$100 million dollar loss a year is important to the consumer public and the individual consumer who will pay rather than lose his credit rating or job. It is important to them, it is important to the Congress. The mass mailing of unsolicited credit cards has to be controlled now.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S "PALACE GUARDS"

#### HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I did not know whether to laugh or cry when I picked up the Tuesday edition of the Washington Star and viewed the photograph of the White House guard in his new ceremonial uniform.

My first impression was that a visiting South American dictator had attracted enough attention to merit his photo on page 1.

Imagine my surprise to find that our own President had prompted and approved the design of this uniform for his own White House guards.

While I do not consider myself to be an expert judge of fashions—I know what I like—and I do not like the braided and shakoed "palace guards" now at the White House.

I really do not think it is necessary to have a European or South American look at the White House—if that is what the President has in mind.

Perhaps he will now want to be addressed as "El Presidente."

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the uniform change is just an experiment—an experiment that failed. Let us bring back the American look to the White House—and call the Chief Executive "The President" once again.

#### LEADERSHIP FOR THE 1970'S

#### HON. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, Stanley N. Lundine was inaugurated as mayor of the city of Jamestown, N.Y. At age 30, Mayor Lundine is one of the youngest city officials in the State. Mayor Lundine defeated the Republican incumbent by a sizable majority and his Democratic ticket captured eight of the 12 seats on the city council.

The importance, however, of Mayor Lundine's election and inauguration is not so much that he is a Democrat, rather, it is an offer to the people of Jamestown. An opportunity to meet the complex demands of the coming decade. As a graduate of Duke University and New York University Law School, Mayor Lundine brings to his office a capability that is sorely needed.

As Mayor Lundine himself said:

I saw Jamestown going downhill. There seemed to be no long-term goals and no respect for the advice of professional planners or of a concerned citizenry. I finally concluded if we are going to take a new direction, we who have a stake in our city's future must make the sacrifice and become actively involved.

Stanley Lundine has faced that challenge and now assumes office. I know that the people of Jamestown and western New York wish him every success in governing the city of Jamestown. Under his leadership, Jamestown will move forward. I am enclosing an article from the Buffalo Evening News commenting on his election:

NEW MAYOR HOPES TO MOVE JAMESTOWN

JAMESTOWN, December 22.—"Frankly, it has not been my life's ambition to be mayor of a small city," Stanley N. Lundine confided last October to the Jamestown Jaycees but he will become exactly that Jan. 1. At 30, he will be one of the state's youngest mayors.

Heading a "blue ribbon" Democratic ticket last month, the young attorney unseated Republican Mayor Charles B. Magnuson by a vote of 7595 to 5830. The Democrats captured eight seats on the 12-member City Council.

"I saw Jamestown going downhill," Mr. Lundine declared. "There seemed to be no long-term goals and no respect for the advice of professional planners or of a concerned citizenry. I finally concluded if we are going to take a new direction, we who have a stake in our city's future must make the sacrifice and become actively involved."

CORPORATION COUNSEL'S AIDE

Mr. Lundine's interest in government was given a boost in 1959 when, at Duke University, he was chosen to accompany John F. Kennedy, then a Massachusetts senator, on a tour of the campus. "It was a day," he said, "I'll never forget."

After graduating from New York University Law School, he returned to Jamestown to practice law with Alfred G. Ford and in 1965 was named associate corporation counsel by Democratic Mayor Frederick H. Dunn.

A native of Jamestown, the mayor-elect is the son of Mr. and Mrs. G. Elving Lundine. His father is president of Dowcraft Corp. in Falconer. His wife, Karol, is an English instructor at Jamestown Community College.

**WILL FIGHT FOR YOUTH**

Noting that "Jamestown is getting the reputation of being a good city to be from," he declared: "To deny we have a problem with the exodus of talented youngsters is to ignore patent facts."

He has pledged to establish a youth opportunity commission to study the extent of the problem and propose solutions.

The mayor-elect already has announced he will create the post of ombudsman for Jamestown "to provide a direct link between the people and their government." He will name Sam Nalbene, a long-time labor union representative. At the same time, he said he will abolish the position of city personnel director, creating speculation that Mr. Nalbene will represent the city at employee bargaining sessions.

**CALLS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

The youthful Democrat advocates merging city and county Social Services. He has called on the county to provide a road system to serve urban areas including an "outer belt" connecting Lakewood and Falconer.

As Planning Commission chairman the past two years, he has charged capital projects have been mismanaged.

"There are a plethora of federal and state aid programs we have not looked into," Mr. Lundine said.

Robert Kennedy, he recalls, was fond of quoting George Bernard Shaw's comment that "some people see things as they are and ask why, I see things that never were and ask why not?"

Starting Jan. 1, Stanley Lundine plans to find out "why not."

**U.S.S. "MOUNT WHITNEY"**

**HON. BOB WILSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, on January 8, I had the privilege of participating in the launching of a new amphibious flagship the U.S.S. *Mount Whitney*. This great new vessel, the first of its type in the U.S. fleet was christened by the beautiful wife of Adm. William I. Martin.

Naturally, we boastful Californians are pleased and proud that this new ship was named after the highest peak in the continental United States and wish her many years of safe and effective action in defense of our country.

I include as a portion of my remarks a resolution passed by the Board of Supervisors, County of Inyo, State of California, relative to this new flagship:

**RESOLUTION 70-3**

Whereas, the Federal Government has built an Amphibious Force Flagship (LCC-20); and

Whereas, the Federal Government has chosen to name this Flagship after the most majestic and highest peak in the Sierra Nevada Mountain Range; and

Whereas, this Mountain Peak is the highest peak in the first 48 States of the United States; and

Whereas, this beautiful Mountain Peak is situated within the boundaries of the County of Inyo, State of California; and

Whereas, the County of Inyo Board of Supervisors wish to express their appreciation to the Federal Government for naming this new Amphibious Force Flagship after this national landmark;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Board of Supervisors of the County of Inyo, State of California, do hereby commend the Federal Government, Department of Defense for naming the Amphibious Force Flagship (LCC-20) the "USS Mt. Whitney".  
Passed and approved this 5th day of January 1970.

**AMERICAN JEWISH COMMUNITY IS CONCERNED ABOUT U.S. POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST**

**HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, leaders of major American Jewish organizations from across the country gathered in Washington this week because of their concern over the trend of U.S. policy in the Middle East.

I met with the entire delegation and assured them that I am in complete sympathy with their concern.

Later, I conferred with two delegates from the Niagara Frontier, Samuel J. Weinstein and Donald P. Sheldon, who elaborated on the views of the organizations in my home area.

I am very familiar with the issues involved in the Middle East and I have joined with the dean of the New York delegation (Mr. CELLER) in resolutions calling for U.S. efforts aimed at obtaining peace in the Middle East.

Delegation members rightfully had taken issue with the policy statement issued earlier by Secretary of State Rogers. But the policy position was reversed in a statement sent to the conference by President Nixon. The President emphasized that:

The United States does not intend to negotiate the terms of peace.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that our national policy is now back on the track. As part of my remarks, I include the text of a resolution adopted at this week's conference:

**RESOLUTION ON PEACE IN MIDDLE EAST**  
(Adopted by delegates to the National Emergency Conference on Peace in the Middle East, convened by the Conference of Presidents of major American Jewish organizations, January 25-26, 1970, Washington, D.C.)

The leadership of the American Jewish community, gathered in our nation's capital, expresses its deep anxiety over the direction of United States policy in the Middle East.

We do so as Americans profoundly concerned for our country's national interests; as Jews with a strong sense of kinship with our fellow Jews; as people who share all mankind's yearning for peace.

Since the founding of the State of Israel in 1948 the people and government of the United States have consistently affirmed that it is in America's national interest to support the sovereignty and security of Israel. We are truly gratified that we have received this day from President Richard M. Nixon a clear re-affirmation of this Administration's friendship, understanding and support for Israel. The President stated that "the United States does not intend to negotiate the terms of peace." Earlier, he made clear his belief that the Four Powers "cannot dictate a settlement in the Middle East."

We believe that the attempts of the Four Powers to draft the framework for a settlement have in fact impeded the progress toward a genuine peace.

We believe that the recent specific proposals submitted by our State Department to the Two Power and Four Power talks—which suggest: pre-determined Egypt-Israel and Jordan-Israel borders; that Jordan share in the administration of Jerusalem; and that the Arab refugees be repatriated under a formula that would flood Israel with those bent upon its destruction—endanger the security of Israel and imperil the cause of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. These proposals should be withdrawn forthwith so that the Arab-Israeli negotiations which President Nixon has called for will indeed be undertaken without pre-conditions.

Peace in the Middle East can be attained only if Israel is recognized by her Arab neighbors as a sovereign state with mutually agreed upon secure borders; only if the nations which fought the war make the peace, negotiating freely; only if the Arab lust for vengeance is abandoned.

In light of the massive arms shipments to Arab states by the Soviet Union, France and other countries, it is imperative that the United States continue to support the security of Israel with the military equipment she so urgently requires.

We believe that the role of America in the Middle East is to bring the parties together in direct negotiations; to stand firm against Soviet pressure, and above all to provide Israel with sufficient economic and military strength to deter any Arab ruler from aggression.

We dedicate ourselves to the achievement of a just and lasting peace, fulfilling the divine promise spoken by the immortal prophet of Israel: Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

**THE STAR-LEDGER SELECTED FOR AWARDS**

**HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to note that the Star-Ledger, the outstanding newspaper published in Newark, N.J., recently received the New Jersey Press Association awards for best editorial and best feature reporting. We all look to the editorials of our daily newspapers to provide informed and reasoned opinion on issues important to the people in the communities they serve. That the Star-Ledger has more than fulfilled this responsibility is evident from the citation on the editorial award that:

Star-Ledger editorials are solid, hard-hitting and there is never any doubt as to the paper's editorial position. All are marked by a high degree of purpose, clarity and audacity, which readers respect.

I insert an article describing the awards, from the Star-Ledger of January 17, 1970, in the RECORD at this point:

**TWO FIRST-PLACE AWARDS WON BY STAR-LEDGER**

The Star-Ledger received awards for best editorial and best feature reporting, in the New Jersey Press Association contest for newspapers, it was announced yesterday.

The awards were presented last night at a dinner highlighting the association's annual meeting in the Dennis Hotel, Atlantic City.

An editorial entitled "Reversing the Tide" by Star-Ledger editorial page editor Neal Cocchia was awarded first place by the judges. The Verona Plan, a page one news feature on the busing of Newark school children to Verona, by Star-Ledger education writer Robert J. Braun, won first prize in the best reporting-feature category.

The judges' comment on the best editorial were: "Star-Ledger editorials are solid, hard-hitting and there is never any doubt as to the paper's editorial position. All are marked by a high degree of purpose, clarity, audacity, which readers respect, I am sure."

A special report on Today's Brides, in the Sunday Star-Ledger by staff writer Nancy Razen took second place in the category of best column of interest to women.

#### OUR NO. 1 PRIORITY—CHECK INFLATION

**HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today supporting President Nixon's veto of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's appropriations bill. I consider the veto, while it may hurt in the short run, as necessary to the long-range benefit of public education.

Within the past 5 days, I have had the opportunity to deliver two speeches in my congressional district on the subject of the HEW appropriations bill. The first was delivered before the Oswego County School Boards Association in Oswego, N.Y., and the second was before the League of Women Voters of Potsdam and Canton, N.Y., in Potsdam.

Because I feel this legislation is so crucial to all Americans, I am inserting here for the RECORD the two speeches:

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN ROBERT C. McEWEN

Of overriding concern to most persons involved in our educational system—teachers, administrators, elected officials—is the matter of financing adequate educations for the children of our country.

As inflation has spiralled ever higher in the decade of the 60's, the problem has grown more and more critical. Where will the money come from? Property taxes at the local level; state aid; federal aid?

There is general agreement that in most areas property taxes have reached a peak and can go no higher without becoming confiscatory.

States, with their fairly limited access to tax sources, also are near the maximum.

The federal government? With the federal government, it is a matter of priorities—defense, education, health, welfare, highways, pollution, control of crime.

Because even at the federal level we cannot tax indefinitely. Even at the federal level we cannot continue to spend that which we do not have. So it is a matter of, as I say, priorities.

And one priority at this time, in fact, the number one domestic priority, is inflation.

Inflation will cost the average family of four \$2,400 more this year to live than it did in 1960. If it is not halted, many families and many businesses will be ruined and the nation will face a major disaster.

And that brings me down to what I want to talk about specifically tonight—the HEW appropriations bill with its \$1.26 billion above budget fund largely for education.

The bill will soon be sent to the President.

The President has made it totally clear that he will veto it, largely because of that extra amount of money.

Let's look for a moment and see what his reasoning is. Because it certainly is different from the reasoning of the very powerful education lobby that is working hard to round up enough votes in the House and the Senate to override that veto.

Let me quote from a letter that was sent to me by Creed Black, an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I am assured that it represents the views of both Secretary Finch and President Nixon.

"Passage of the proposed HEW-Labor-OEO bill in its present form is not in the best interests of the Department or the Nation. Our opposition to the Health, Education, and Welfare portion of the bill is based on the following considerations:

1. The bill would increase inflationary pressures by adding almost \$1.3 billion to the HEW budget proposed by President Nixon.

2. The proposed additional funding comes too late in the year for the additional money to be wisely spent.

3. Most of the proposed increases go to marginal or misdirected programs which need to be overhauled, not expanded.

4. Other portions of the proposed increases go to low priority programs which can be safely deferred until inflation is checked.

5. While compounding the mistakes of the past, the increases ignore the need for new directions in the future.

6. Most of the increases are in mandatory formula grant programs."

But now, let's get into specifics, namely the specific reason why the education lobby seeks to override the veto.

The reason is "impacted aid."

Impacted aid, as you know, is the short term for aid to federally affected school districts—districts which have children whose parents are federal employees.

I do not have to go into the details of what this program is all about. Suffice it to say that it has grown over the years in size and scope to the point where now it is a sacred cow. Few Congressmen dare oppose it, few dare to recommend changes.

Yet the fact is that impacted aid is an unfair program. It gives large sums of money to some quite wealthy districts. In fact, the wealthiest county per capita in the nation, Montgomery County, Maryland, gets the largest amount of impacted aid.

On the other hand, many very poor, very needy school districts get none. In fact, Montgomery County, Maryland, in 1968, received \$5.8 million, and the nation's 100 poorest counties received \$3.2 million.

Some school districts would go bankrupt without it, but some use it to keep property taxes abnormally low purely for frills.

The program needs reform. Period. And I can tell you tonight that HEW, which had the respected Battelle Memorial Institute of Columbus, Ohio, do a thorough study of the situation, will urge Congress to make major reforms this year.

But getting back to the program as it now stands, in 1968 the Congress appropriated 525 million dollars for it for the year ending June 30, 1969. Last year the Congress appropriated nothing. It just dragged its feet. A bill that should have been sent to the President by June 30 has not been sent to him yet, with more than half of the year already gone.

That bill contains \$600 million for impacted aid, compared to \$520 million last year. This is an increase of \$80 million. But more than that, it is an increase of \$400 million over the budget figures that had been recommended for this year by President Johnson before he went out of office and that was adhered to by the Nixon Administration.

The reason for the big budget decrease is that it provides only for school districts

which have children whose parents work and live on federal land. In other words, for those people who pay no taxes either directly or indirectly toward the support of schools.

Traditionally, Congress has paid for another category, too; this is for children whose parent or parents are federal employees, but who do not also live on federal land.

And that, you see, is the rub.

The question is, should the federal government subsidize school districts whose children's parents are already providing a tax base?

HEW thinks not, although admittedly there are a few districts which really need it.

Congressmen who live in districts getting this help may have varying opinions, but all are under pressure to vote for it.

Under ordinary circumstances and in ordinary years, there might be some justification for asking for the \$600 million. But these are neither ordinary circumstances nor ordinary years.

We are in the middle of an inflation. A basic part of controlling inflation is keeping federal spending under control and balancing the federal budget.

The President is determined to do this. In his State of the Union Message yesterday, he told us bluntly that "to present and stay within a balanced budget requires hard decisions. It means rejecting spending programs which would benefit some of the people when their net effect would result in price increases for all of the people."

Clearly, the President thinks the HEW budget falls within that category.

But since we have inflation, the question is asked, "Shouldn't we finance the schools adequately enough to overcome the adverse effects of it?"

The answer seems to be, "You can't, at least not at the current rate of inflation."

Let me quote from School Management magazine of this month.

I quote: "Until inflation cools down, school districts that increase spending will, in effect, simply be spinning their wheels; school districts that fail to increase spending will face program cutbacks. While many administrators complain bitterly, these days, about the adverse effect on education of the Nixon Administration's tough anti-inflation measures, the cost of education index makes it abundantly clear that inflation itself is far more damaging than any of the attempts to bring it under control."

It seems clear then, that the President's efforts to curb inflation, while they may hurt in the short run, are necessary to the long range benefit of public education.

For that reason alone, I feel justified in supporting this veto. And I shall.

But, please, before you ride me out of here on a rail, don't think either I or the President is completely heartless.

I feel sure that if the veto is sustained the Congress will be asked to find a compromise between the figure in the President's budget and the figure in the bill. Nobody wants to see schools closed or children deprived. I am convinced it will not happen.

There is one other question that I am asked about the President's action, and that has to do with mandatory spending.

Many persons asked, "Why doesn't the President sign the bill and then just not allocate all the funds?"

Now, it is true that this can be done in some cases, but this case is different. Most of the money contained in the extra \$1.26 billion is in the form of mandatory grants.

The President's own lawyers at the Justice Department have ruled that in these cases he has no discretionary powers; he must spend the money. If he does not, then the Courts can force him to.

It is that simple that it is another powerful reason for the veto.

Finally, the question is asked, "Supposing the veto is overridden, then what?"

The answer is that the President will then be forced to cut spending in the HEW budget wherever he can. Unfortunately, there is likely to be in the area of medical research and other programs that may be even more essential than the impacted aid program.

I am sure none of us here wants that.

In closing, let me repeat what I said at the beginning. It is a matter of priorities. Our first priority is solving the inflation problem.

To do that will take difficult decisions on the part of the President and on the part of those who believe like he does.

My decision, as I say, is to support the veto. In the long run, actions like these, unpleasant as they may be, heartless as they may be made to appear, will save the value of our currency and will insure the perpetuation of a sound public school system.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN ROBERT C. MC-EWEN, BEFORE THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

I welcomed your invitation to again meet with you, and it is, indeed, a pleasure for me to be here.

Meeting, as we are, in close proximity to four fine institutions of higher learning, and seeing before me so many who are closely associated with these colleges, it seemed to me that this would be an appropriate place to speak on the subject of education.

I believe that the time is right also, for the announced intention of our President to veto the Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Bill, and the anticipated vote in the House of Representatives to sustain or override such a veto, are much in the news at this time. I would also add that there are those who have high hopes of making it a political issue in the coming campaigns.

But before we do that, and in the calm and nonpartisan environment of this meeting, there are some thoughts that I would like to share with you. Following that, I shall expect your questions and comments. I know by my experience from past meetings with you ladies of the League of Women Voters, I shall not be disappointed, for while my answers will not be as edifying as we might both wish, I know that your questions and comments will be stimulating to me.

The education of our young people is a tradition which dates from the earliest days of our country. The right to an education has always been considered of the utmost importance from the days of the colonies, throughout the development of the States up through the present.

Historically, the responsibility for education has rested with the local communities. Gradually the States became involved and then in 1965 the Federal government became involved on a large scale. The Federal and State roles, however, have been and should continue to be supplementary to the efforts of the local community or school district. This practice assures us that we will have a strong voice in the education of our children—a process that is popularly known as local control of education. Local control is an all encompassing term which includes the financing of education, and some of the aspects of school administration. Today I am concerned with the financial aspects of local control because financial problems cannot be solved just merely by talking and planning—it takes action.

Each community has a responsibility to provide the best education possible for its children. As I have mentioned before, this is a tradition but it is also an obligation. America is still a country where we provide for ourselves. The role the State and Federal governments is playing is indeed large in terms of overall dollars spent, but it is not in any way designed to take the place of local initiative. In terms of education, there

is a partnership which has developed and one in which the Federal government is definitely a junior partner.

I do not think it can be denied that there is a financial crisis today in education. Revenue for schools has become more and more difficult to acquire. Many school districts have taxed as much as possible. Others are reluctant to seek school bond issues because they are consistently turned down by the voters. At the 1969 meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, money was one of the top issues. Many of the nearly 30,000 school leaders attending the conference thought it was the most important issue. Speakers consistently mentioned financial problems as associated with many of the other problems in their school districts and States. The financial problems we have here are shared by a significant number of districts throughout the country. In Youngstown, Ohio, the voters refused school bond issue after another, and the result was that schools had to be closed. Who was hurt by this situation? The children made up the class hours during the summer, but I think educators will agree that a two month recess in the middle of the year should be avoided. Many families had to rearrange their summer plans because of school, teachers were inconvenienced and the life of the community was disrupted. Voters finally did pass a bond issue and the problem was resolved temporarily. Other school districts have been and are in danger of closing. Others have to be satisfied with teachers who are willing to work for an inadequate salary, and to be content with unsatisfactory physical equipment and buildings. I am confident that the number of school districts with similar or even identical problems with those here would be quite large. There are problems within every State, and I think it could be said that every State is working on solutions to them.

The Federal role in education is indeed expanding. During the school year 1967-68, the Federal government provided \$2,271,909,000 to the revenues of public elementary and secondary schools. This accounted for 7.7% of the revenue of public schools. On the other hand, the State provided 40.3% of the total and local sources provided 52% of the total. It is obvious that the Federal government is definitely the junior partner in the financing of education. In the State of New York, the Federal government provided 4.4% of the total revenues. As I am sure you are aware, the Federal government has a multitude of programs for education. Each with its own set of guidelines and priorities. Probably the most ambitious in its goal is Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act—Assistance for Disadvantaged Children. Title II of the ESEA during the first 2 years of its existence has allowed the procurement of over 45 million textbooks and library books by schools to help stock libraries and provide the latest teaching materials to even the most rural school. Bilingual programs have made breakthroughs in language barriers that previously meant many children could not understand their teachers and never achieved according to their potential.

Other programs provide assistance to school districts which are over-burdened because of non-taxable Federal property. Over the last ten years, Federal outlays for education have gone from \$2 billion in 1960 to an estimated \$9.8 billion for 1970. These figures include not only programs administered by the Office of Education, but those which are considered as education in other agencies, i.e., Office of Economic Opportunity, National Science Foundation, etc.

Even with an expenditure as large as nearly \$10 billion, the funds spent for education amount to only 5% of the total Federal budget. This is obvious evidence that

education still remains the responsibility of the State and local sector rather than the Federal government.

As important as education is in this country, we have a multitude of other problems which must be solved. Some of the most devastating are those of poverty, health and pollution. The poverty cycle which traps millions of Americans is a national problem which must receive a high priority if we are to reduce both its numbers and its severity. The breakdown in health care in this country has caused a health crisis which must be given a high priority if every American is to have an equal opportunity to live a healthy and happy life. And, of course, pollution is a menace which all of you know first hand, and one which must be given the highest priority if we are not to turn America into a wasteland. Indeed, there are many programs which must necessarily receive a higher priority than education in the Federal framework.

If we stop and think about programs which are supported by the Federal government and are operating here in St. Lawrence County, we can see worthy programs which could benefit many people if they were enlarged. For example, the manpower training programs are an essential part of our attempts to eliminate poverty. The unemployed and underemployed often need only to learn a marketable skill to be able to raise themselves out of poverty. The nurse training program here is a good example of a profession which can be learned—the result of which benefits the individual with a steady income and the rewards of self-satisfaction and the community with a supply of well-qualified people to provide the vital service.

Additional funds for water pollution would benefit the entire community. Additional funds for student loan programs would enable more of our young people to go on to college either here or away. Urban renewal programs would help our towns and benefit each one of us and especially those living in certain areas. And probably one of the potentially most effective programs to help us are those which encourage economic development. Under these programs, industry is encouraged to locate in rural areas thereby providing jobs for local people and additional revenue for businesses in the communities as well as the families involved.

Like Tennyson's brook, I have wandered. From education, I appear to have digressed to poverty, health and pollution; manpower training programs and MDTA's licensed practical nurse training program, in particular; the abatement of water pollution, urban renewal and economic development.

These, too, are priority needs. They certainly are if you happen to be the family living in poverty, or the person in need of health services, or the community with urban blight or facing the loss of potable water supply, or the man in need of training to equip himself with an employable skill, or the woman who wants to help herself and serve others as a licensed practical nurse. Depending on our own location and situation, priorities appear somewhat differently to each of us.

Thus, I should not evidence surprise if school administrators find that the road of least resistance is to blame the State or Federal governments for their fiscal problems. And consequently to sit back and wait for the State and Federal governments to solve them.

Your Congressman, from his particular location and situation, tries to see all of these priority needs, while at the same time, viewing them all in relation to what he sees as our number one domestic priority—control of inflation. For inflation has hurt us all.

For the average family of four, it now costs \$2,400 per year more for living expenses than it did just ten years ago. This statement, I am sure, will come as no surprise to you ladies whose many duties include that of being the family purchasing agent.

That same inflation, the fires of which were fueled by this decade's large Federal budget deficits during prior years, has most cruelly robbed the poor, the welfare recipient and the senior citizen living upon a limited and fixed income.

So, too, this same inflation has been costly to our efforts to improve the quality of education. This month's issue of "School Management" says, "Inflation is roaring through education's fiscal forest like a fire blazing out of control. Dollars spent for books, buildings, salaries and services are going up in smoke." The article then goes on to point out that our cost of education index shows this year's increase to be nearly 13% over 1968-69. Last year, the article points out, school spending increased 11%, but, says the article, "While spending reached record heights in 1968-69, so did inflation, which rose nearly 10 index points, or almost 7%, wiping out much of the 11% increase in spending."

We must give top priority to curbing inflation. Our efforts in this are unfinished and success is still in doubt.

We must get inflation under control before it crushes those individuals most vulnerable. We must get inflation under control before it destroys the nation's capacity for social progress.

#### THE 52D ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

#### HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, once again, I am glad to have this opportunity to join my colleagues in celebrating that historic day 52 years ago when the noble Ukrainian people proclaimed their independence.

These gallant lovers of freedom have been fighting Russians since 1667, when the czars first began annexing their lands, and since that time their soil has been nourished by the blood of Ukrainian patriots.

On January 22, 1918, the dreams harbored for centuries were fulfilled when the Ukrainian lands were united into one independent and sovereign nation, and the Act of Independence and Union was proclaimed in Kiev, their national capital.

It is one of the great tragedies of history that the freedom of these magnificent people was destined to be short lived. The Bolshevik government which seized power following the overthrow of the czars, moved quickly to conquer the Ukraine. For 3½ years these valiant people defended their homeland against the onslaught of the Communist hordes, but were finally overwhelmed by full might of the fanatic Red forces.

Although prisoners in their own land today, neither political repression nor religious persecution by their oppressors can destroy the intense desire for free-

dom which burns so brightly in the hearts of these great people.

As we celebrate this anniversary, it is a privilege to join with freedom-loving people everywhere to salute the courage, patriotism, and profound dedication to liberty which is an integral part of the Ukrainian character, and an inspiration to all mankind. I share their hope that the peaceful liberation of their homeland will be soon realized.

#### CONGRESSMAN CONYERS' 1970 QUESTIONNAIRE

#### HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, as in the past I am sending this year to my constituents a questionnaire designed to outline for me the opinions of the First Congressional District of Michigan. A number of my colleagues have asked me for a list of the questions I will ask. For their information I am including the questionnaire at this point in the RECORD. The title of it is: "Congressman Conyers Wants Your Opinion." The text follows:

#### CONGRESSMAN CONYERS' 1970 QUESTIONNAIRE

##### I. NATIONAL PRIORITIES

1. Do you feel we should spend more on (a) housing (b) education (c) welfare (d) job training (e) other domestic problems? (Circle)?

2. Do you feel the Federal government should make it its highest responsibility to insure that there are jobs for everyone who wants to work?

3. Has any member of your family been laid-off during the past year, and does it appear that they will be anytime in the near future?

4. Should we reduce annual spending on (a) Vietnam (\$30 bil) (b) space program (\$4 bil) (c) military (\$70 bil) (d) foreign aid (\$2 bil) (Circle)?

##### II. VIETNAM

A. Do you support? 1. Immediate withdrawal of all American forces; 2. Continued withdrawal at the present level?

B. Do you feel President Nixon is sincere about ending the war?

##### III. VOLUNTEER ARMY

1. Do you favor replacing the draft with a volunteer army?

##### IV. PRESIDENT NIXON

1. Do you feel President Nixon's attitudes towards blacks has improved?

2. Do you feel President Nixon has further polarized the nation?

##### V. LAW ENFORCEMENT

1. Do you feel that there are underlying causes that account for the increase in crime in the streets?

2. Is police abuse and brutality on the increase?

##### VI. VOTING

1. Should the voting age be lowered to eighteen?

##### VII. MIDDLE EAST

1. Do you favor direct negotiations between the Arabs and Israelis to end the conflict in the Middle East?

#### THE YOUNG KENTUCKIANS

#### HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, Kentucky has given some of her finest young men to the war in Vietnam. Some have paid the supreme sacrifice, their lives; others have been wounded; while others have had to undergo the grinding, behind-the-lines support action which is often so difficult because of the boredom inherent in such tasks. All these men are brave and fine representatives of the Bluegrass State and of America.

In the December 1969 Veterans of Foreign Wars magazine, there is an article by Hal Drake, entitled "The Young Kentuckians," which tells the story of a group of young men from Carrollton, Ky., whose National Guard unit was called up to war in Vietnam. These men of the 138th Artillery deserve our praise and our thanks. The article follows:

#### THE YOUNG KENTUCKIANS (By Hal Drake)

They all spoke with the same dry and friendly accent about the same things—the same town, the same high school, the same girls.

One of them turned down a portable phonograph playing Hank Williams' "There'll Be No Teardrops Tonight" and offered an open can of warm beer to a visitor. "Here. We'll make a Kentuckian out of you. Kentuckians drink beer."

All the youngsters who sat behind a track-mounted 155mm howitzer—a ponderous machine that resembles a rolling pillbox—were from Carrollton, Ky. A year before, they were working on highways, raising hell at drive-ins and making marriage plans. Then they got the word—by radio, telephone or word of mouth. No more once-a-week meetings at the National Guard Armory in Carrollton. This was it; they were in. The 138th Artillery was called up—even if everybody in it had just sweated out the long Pueblo crisis, as their older brothers had once barely cleared the Berlin Blockade.

They were rudely and swiftly dumped into a fourth dimension called Vietnam—and now sat on a mountain that had been beheaded and stripped by bulldozers, an awful place called Fire Support Base Bastogne.

A fire base is a cocked mace of crushing firepower—a compact but powerful concentration of artillery that can throw a heavy package of steel-jacketed explosive in any direction. Below the Kentuckians, a battery of large and deafening 175mm howitzers were making life uncomfortable and perhaps very short for crouching enemy in the A Shau Valley. The smaller guns of the National Guard outfit were spidered in all directions, at the low-lying cowl of thickly-forested mountains around the fire base.

The youngsters from Carrollton had nothing to do; they had not fired since the previous afternoon, when the forward observer saw some figures moving through a nearby treeline. He instantly decided they were not friends of his. He called back and the artillerymen piled into the hot, narrow, turret-like housing of the gun. For 45 minutes, they mechanically hoisted rounds into a yawning breech, then braced and winced as the barrage went out with a loud, heavy slam. A tree-line ahead was smothered in a heave of dust and flame. They fired 150 times—hard, shirts-off, ear-battering work.

Now—nothing. They only stood and waited to fire. They may fire one round a day or 1,000, depending on which way an unpredictable war might go. It is a formless, directionless war with no fixed lines, firmly secured flanks or pinpointed enemies—a war in which an enemy battalion can suddenly materialize in a thick, empty woods and a decisive, blood-poker battle can start after two patrols accidentally stumble into each other.

A stack of canvas-covered ammunition crates became a table for an outdoor hearts game, and a portable phonograph that had traveled 13,500 miles played Hank Williams. They wrote letters and read paperback novels. They talked of the other world they had known only a year before—the world that had changed with bewildering speed.

"I'd just got off construction work on Highway 71," 22-year-old Eddie L. Satchwell recalls. "I pulled into the teenage center, ready for a good night and a fine time. A bunch ran up and said, 'You're activated.' I told them to knock it off—don't even kid like that. I didn't believe anybody until I went back out to the car and turned on the radio. That was it; before I know what was happening, I was over here.

"Hell, it's all right. Wasn't as bad I thought. I'm kind of grateful for it now; I wouldn't have known what any of this stuff was about if I hadn't come over. It's not so much dangerous up here as it is monotonous."

True enough. The Kentuckians have never seen the face of the enemy—nor even heard the slashing whistle of an incoming round. When the first group moved into the fire base, astride a footpath that is being widened into a highway, the guns kept up a thunderous, all-hours racket. Cpl. Earl W. Wilson told of the time, "when Charlie was running all over the valley," when the guns poured out 900 rounds in 24 hours—so many that trucks went out on an insecure road, rolling back and forth to the Gia Le Combat Base to keep the smoking howitzer breeches fed. A cease fire and stand down did not come until 3 a.m.

Now the young Kentuckians are very good about keeping in touch with their families. Letter writing is a fine way to fill dead time. Even the hearts game takes on a dull, go-through-the-motions monotony.

"Fire mission!" The hearts players stuff their cards in their pockets. Satchwell lays an open paperback face down on the canvas. They run to the gun. One round screeches out. They walk back. Cards are carefully retrieved from pockets and the game resumes. Satchwell picks up his book. No need to glance at the title; it could be anything from Ernest Haycox to Aldous Huxley. It will pass through every hand in the gun section and the fire base, until the pages are thin as ancient parchment and the book falls to pieces. Reading is something to do—even if you only stare blankly at big words.

There they are—a good part of a whole generation in a small town. They are here because they have to be, doing it because it must be done. It is hard to forget any of them—Earl Wilson, Duane Marsh, Wayne Smith, Eddie L. Satchwell.

"They wanted the best Kentucky had," Satchwell grinned, "so they called us."

The Paris peace talks? Nobody took the discussions seriously; nobody expected an overnight miracle to bring them home. Walk down a dirt road and talk to 1st Sgt. Leland W. Hocutt, 43, of Wendell, N.C. His outfit, C. Btry., 1st Bn., 83rd Arty., is busier and noisier than the other units—the 175s are slamming into enemy bunkers and supply caches in the valley. There is little time to read and, to Hocutt, the negotiations are non-news anyway.

"Now ain't that the damndest bunch of dirty boogie you ever seen?" he asks disgustedly.

There was another shattering roar from Bastogne, named by the 101st Airborne Division, which the base supports, for the little Belgian town that was a focal point for the Battle of the Bulge. On the way back to Gia Le is another thunderstorm of firepower—Fire Support Base Birmingham. It sat atop a hill overlooking roosting helicopters that swallowed loads of young paratroopers, lurched aloft and headed into the valley. The road that runs past the fire bases will thrust through the A Shau Valley when troops clear the way with rifles so the bulldozers can go to work.

At Gia Le, you meet another reservist. Sp/5 John K. Smithson is 25, newly married and from Washington, Pa.

"On 11 April, 1968," Smithson relates, "I was sitting there with my fiancée, watching TV—and it flashed over the noon news. You know what we were doing then? Talking about our wedding. It was really a blow to both of us. We got married on the 27th and I left May 13—just two weeks together.

"No, I'm not mad about anything. I drove a truck for six months, bringing everything up to the fire bases. It was a great satisfaction to see the guys out in the field and help them out. This is just something that has to be done..."

#### THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE UNITED STATES JAYCEES

#### HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 50th anniversary of the founding of the United States Jaycees. I am privileged to join my colleagues in saluting this outstanding organization and recognizing the many services they perform, touching vital areas of American life.

The Jaycees came into existence on the strength of a very simple but valid idea—to teach civic responsibility and to express the viewpoint of the younger man; while, at the same time, promoting Americanism in general and many more specific and commendable goals.

The complete record of the Jaycees during the past half century would be impossible to recount, for it would have to contain the dreams and achievements of hundreds of thousands of young men in chapters throughout the world. The success of their projects is American democracy and ingenuity at work—the story of young men building and developing themselves and their communities.

Local problems of every kind receive the attention of Jaycees in the chapters around the Fifth District of Alabama at Tuscaloosa, Bessemer, Clanton, Demopolis, Marion, York, and Livingston. As a former Tuscaloosa Jaycee, I can be thankful for the many treasured friendships developed as we went about our work in the community.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to pay tribute to the Jaycees on this significant anniversary. I applaud their achievements and wish them well in future endeavors knowing that whatever project

they may undertake, they will be acting as community-minded citizens, concerned with making America a better place to live.

#### U.S. POLICY TOWARD ISRAEL

#### HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, on December 22, 1969, Ted Szulc reported in the New York Times that David Rockefeller, chairman of the board of the Chase Manhattan Bank, John J. McCloy, former president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, Robert B. Anderson, former Secretary of the Treasury, and former director of Dresser Industries Co., and others met with the President on December 9 and advised him against continuing the present policy of allegedly supporting Israel in its confrontation with the Arab countries. Of course, Chase Manhattan Bank has many interests and connections with oil in the Middle East and Dresser Industries Co. has oil interests in Kuwait and Libya.

It appears from the article that the group basically argued that the oil industry was suffering because our policies toward Israel have had adverse effects on the economic and political reaction of the Arab States, that "the United States must act immediately to improve its relations with oil-producing and other Arab States."

EDWARD I. KOCH, my very able colleague from New York, immediately challenged Mr. David Rockefeller on this approach and this attempt to exert pressure on American foreign policy which pressure was so closely aligned with the business interests of Chase Manhattan and Dresser. He wrote Mr. Rockefeller on December 22 pointing out that he believed it to be "in our national interest to support the State of Israel as the one democratic government in that area which from its inception has identified with the United States." He further pointed out that it is for this very reason that Israel "has gained the enmity of the Soviet Union." He then asked Mr. Rockefeller whether the thrust of Mr. Szulc's article was correct, concluding:

While you and Chase Manhattan Bank have an absolute right to take any position you deem correct in support of your economic interests and while I have no quarrel with your having financial agreements with any of the Arab states, I want you to know that when you attempt to influence the foreign policy of the United States so as to support your economic interests, you run the risk of having those who disagree with you undertake a campaign designed to render effects which would be economically adverse for the Chase Manhattan Bank.

Mr. KOCH then stated that the survival of Israel was of utmost importance to him and to his constituents, "Jews and Christians alike." He asked for a response and a discussion of the matter.

Mr. David Rockefeller then answered on December 29 as follows:

I appreciate your interest in my views on the current situation in the Middle East.

I think you will recognize that my chief desire, which I'm sure you share, is to see that peace is achieved in that troubled region, a peace taking fully into account the legitimate aspirations of the parties involved.

A recent visit to the Middle East reinforced my conviction that the continuing hostilities there could easily escalate into a full-scale war. I believe, though, that this possibility could be averted if both the United States and the Soviet Union were willing to support a balanced peace formula.

Any such formula admittedly would require concessions by both Israelis and Arabs on such issues as boundaries, refugees, access to waterways, security arrangements and the like. But it would seem to me to offer both sides their best hope of achieving fundamental goals without the holocaust of another war—a war which neither they nor the rest of the world can afford to risk at this time.

The deepening of Middle East tensions in the past two years and the apparent retreat of both parties from compromise undoubtedly have made it more difficult for Washington or the United Nations or anyone else to serve as peacemaker.

Nevertheless, my own observations during my Middle East trip convinced me that thoughtful Arabs are beginning to question whether the current turmoil in the area really furthers their own interests. More and more of them appear disposed to explore reasonable compromises.

In such explorations, the United States should not under any circumstances try to impose a dictated settlement on either side. Nor should we encourage steps that would undermine Israel's strength and security as a sovereign nation. However, we should be mindful that while Israel's short-term security might perhaps be buttressed by military superiority, her longer-term security would be far better served by cultivating Arab moderation.

In view of this, it seems to me the prudent course would be to seek an accommodation—through direct negotiations between the parties—that would contribute not only to Israel's future security but to legitimate Arab goals as well, and thus to the preservation of peace in the region.

Believing as I do that the situation is sufficiently critical and the stakes of war or peace sufficiently high to warrant the best thinking of all concerned citizens, I would be pleased to meet with you as you suggest to discuss this matter further.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

DAVID ROCKEFELLER.

Though no one can quarrel with the proposition that it would be desirable, ultimately, to bring about peace in the Middle East through voluntary agreement between the Arab States and Israel, Mr. Rockefeller's letter was not, in fact, responsive to that of Congressman KOCH. It did not clarify what he thought the position of the United States should be in the interim—before more salubrious relations for peace between Israel and the Arab States and more congenial relations for negotiation between the United States and the Soviet Union are attained.

Obviously, under present conditions, a unilateral change in U.S. attitude toward Israel and the Arab world in the direction of neutrality would result in Israel's natural democratic friend, the United States, being neutral and the Soviet Union, the long-time collaborationist with the Arab States, continuing to be these states'

active and partisan ally. In the wake of the French sale of 110 planes to Libya, absolute neutrality for the United States would be like the neutrality we observed in Spain when Hitler and Mussolini were supplying Franco.

Congressman KOCH very appropriately answered in his address before the American Jewish Congress on January 11, 1970, as follows:

On December 22, a Ted Szulc article in the New York Times described a meeting of December 9th between President Nixon, David Rockefeller and several others. I was extremely distressed by the sense of that article which implied that Mr. Rockefeller, among others, had urged that the United States alter its Mid East policy so as to have it more favorably received by the Arab States. I wrote to him asking whether the article accurately reflected his advice to the President.

His letter of December 29th was not, in my judgment, responsive and I so advised him on January 5th. I personally met with Mr. Rockefeller on January 8th to further discuss the matter. On that occasion he did respond directly to my questions and stated that with one exception the article accurately reflected his point of view. The exception was that he felt there was an unfair implication that his advice to the President was motivated by his concern for the business interests of the Chase Manhattan Bank. I advised him that there is clearly a fundamental disagreement between us concerning Israel and its security and, what in fact, is in the best interest of the United States.

I believe that the policies of our government are affected, not only by public office holders, but also by the opinions of respected men and women in prominent positions in the private sector. Consequently, Mr. Rockefeller's position continues to be a legitimate matter of public concern, and my constituent mail makes clear that this is so. At our meeting, I urged him to make a public statement explaining his position. On the same day he did issue a clarifying statement. Everyone interested in this subject must decide for himself whether Mr. Rockefeller's new statement is satisfactory from their point of view. From my point of view it is not.

I do not believe that it is in our national interest to change the policy of our government vis-a-vis Israel so as to make it more acceptable to the Arab States. I prefer and support the position that President Nixon espoused when he was Candidate Nixon . . . and that was, "I support a policy that would give Israel a technological military margin to more than offset her hostile neighbors' numerical superiority."

Unfortunately the campaign rhetoric has not been fulfilled and we have seen under the present administration a change in policy which euphemistically has been labeled a "balanced policy". Yes, the scales have been tipped, but tipped adversely, to Israel and its security. The advice given by David Rockefeller, John McCloy and those others who met with President Nixon on December 9th can only tip them further in that direction. Therefore, each of us here assembled must work doubly hard to restore that policy which was predicated on the preservation of the sovereignty of Israel by providing it with sufficient arms, planes and economic support so as to prevent an attack from any or all of the Arab States.

I applaud my colleague for pointing out so clearly the fallacious and evasiveness of Mr. Rockefeller's reply.

I agree with Chairman CELLER's statement, in his declaration in support of peace in the Middle East, that—

All the people of the Middle East have a common goal in striving to wipe out the scourges of disease, poverty, illiteracy and to meet together in good faith to achieve peace and turn their swords into ploughshares.

But until they do in fact realize that this is the proper common goal, as Chairman's CELLER's declaration states:

It is not in the interest of the United States or in the service of world peace to create the impression that Israel will be left defenseless in face of the continuing flow of sophisticated offensive armaments to the Arab nations supplied by the Soviet Union and other sources.

With this viewpoint I entirely agree.

#### ASSAULT ON PRIVATE SCHOOL SYSTEMS BY FEDERAL JUDICIARY

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the assault on private school systems in this country by the Federal judiciary must be repelled, and it must be repelled now.

The outrageous decision by three Federal judges in Washington, denying tax exemptions to some private schools in Mississippi, is certainly characteristic of the discriminatory nature of the court where the South is concerned.

Yet, there is another profound danger in this latest rape of the law. I have warned my colleagues more than once that letting the judicial branch write laws, simply because for the moment they have application only to the South, a favorite whipping boy since time in memoriam, is simply allowing the constitutional powers of the legislative branch to be eaten away.

Surely all in this body are aware that section 501(c)(3) of the Tax Code says that a nonprofit organization is exempt from Federal taxes if it is organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary or educational purposes. We ought to know this. We wrote the law.

If my colleagues are not concerned with the loss of their power to make laws, even the ones under which the Internal Revenue Service operate, they will be most concerned when the Federal decrees now clubbing helpless southern school boards, schoolchildren, and their parents, begin to strike their own constituencies.

As the saying goes, a hit dog hollers—and where the dog happens to be at the time makes little difference. It still hurts.

I am today introducing legislation to amend sections 501 and 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that tax-exempt status under section 501 shall not be denied to a private school on account of the admission policies, requirements for admission, or composition of the student body or faculty of such school.

If a court of the United States enters

a final judgment that the Constitution or laws of the United States prohibit the granting of exempt status to a private school on account of the admission policies, the requirements of admission, or the composition of the student body or faculty of such school, for the period during which such judgment is in effect, then no institution organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, testing for public safety, literacy, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals shall be exempt from taxation.

**THE INSPIRING LIFE OF THE LATE  
MAJ. GEN. THOMAS F. FOLEY OF  
WORCESTER, MASS.**

**HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, perhaps never before has there been a time in our history when the people of this country, particularly our youth, were more in need of and receptive to an inspiring example which, after all, represents the truest teaching.

Such an example is, indeed, provided by the life and deeds of a "noble creature" who, throughout his days, enriched the lives of all his associates and fellow citizens, and the spirit of his community by his hourly projection and daily practice of those immaterial but everlasting virtues and values upon which this Nation was founded and without which no community in our beloved land can long endure.

If ever there was a human model that warranted the admonition "be like this man" that model is personified by the story of the late Maj. Gen. Thomas F. Foley. At this point I would like to include the graphic recital of his life and activities that appeared in the January 26, 1970, issue of the Worcester, Mass., Telegram; the article follows:

**MAJOR GENERAL FOLEY DIES AT 90**

Retired Maj. Gen. Thomas F. Foley, who rose from Army private to National Guard general in a beribboned military career spanning nearly half a century, died yesterday in his home, 17 Circuit Ave.

He was 90.

Gen. Foley was chief of police here for 19 years—1928 to 1947—climaxing a 40-year career in the Worcester Police Department.

To the general public, he was always "Worcester's first soldier."

**AWARD FOR GALLANTRY**

A much-decorated hero of World War I action in France, Gen. Foley held the nation's second-highest award for gallantry—the Distinguished Service Cross.

The municipal athletic field on Chandler Street honors his name—General Foley Stadium.

For 42 consecutive years—1919 through 1960, when he was 80—Gen. Foley marched as marshal at the head of Worcester's annual Nov. 11 Veterans Day parades.

For 46 years he was guest speaker at Memorial Day exercises at Columbus Park Grammar School, at the foot of the hill near his home.

In 1967, when ill health broke the string, 600 school children climbed to the general's

home to bring their Memorial Day observance to him in a touching tribute.

Gen. Foley's military career began during the Spanish-American War. He enlisted May 10, 1898. It ended during World War II. He was commander of the Massachusetts State Guard (the home-front soldiers) when he retired March 16, 1942.

He first served with the 47th New York Infantry, according to records. When the 9th Massachusetts Infantry returned from Cuba, he was accepted as a private in Worcester's so-called Emmet Guards, Company G of what was then the Massachusetts Volunteer Militia, forerunner of today's National Guard.

By 1907, when he was appointed a patrolman in the Worcester Police Department, Gen. Foley had risen to first sergeant in the militia.

He was commissioned a lieutenant in the Emmet Guards in 1908, and in 1912 he was promoted to captain.

It was Capt. Foley who commanded the Emmets during the Mexican Border incident in 1916, and March 25, 1917, he led the city soldiers overseas for duty in France with the famed 26th Yankee Division as part of the American Expeditionary Force in World War I.

The first completely American division to reach France in World War I, the YD also was the first U.S. division to go into battle without the aid of other Allied troops.

Gen. Foley participated in five offensives with the 26th Division, mostly as commander of Company G, 101st Regiment. He won a battlefield commission to the rank of major and was placed in command of the 3rd Battalion, 101st Infantry.

**DSC CITATION**

Machine-gunned and gassed in action, he was awarded the DSC by the commanding general of the AEF, the late General of the Army John J. Pershing.

The citation with his Distinguished Service Cross reads:

"For repeated acts of extraordinary heroism in action near Vaux, France, July 15 to 22, 1918. Throughout the four days of the advance, he commanded and led his battalion with exceptional bravery and judgment, thereby inspiring his men.

"When strong resistance was encountered, he personally went forward and reconnoitered the terrain under heavy machine gun and sniper fire, and on July 15 and again July 22, he personally led his battalion in successful attacks," concludes the DSC citation.

**SILVER STAR**

The 26th Division awarded the then Capt. Foley the Silver Star for gallantry in action during the Second Battle of the Marne, from July 18 to July 25, 1918.

He was awarded the French Legion of Honor by presidential decree May 14, 1919, and the French Croix de Guerre with Palm, April 24, 1919, with the following citation:

"During the advance near Vaux on July 15, 1918, he commanded his battalion with great bravery and intelligence. Leading his men on by advancing in front of them in the face of heavy enemy resistance, and making reconnaissance under violent machine-gun fire, he made two successful attacks with his battalion on July 15 and July 22, 1918."

**OTHER AWARDS**

For heroism in other actions, Gen. Foley was awarded an Oak Leaf for his DSC, and two palms for the Croix de Guerre in lieu of other medals of the same grade from the French government.

He was awarded numerous 26th Division citations for conduct during action in the Chemin-des-Dames sector and in other battles fought by the YD.

Gen. Foley was wounded by shrapnel in the battle at Chateau Thierry. Forced to

seek hospital aid after three days of fighting, he later returned to duty to lead the 101st Battalion in its Meuse-Argonne offensive.

In making the Silver Star presentation, Gen. C. R. Edwards, commander of the 16th Division (Camp Edward was named after him), said:

"If ever there was a gamer fighter in the United States Army, I'd like to know where he is."

**NAMED BRIGADIER**

When Gen. Foley was appointed brigadier general in the National Guard after World War I, Maj. Gen. Edward L. Logan said:

"As a friend Gen. Foley was never anything but loyal. As a soldier he was never anything but true. In the Ninth Massachusetts, and later in the 101st, we looked forward to him and his men. No more loyal, efficient, patriotic citizen ever existed..."

More than 1,000 persons attended the May 1, 1923, tribute to Gen. Foley after his promotion to brigadier general.

**ELECTED CHIEF MARSHAL**

Gen. Foley returned from overseas April 28, 1919, and was promoted to police lieutenant that year.

On Nov. 3, 1919, Worcester Post, American Legion, elected him chief marshal for a parade to mark the first anniversary of what was then Armistice Day.

Despite the rain, the Tuesday, Nov. 11, 1919, parade was a huge success, with about 150,000 persons lining downtown streets to see 12,000 marchers in an eight-division parade.

In 1954, after World War II and the Korean War had brought about a change from Armistice Day to Veterans Day, Gen. Foley was still at the head of the parade, at age 74.

The leader of the band directly behind the general's military aides, passed word along in 1954 that the general was "too peppery," and urged, "Please ask him to slow down a little..."

Gen. Foley marched for the 42nd and final time in the Nov. 11, 1960 salute to veterans. The next year Clifford Benson, commander of the Worcester Veterans Council was marshal.

**RODE HORSEBACK**

Gen. Foley spent the day at home in 1919, recalling for a newspaperman that in 1919 and the years immediately after that he and his staff rode horseback in the big parade.

As always, the white haired blue-eyed man was interviewed on the sunporch of his home at 17 Circuit Ave. Still on the wall was the Distinguished Service Cross Citation—just below a photograph of Gen. Pershing and Capt. Foley.

Other photographs pictured encampments of troops long ago; of basketball teams of the Police Department, of friends long deceased, and a framed yellowed penciled letter from a general, next to the DSC citation that reads:

"To Capt. Foley: Your mission is this—fight to the very end. Never retreat. Never give up."

He never did.

**NAMED POLICE CAPTAIN**

Promoted to police captain in 1920, and deputy police chief in 1924, Gen. Foley topped the Civil Service examination for police chief in 1928 after Chief George H. Hill retired to become manager of the Worcester Safety Council.

On May 31, Police Chief Foley retired, ending 40 years of municipal service.

In the peaceful years after World War I, Gen. Foley was active in the reorganization of the National Guard. In 1920, he was promoted to colonel and placed in command of the 101st Regiment, then in Boston.

In 1923 he was advanced to brigadier general in command of the 52nd Infantry Brigade, consisting of the 104th and 181st Infantry Regiments with headquarters here.

In 1928, when he was appointed police chief, Gen. Foley relinquished some of his duties with the National Guard, and April 4, 1935, he retired from active military duty.

When the National Guard was called into federal service, just before America's entry into World War II, the State Guard was formed as the home militia. Gen. Foley was named commander of the First Brigade on Jan. 14, 1941, at his former rank of brigadier general.

He assumed command of the State Guard Feb. 27, 1942, after Maj. Gen. Erland Fish, commandant, was killed in a Boston traffic accident.

#### HONORED AT REVIEW

Three weeks later, Gen. Foley retired from active duty with the State Guard at his own request, saying he felt he could not give the post the attention it required while still serving full time as Worcester's chief of police.

A year later, June 25, 1943, Gen. Foley was honored at a review of 800 officers and non-commissioned officers of the State Guard at the Massachusetts Military Academy in Concord.

Four years later, June 25, 1947, he was saluted at a testimonial dinner marking his retirement as police chief. About 550 friends attended the dinner at the former Sheraton Hotel.

The late Dr. Joseph W. O'Connor, a World War I buddy and toastmaster, said:

"Forty-nine years' service to state and country is a record not to be passed over lightly, a record we're proud of. . . . No one served under Tom Foley. You served with him. As a soldier, citizen and public official, you could have no quarrel with his acts."

Twenty years later, April 6, 1967, in what was perhaps his last public function, Gen. Foley was chosen to place the ceremonial wreath in the Worcester War Memorial Auditorium's Hall of Heroes, at ceremonies noting the 50th anniversary of the United States' entry into World War I.

As part of his public service, Gen. Foley served as Worcester's fuel commissioner during the 1920 coal shortage.

During World War II, he was on a special committee that studied the city's air raid center reports, and in 1949 he was appointed chairman of the city's Military Manpower Committee named to aid Army and Air Force recruiting.

He was a founder of the Armed Forces Dinner Organization. In 1959, he was presented the Award of Merit scroll at the 32nd annual dinner, the second recipient of the award.

#### EMERALD CLUB HONOR

In 1961, he was presented the Emerald Club's annual award—a plaque and shillelagh—as Worcester's outstanding Irish-American.

On Nov. 11, 1953, the Worcester Veterans Council presented Gen. Foley a plaque as the city's outstanding citizen, and April 28, 1962, he was honored for his contributions to the city's civic life at Worcester State College's annual scholarship tea.

Worcester Barracks, World War I Veterans Association, presented Gen. Foley its past commander plaque and jeweled pin Oct. 2, 1962. He had organized and served as commander of the Barracks from its inception, Oct. 4, 1955, until 1961.

He long was chairman of the trustees of GAR (Grand Army of the Republic) Hall on Pearl Street, and in 1957 was appointed a trustee of the World War I Veterans Memorial Fund.

#### ATHLETIC FIELD

Post 5, American Legion, suggested on Nov. 19, 1962, that the World War I Memorial Fund be donated toward refurbishing the schoolboy athletic field on Chandler Street, and that it be named in honor of Gen. Foley.

The city accepted the gift of \$200,000 on Jan. 17, 1963, and on June 14, 1965, in Flag

Day ceremonies, the field was dedicated. Gen. Foley was a guest at the ceremony.

Gen. Foley was a charter member of Worcester Post, American Legion, and Homer J. Wheaton Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

He was a charter member of Alhambra Council, Knights of Columbus, and a past grand knight of the order. He also was a member of Bishop O'Reilly Assembly, Fourth Degree, K. of C.

He was a member of the Purple Heart Association, Worcester Chapter, Yankee Division Veterans Association, and Worcester Lodge of Elks.

He was a founder of St. Andrew the Apostle Church and a member of the Holy Name Society at St. Andrew's parish.

Gen. Foley was born in Worcester Dec. 27, 1879, son of John and Mary (Carroll) Foley, at 184 Maywood St.

In 1909 he married Mary E. O'Donnell, the girl whose books he once carried home from the old English High School, later Classical High. The general was graduated with the class of 1897.

Mrs. Foley died July 4, 1947, at the family summer home at Misquamicut, R.I.

The Foleys had six children, Thomas F. Foley, Jr. died of a heart attack March 30, 1939, at Boston Garden, while watching a Stanley Cup hockey playoff game with his parents. He was 26, a graduate of Dartmouth College.

#### SURVIVORS

The general leaves four sons, Dr. Robert E. Foley of Wellesley, associated with the Lahey Clinic in Boston, John J. Foley of Farmington, assistant vice president of New England Power Service Co., Paul E. Foley of Auburn and Vincent D. Foley of Worcester; a daughter, Miss Kathleen A. Foley, with whom he made his home; a brother, Edward J. Foley, a retired district fire chief; 13 grandchildren, and five great-grandchildren.

The funeral will be held Wednesday from his home with a High Mass at 10 a.m. in St. Andrew the Apostle Church, 16 Vineyard St. Burial will be in St. John's Cemetery.

Calling hours at his home, 17 Circuit Ave., are 7 to 9 tonight and 2 to 4 and 7 to 9 p.m. tomorrow.

The John J. Fay Funeral Home, 2 Woodland St., is in charge of arrangements.

### LEGENDARY "DOC" HILL RETIRES AFTER 40 YEARS IN HAWAII LEGISLATURE

#### HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in nearly 40 years, the grand old man of Hawaii's "Grand Old Party," Senator William Hardy "Doc" Hill, was not a member of the Hawaii State Legislature when it convened last week.

In early January, at age 79, the Big Island's legendary "Doc" Hill retired from the legislative arena where he had served since 1929, when he first took a seat in the then territorial legislature.

The colorful Republican orator will be greatly missed by his legion of friends from both political parties, and indeed it is with regret that we view the passing of a unique era in the history of Hawaii with the departure from the State senate of this distinguished statesman.

Sometimes irascible, oftentimes flam-

boyant, but always keenly analytical and astute in his approach to the problems of the day, Senator Hill contributed greatly to the work of the legislature and to the development of the 50th State.

It is hoped that "Doc" Hill, although officially retired from his legislative duties, will still be available to give counsel to those who seek it.

As a personal friend and as Hawaii's Congressman, I extend to "Doc" Hill a fond Aloha, and wish for him and Mrs. Hill many more years of the good life.

I know that my colleagues in the Congress would wish to join me in saluting this very special citizen of Hawaii. I believe the Members will also enjoy reading a delightful feature article about Senator Hill from the Honolulu Advertiser of January 16, 1970. The article by Advertiser politics writer Gerry Keir follows for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### THE SENATE'S LOSING A LOT OF CHARM

(By Gerry Keir)

"Mr. President?"

"Senator Hill is recognized."

When those words were spoken, the Senate would settle back, ready for a flow of wit, humor and the finely-tuned oratory in which William Hardy Hill savored the English language and tickled the fancy of his listeners. Now, after 35 years in the legislative halls of Hawaii, the "Doc" has retired at the age of 79.

If ever the term Elder Statesman fit a man, it fit Doc. After many years in the inner circle of power in Hawaii government, age and the Democratic ascendancy in the Senate moved him back into the ranks during the late 1960s.

But really, Doc Hill never took a back seat to anyone in speaking his piece on the Senate floor. And age which slowed his step hasn't yet worked its way up to the quick mind beneath that Caesar-like haircut.

He could be slashing, mellow, philosophical.

In his days as Senate president he was quick to take up the cudgels against members of both parties. He often matched words with a fellow Big Island orator, former Democratic Sen. Nelson K. Doi, now a Circuit Court judge in Hilo.

He also had a lingering feud with Republican Sen. Randy Crossley during which Crossley considered resigning from the party.

As Democrat majorities in the Senate proved unable to resolve factional differences during the 1960s, it was Hill who seemed best able to pick the perfect time and battleground to rub salt into open Democratic wounds.

He criticized their sometimes faltering attempts to organize the Senate. He lambasted their procedures on the floor.

Once, when the Democratic-run Senate couldn't reach agreement on a new reapportionment plan, Hill offered to bring his pet mynah bird—"Little Doc"—from Hilo to help.

"Little Doc," said Big Doc, was more capable of coming up with a solution than were the wrangling attorneys in the Senate. You see, Big Doc had a thinly-veiled disdain for the legal profession.

What will be missed most around the Senate will be the little touches that Doc provided. His talking mynah bird was one such flamboyance.

Every year until the bird died in 1965, "Little Doc" was brought from Hilo by his master to sit caged outside of the Senator's Iolani Palace office—whistling at the wahines and saying "Vote for Doc Hill" in true campaign style.

Doc's hearing problems also were legend. Because of them, he had a special electronic

arrangement through which he could hook his hearing aid into the Senate public address system and hear proceedings on the floor. The only problem occurred when other senators didn't turn on their microphone switches before speaking.

"Flip your flipper," Doc would roar irascibly, and the offending lawmaker would comply.

But perhaps Doc's unique contribution to the Senate was his habit periodically of taking the floor to assess the situation, philosophically putting current events in the Senate in the perspective of his decades of service.

He loved to give advice to the younger lawmakers, some of whom weren't even born when Doc first took the boat from Hilo to Honolulu in 1929 to sit for the first time in the Territorial Legislature. And the others loved to listen to the orator—who generally had some pointed barbs concealed in the full-flowing commentary.

Perhaps the ceremonial highlight of Doc's Senate career came in 1967, when he appeared during one of the extended days of the session dressed in a kimono.

"Mr. President," he said. "I have been humiliated, insulted and shunned the past few days and it's all your fault."

"Last Thursday, Mr. President, I arose on this floor to tell you of rumors that the Senate might not adjourn as scheduled the next day."

"I told you that my wife was going back home to Hilo in a few hours and wanted to know how many shirts she should leave for me in Honolulu. And you told me—before this body—that she should leave only one shirt."

"Along about Saturday, I began to notice that when I would approach a group of senators I thought were my friends, they would scatter or else get upwind of me."

"I wondered what was wrong. Had I voted wrong on one of their pet measures?"

"Finally, a Democratic senator put it to me simply—'You smell like a goat,' he said."

Once he missed the opening day of the Legislature because of illness. But, on his return, it was the same Doc.

"It has been rumored in the newspapers that Doc Hill has been sick," he said.

"I was at death's door. Gabriel was blowing his horn—but my hearing aid gave out and I didn't hear him."

When the Senate voted to disband the State Subversive Activities Committee in 1969, it was Doc who provided the most rousing defense.

"I want to say, shame on you," he told his fellow senators. "Shame and double shame. . ."

"When you turn on the lights, the cockroaches run."

Next week, when the Senate turns on its lights for the 1970 session, Doc won't be there. The cribbage players and the peanut-munching crowd (two of his favorite leisure-time activities when proceedings dragged) will miss him.

And so will the Capitol reporters, for whom he spiced up many an otherwise intense, humdrum moment of lawmaking in Hawaii.

#### PEACE CORPS CALLED SLOVENLY, BAD INFLUENCE—MALAWI ASKS WITHDRAWAL

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, another "emerging nation" has become sufficiently civilized to recognize and react

to the regression from civilization and decency of some of our do-gooders. This time the African state of Malawi, which has demonstrated in other ways its superiority to its black neighbors, has asked that we withdraw our Peace Corps personnel, because their bad conduct and behavior, and their slovenliness are bad influences on the nation's children.

A pertinent news clipping is included in my remarks:

#### MALAWI OUSTS PEACE CORPS

BLANTYRE, MALAWI, January 26.—All U.S. Peace Corps volunteers will be withdrawn from this country by the end of 1971 following requests by the Malawi government and the ruling Malawi Congress Party, it was announced.

There are about 150 Peace Corps volunteers working here with the ministries of health and education.

A resolution passed by the Congress Party's annual convention demanded that recruitment cease and that all volunteers leave within 18 months. Delegates cited "complaints by our people against the influence which Peace Corps volunteers have over our children and because of their bad conduct and behavior and their slovenliness."

#### MORE SUPPORT FOR FLEXIBLE EXCHANGE RATES

### HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a Wall Street Journal editorial of January 23 points out that all countries stand to gain by a more flexible system of exchange rates by which we can follow our own internal financial policies without posing so much danger to the system as a whole.

I include the editorial, "The Time Is Now" for the attention of my colleagues at this point in the RECORD:

#### THE TIME IS NOW

The best time to fix a leaky roof, the ancient adage goes, is when it isn't raining. It's the sort of obvious fact that homeowners are said to overlook, although we don't know that many actually do.

National governments, anyway, should fix their currency roofs in good weather. As central bankers held their latest gathering in Basel, the weather was clearer than it had been through most of the past couple of years.

At a number of earlier meetings the bankers had struggled to find ways to keep the U.S. from losing all its gold, a development that could have had shattering repercussions for the world monetary system. At present, though, the U.S. is gaining gold and the free-market price of the metal has fallen to around the official level of \$35 an ounce.

Earlier, too, West Germany's market was so strong that it was positively embarrassing other governments, which had been much less careful to guard the value of their currencies. Now the official value of the mark has been pushed high enough that Germany has been losing, instead of consistently gaining, currency reserves.

The true sources of the recurring monetary troubles, the U.S. dollar, the British pound and the French franc, all appear relatively stable—for the time being, at any rate. In each case there are lingering or looming troubles that could abruptly change the situation.

In the U.S., the balance of payments is still deeply in deficit. In each country inflation remains very much a factor, despite efforts to overcome it. The future, in other words, is highly uncertain, no matter how placid the present.

Right now, then, would seem a fine time to move away from the current inflexibility of currency exchange rates. Exactly how far such a movement goes, or precisely how it's effected, would appear to be less important than a decision for some increase in flexibility.

Wolfgang Schmitz, president of the Austrian National Bank, argues that the details can be safely left to the International Monetary Fund, working in cooperation with member governments. At the moment the IMF happens to be in the midst of a study of monetary reform.

Currently the IMF can approve changes in exchange rates only when a country's balance of payments is in "fundamental disequilibrium." Whatever this meant in theory, in practice it has meant that changes have been made, and approved, only in times of severe national crises.

Maintaining fixed rates has become a matter of national pride. Governments resort to borrowing and all sorts of restrictions on world trade before they will ever concede that their currency is overvalued.

In Dr. Schmitz' view, "Today there is widespread and growing understanding that it has become necessary to ease our exchange rate system, which has become too rigid, and to make the original Bretton Woods idea of sufficient flexibility effective again."

More flexible exchange rates would not lessen any nation's responsibility for guarding the value of its own currency. In fact they conceivably could put more pressure on a country's financial policy-makers, since the results of profligate policies might show up more quickly in rate changes.

The chief potential gain from greater flexibility, however, is that it could permit any country to follow whatever internal policy it chose without posing quite so much danger to the world monetary system. Central bankers might not have to meet so often to head off an impending cataclysm.

Those bankers thus should have an incentive to favor change. Only fools delay their roof-fixing until it rains.

#### FEDERAL FUNDS TO HELP FIGHT CRIME ALLOTTED

### HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government recently announced the allocation of funds to the States for action programs to be conducted under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. The State of New Jersey will receive \$7 million to carry out the excellent plan which has been developed with the initial planning funds. As a January 20 editorial in the Evening News points out, these action projects "range from relatively simple undertakings like improvement of law-enforcement personnel and crime prevention to sophisticated studies in communications and use of computers in crime fighting." Hearings will begin February 18 in the House Judiciary Committee to assess the effectiveness of the act and our study will also consider the need for increased

funds, such as I have proposed in H.R. 15532, to authorize the appropriation of \$750 million in fiscal year 1971.

I include the editorial from the Evening News commenting on this matter in the RECORD, as follows:

#### CASH VERSUS CRIME

The \$7 million in federal funds allocated to New Jersey under the Safe Streets Act will provide the state and its county and municipal governments an excellent opportunity to undertake programs to improve law enforcement. The federal grant will be matched by about \$3 million in contributions from the state and local governments. The \$10 million thus available will be used to find a variety of programs this year under the aegis of the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency (SLEPA), which channels the federal grants to programs it has approved.

The federal contribution represents an eightfold increase in the money made available last year. Indeed, even with a mere \$860,000 in federal money, some worthwhile programs were undertaken, including a project in Willingboro that took a narcotics education program directly into the schools and another that sought to improve the response time of police to radioed calls in Fort Lee. The money also enabled the state police to hold a unique school on organized crime last October.

These and similar projects fall within 10 categories of action programs created by SLEPA, which range from relatively simple undertakings like improvement of law enforcement personnel and crime prevention to sophisticated studies in communications and use of computers in crime fighting.

The grant to New Jersey for action programs and planning is part of \$268 million in funds to be distributed, primarily among the states. It is a sizable amount for a starter and represents an overdue federal commitment to state and local governments in providing the kind of programs they could not possibly afford on their own.

In the spending of such a sum there is, of course, a danger that wasteful and inefficient programs could eat up a substantial part of the money. Both the Justice Department and such state agencies as New Jersey's SLEPA are, we trust, committed to a continuing evaluation of programs to make sure that the money is spent toward the goal of reducing crime and making streets safe once again.

#### THE CLEAR AIR CRISIS

### HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, despite the growing lipservice paid to the problem of water and air pollution, all too many persons, particularly those in largely rural areas who do not face the fumes every day, act as if they believe that this is a reckoning to be faced in the future. But this is not the case; the crisis is upon us now. It is no longer confined to our cities and industrial areas, and it grows with each day's delay in undertaking the measures necessary to combat it.

I would like to insert in the RECORD the following perceptive editorial appearing in the December 27, 1969, issue of the Watertown, Wis., Daily Times. Although the Watertown paper serves a

predominantly rural area, the editorial clearly expresses the urgency of the pollution question for all Americans; we have literally run out of clean air. It follows:

#### THE CLEAN AIR CRISIS

There was a grim bit of news from New York City the other day. A group created to fight air pollution confronted Christmas shoppers in Herald Square with signs that said: "This is an air pollution poison pocket. Danger. Breath at your own risk."

That has its humorous overtones, but they give away to the serious import of this reminder that one of the city's highest pollution readings was made in this busy square faced by two enormous department stores. One gets to thinking that perhaps in the not very distant future this will have to be standard practice in big cities—warnings that this or that area is a "poison pocket" dangerous to health.

Reading about that "breath at your own risk" sign in New York, one may fondly assume that most of the air in this broad land is still pure. That is an illusion. Specialists at the Atmospheric Sciences Research Center in Scotia, N.Y., say that the last pollution-free air in this country was detected near Flagstaff, Ariz., six years ago. A spokesman for the Research Center put it thus: "We ran out of clean air, so to speak. For six years we have been looking for some in the remotest parts of the United States."

The message is clear: Air pollution is no longer a problem that only city dwellers need worry about. More and more, airborne poisons generated in the great population centers are spilling out into the adjoining countryside—in some cases for hundreds of miles.

This phenomenon has become so prevalent that some scientists now think air throughout the Northern hemisphere will be dangerously poisoned by 1990 unless the present trend is halted. That trend, in starkest terms, is that air pollution is increasing much faster than the air can cleanse itself.

It is wearisome, no doubt, to be reminded of this again and again. Such reminders are, however, a necessary part of alerting the public to the urgency of this threat. We are no longer dealing with some hazard of the vaguely distant future. It is not an exaggeration to say that in this highly industrialized and transportation-oriented society we stand on the verge of a grave peril. Whatever is being done to curb air pollution is not enough. Efforts by industry and government alike must be redoubled if we are to avert disaster.

#### UKRAINIAN RESOLVE LAUDED

### HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 52d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine. I would like to join my colleagues in paying respect to the brave, but still captive people of the Ukraine and also to their relatives and descendants who are now citizens of this free country. The 47 million people of the Ukraine represent the largest non-Russian nation both in the U.S.S.R. and in Eastern Europe. These strong people whose freedom was so short lived, crushed by the Bolsheviks, remain strong in their resolve to remove the Soviet yoke of oppression. Their continued resistance can be seen in the re-

ports which come out of this region—reports which tell of discontent among intellectuals, farmers, and workers. Of course, these sentiments are echoed by all the enslaved peoples of Eastern Europe. Only by brute strength was the Soviet Union able to crush the move for freedom and sovereignty in Czechoslovakia. Their purpose and hope remain steadfast as does that of the Ukrainian people.

Therefore, it is our duty and privilege to affirm our moral support for these people in their quest for self-determination. It is our duty because we live in a land where freedom and liberty are constitutional rights which have been strengthened over almost 200 years. It is our privilege because we already have by birthright what the captive peoples seek through resistance and sacrifice. Their plight should serve as a reminder to us all that many still fight for the opportunities which we have been given freely.

Let us look to the day when the subjugation of these people and will be terminated through a recognition on the part of the Soviet Union of the rights of the sovereign people of the Ukraine. In the meantime, let it be known that I continue to support the cause of Ukrainian independence.

#### POPULATION COMMISSION

### HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population of which I am chairman, has spent the past year studying the problem of population growth. Through our hearings and research, we became aware of the urgency of this insidious problem. Our analysis of population growth eventually led us to the production of our family planning report.

In this morning's Washington Post, January 27, there is an editorial by Mr. David S. Broder in which he commends President Nixon's efforts to deal with the population problem. Mr. Broder makes note of President Nixon's objective of a balanced growth for America, and his desire for a Commission on Population Growth. There is presently a measure designed to create this Commission, and Mr. Broder urges that Congress bring this measure to a vote. For the benefit of my colleagues I will reprint this article in the RECORD:

#### PRESIDENT TAKES MAJOR STEP IN URGING POPULATION DISPERSAL

(By David S. Broder)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—In a generally overlooked section of his State of the Union address, President Nixon called on Congress to join him in developing "a national growth policy" aimed at channeling the 100 million additional Americans who will join the population by the end of this century away from our overcrowded big cities and into more habitable sections of the country.

Now celebration of the joys and virtues of small town and rural life has been a presidential tradition since Jefferson's time. But if

administration officials are right in saying that this passage of the President's address was no casual bit of rhetoric, it could signal as significant a development in the national policy as any recent President has initiated.

There is no lack of evidence of what awaits us if we continue to let population trends continue as they have for the past three decades. But, as James L. Sundquist of the Brookings Institution points out in an article in the current issue of *The Public Interest*, it has been very difficult to engage the federal government in serious planning to change this trend.

Now the Nixon administration—so unlike the stereotype of a Republican laissez faire government in its penchant for long-range planning—appears ready to launch the first serious effort in this direction.

About time, too. For as Sundquist notes, if current trends continue to the end of the century, 77 per cent of the predicted 300 million Americans will then be jammed into just 11 per cent of our continental land area. Only 36 million citizens will live outside urban areas of at least 100,000 population, and 187 million persons (equal to our total population only eight years ago) will be concentrated in "four huge urban agglomerations" facing the Atlantic, the Pacific, the Gulf of Mexico and the Great Lakes.

It is this grim prospect that Mr. Nixon seeks to avert by consciously using governmental policy to change the trend that saw "a third of our counties lose population in the '60s," as he said, while "the violent and decayed central cities of our great metropolitan complexes (became) the most conspicuous area of failure in American life today."

The President suggested that the federal government:

Make its future decisions on buying and selling land, building highways, airports and other public facilities "with the clear objective of aiding a balanced growth for America."

Assist in the building of new cities, as well as rehabilitating old ones.

Seek to "create a new rural environment which would not only stem the migration to urban centers but reverse it."

These prescriptions in themselves are neither novel nor specific nor adequate. What is important is simply the fact that the President chose to highlight the problem of population balance and has committed his administration to act on it.

As Sundquist, himself an able official of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, noted in his article, the problem, though evident to scholars, never won a place on the national agenda in the 1960s. Orville Freeman, as Secretary of Agriculture, made a lot of speeches on rural development but President Johnson offered little more than moral support. The only major outline of a substantive program for population distribution came in a 1968 report from the Advisory Commission on Inter-government Relations, called "Urban and Rural America: Policies for Future Growth." Unfortunately, like many other studies done by that useful group, it received virtually no attention from the press and the policy-makers.

Now Mr. Nixon, who last year gave the most comprehensive message any American President has delivered on the general problem of population growth, has put this matter near the top of the national agenda and has instructed his Urban Affairs Council staff to make it the major area of study for the coming year.

That by itself will help mobilize the research capacity of government in the academic community, and, as Sundquist notes, research is the first and most obvious requirement for developing a population distribution policy.

But if action is to follow from research, it

will take a commitment from Congress as well as the President. An earnest of Congress' awareness of the need would be a move by the House Democratic leadership to bring to a vote the measure creating a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. This legislation, requested by the President in his population message last summer and approved by the Senate, has been languishing in the House Rules Committee. The Democratic Party and House Speaker John W. McCormack have a clear obligation to speed its passage.

Redirecting policy on population growth will not be easy, for, as Sundquist notes, there will be strong political pressures against a policy that is avowedly designed to halt the further concentration of people in the big cities. The real estate and commercial interests of those cities, influential in both parties, have a large stake in their continued growth, whether or not such growth is desirable for anyone else.

But if we are at all serious about improving the environment in which the next generations of Americans will live, no cause is more compelling than the one to which the President summoned Congress last week.

#### FLYING INTO THE 1970'S

### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, as the American traveler and tourist increasingly looks to air transportation to get him where he is going more quickly and more comfortably, some critics of air travel have contended that some cities still have their heads in the ground.

Some do not.

I can report that one city is doing something about the anticipated explosion of air travel predicted for the next decade. That city is Philadelphia, which I am proud to represent.

The city administration has vigorously moved to improve the facilities at Philadelphia International Airport and to keep pace with the jumbo jets and their concomitant passenger service problems.

I applaud the foresighted action of the city administration and, with the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I offer, for the RECORD, a release from the office of the city representative describing the airport modernization program:

#### TEXT OF RELEASE

Signs and more signs, painted in the city colors of blue and gold, stand outside Philadelphia International Airport today to focus public interest on the airport's extensive interim development program.

The multi-million dollar project, instituted by Mayor James H. J. Tate to keep Philadelphia among the nation's leading commercial airports, is the forerunner of eight planned permanent terminal buildings with the first two scheduled to be placed in service in 1974. The interim construction calls for:

Expansion of three passenger concourses, including the addition of 39 passenger departure lounges, an increase in the loading gate total from 23 to 39, and the subsequent relocation, modification and expansion of ticketing, baggage claim and check-in facilities.

Construction of Cargo City, a huge freight center, on 217-acres west of the main terminal, to meet the airport's steady growth in cargo traffic.

Final site preparation for a 10,500-foot east-west instrument runway and taxiways, extension of the north-south landing strip, and the building of three high speed exits from both the new and the existing east-west strip to expedite aircraft clearance.

Director of Commerce S. Harry Galfand said completion of the new runway, a \$16 million project, will insure additional landing area for the 400-passenger Boeing 747 superjet and increase the runway system's operational capacity by an estimated 85 per cent.

Following commissioning of this undertaking, the existing 9,500-foot runway will be closed for complete modernization, Galfand said.

Also planned are two additional self-service parking lots. These will provide 3300 extra parking spaces and expand the total figure, including valet and employees' parking, to 8300.

Another part of the intervening modernization will be the installation of a mechanized baggage conveyor system to serve the baggage claim room to be built on the terminal's west side. An internal roadway linking with the Industrial Highway will offer direct access to the facility.

The interim departure lounges will be formally opened next summer. They will be enclosed with wall to wall carpeting, heating, air-conditioning, modern rest rooms, lighting, contour-seating and other accommodations. A loading bridge for aircraft boarding will be linked to each lounge and will enable travelers to be completely protected from unfavorable weather.

A series of smaller signs, one of which reads: "Sorry about the mess: We're really making improvements!" are mounted inside the terminal to describe projects and direct passengers to aircraft loading points.

More than 6.5 million passengers were served by Philadelphia International Airport last year compared to 5.1 million in 1967 and only 400,000 in 1950. Air traffic studies indicate the airport could have an annual passenger turnover of 25 million by 1985 with unusually large gains in cargo shipments.

Situated on 2800 acres, the airport is the national and international gateway for three million residents of the Delaware Valley.

Vincent G. Kling, nationally known architect who prepared the master modernization plan for Washington International Airport, is handling the new look in passenger terminal facilities at Philadelphia International, in keeping with anticipated needs and the expansionary signs of the times.

#### THE PRICE IS WRONG

### HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, many people sincerely believe that an easing of the restrictions on oil imports will lower prices. They are entitled to their opinion. But, I wish more attention would be given to the views of those who are experts in the oil business. The essential fact is that once the United States imports substantial amounts of foreign crude, our domestic industry will not find it profitable enough to explore for new fields. In a very short time the United States would be dependent upon foreign sources. And when this happens, this country will be at the mercy of the Mideast—prices will be jacked up and the price will go up at home.

The Dallas Times Herald editorialized on this controversy on January 13, 1970. The editorial, "The Price Is Wrong," graphically points out the flaws in the idea that increased imports will reduce the price of crude. Mr. Speaker, I include this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

**THE PRICE IS WRONG**

From the East Coast interests seeking an end to the present oil import program, there proceeds one relentlessly recurring argument: More foreign oil will mean cheaper petroleum product prices for American consumers.

To today's penny-conscious, inflation-harassed consumer, the argument is bound to be impressive. But alas, it doesn't hold water—as a recent event in the Near East tends to prove.

In Baghdad last week, representatives of national oil companies or organizations in Iraq, Libya, Algeria and Egypt met to see what they could do about jacking up the asking price for their oil.

Mark now—this is not the action of one Arab bloc nation, but rather of four. And even more may join up as time goes on.

The Arabs at the Baghdad meeting would doubtless be tickled to sell more oil to the United States—something a special presidential task force studying the oil import program is believed to favor their doing. But they'll do it at their own price.

Ultimately, as major oil company spokesmen keep contending (is anyone at all paying attention?), imported foreign oil is likely to get just as expensive as domestic oil. Maybe more so.

Moreover, as the companies also point out, supplies of foreign oil are notoriously unreliable. Consider the events two years ago, when the Arabs, seeking a scapegoat for Israel's lightning victory in the Six-Day War, embargoed oil shipments to the United States.

Could it happen again? Indeed it could. And where would we be then? Gasping for the oil upon which we are dependent to turn our wheels and run our machinery.

For the simple fact is that an increase in oil imports—with its resulting (if temporary) effect of lowering oil prices—would deal a heavy blow to domestic oil exploration.

As one spokesman for independent oilmen puts it, "With domestic exploration and reserves declining and already inadequate, and with oil prices already low relative to costs and to prices of all other commodities, the nation soon will face a critical shortage of both oil and natural gas."

It's not a pretty thought. But, then, neither is increased foreign oil imports a pretty idea. Just pretty lousy.

**GREEKS ALLOW INSPECTION OF PRISON CAMPS**

**HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in an article written by Sam Modiano of the Chicago Tribune, he describes an unprecedented step taken by the present Greek regime of allowing the International Red Cross free access to detainees in prisons and detention areas.

Some have been quick to flood this country with one-sided propaganda concerning alleged tortures of prisoners in

Greece, conveniently overlooking the absence of any kind of civil liberties in Communist bloc countries and other parts of the world.

The Greek caretaker government has allowed the Red Cross, through a signed agreement, to inspect conditions in Greece of detainees.

The regime in Greece has demonstrated its good faith by allowing the Red Cross free access in their inspection of detention areas, and I commend the following article to my colleagues:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Nov. 26, 1969]

**GREEKS ALLOW INSPECTION OF PRISON CAMPS—RED CROSS WILL HAVE FREE ACCESS**

(By Sam Modiano)

ATHENS, November 26.—The Greek revolutionary government will let the International Red Cross supervise the living conditions of political prisoners here.

The agreement, which sets a precedent, was signed in Athens following a wide-spread campaign against the Greek military regime claiming that the political detainees are subjected to inhuman treatment and even medieval torture.

Foreign Minister Panayiotis Pipinellis who signed on behalf of the Greek government said the powers granted to Red Cross "afford guarantees of objective and impartial judgment which cannot but serve the principles of humanitarianism and justice." The agreement allows Red Cross representatives free access to detainees in prisons and detention areas.

More than 6,000 persons, suspected of being potential enemies of the revolution, were arrested on the night of the "colonel's coup," April 21, 1967. Since then about 4,000 prisoners, including elderly persons and women have been freed thru repeated amnesties and by decisions of special judiciary security committees.

Of the 2,200 Greek citizens still detained, about 1,700 are former members of the outlawed Greek Communist party or leaders of the disbanded "United Democratic Left party." They are confined on the Dodecanese island of Leros.

Several women, suspected of being Communists, are being held in Halicarnassos prison on the island of Crete. Other prisoners, charged with criminal offenses or accused of pro-communist leanings, are detained in military and civilian jails throuout the country. An undisclosed number of civilians, suspected of endangering public security, have been deported to remote villages on the Greek mainland.

In addition to civilian prisoners, about 150 retired high ranking army officers are detained under guard in hotels near Athens. The officers, most of whom sided with King Constantine in his abortive coup against the colonels in December, 1967, are said to be under arrest pending investigation regarding an alleged right-wing conspiracy to overthrow the army-backed regime led by Premier George Papadopoulos.

**YALE STUDENTS PETITION FOR TITLE II REPEAL**

**HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA**

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the keen awareness of our college students about the important issues which confront our Nation is nowhere better evidenced than by a Yale University student

petition, bearing more than 1,000 signatures, seeking the repeal of title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950—the infamous concentration camp authorization law. I received this petition today.

This commendable action was spearheaded at Yale by an outstanding young political science senior, Don Nakanishi. The petition points out that the repeal of the Emergency Detention Act is necessary "to deter and prevent the repetition of the injustices" suffered in World War II by 110,000 Japanese Americans who "experienced life in American concentration camps."

It was greatly encouraging to me, as I know it will be to many other Americans who would like to see the repeal of the Emergency Detention Act during this session of Congress, to know of this strong student support.

I submit the text of the student petition for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

**PETITION FOR THE REPEAL OF TITLE II OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT OF 1950, THE EMERGENCY DETENTION ACT**

The provisions of Title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950 permit the indiscriminate detention and incarceration of citizens based upon speculation, conjecture, or suspicion without due process of law.

During the Second World War, over 110,000 Japanese American citizens of these United States, experienced life in American concentration camps. Much has been written since then, expounding upon the unconscionable deprivation of their constitutional rights. However, it merely stands as a condemnation of the "panic" decisions made at that time.

To deter and prevent the repetition of the injustices in the 1940's we, the undersigned, strongly and firmly support the repeal of title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

**THE SIXTH DISTRICT SPEAKS OUT**

**HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, in October 1969, I sent out my annual public opinion poll, something that I have done for some years. The questionnaires were returned in the closing months of the first session of the 91st Congress. It was at the end of the first year of a new administration, and the last year of the decade widely known as the "Soaring Sixties."

I have waited a few weeks longer than usual to publicize the final tabulations. One very good reason was that there was still a relatively heavy return of cards up until the end of 1969. Second, there was much unfinished congressional business in December, which was commented on in the letters that accompanied the cards. Third, and possibly most important of all, is the fact that I believe I was able to detect a different mood on the part of those answering the poll. The rate of letters accompanying the cards, as well as marginal comments written on the cards, was much higher than in past years. There were many comments on longstanding issues, but there were new issues, and new approaches to old ones. I believe these fac-

tors just may be indicative of a new American national mood and attitude for the decade of the 1970's.

For these reasons, then, I have delayed issuing the results until now, the beginning of the second session of the 91st Congress and also the opening month of the decade of the seventies. For, rightly or wrongly, we Americans have a way of reckoning changes in mood, interest, and overall national life in terms of decades.

TABULATED RESULTS OF POLL

The following is given in percentages of those who responded to the questions. Approximately 21,000 replied:

[In percent]

1. Do you favor construction of an anti-ballistic-missile system?	
Yes .....	80
No .....	20
2. Do you favor a federally financed guaranteed annual income?	
Yes .....	9
No .....	91
3. Do you favor expansion of trade with East European Communist countries?	
Yes .....	17
No .....	83
4. Should the Federal Government assume total responsibility (administration and costs) for all welfare programs, and let States, cities, and local units drop them?	
Yes .....	9
No .....	91
5. On student disorders at universities and colleges: Stop Federal aid to students convicted by civil court or disciplined by school authorities for disorder:	
Yes .....	95
No .....	5
Stop Federal aid to schools where administration fails to curb disorders:	
Yes .....	80
No .....	20
6. Which of the following world "hot spots" do you think holds the greatest danger to world peace?	
Vietnam .....	20
Middle East .....	68
Russian-Chinese frontier .....	12
7. In Vietnam, should we:	
Continue present course: limited military action and peace talks in Paris .....	34
Pull out of peace talks; push for military victory (but no nuclear weapons) .....	63
Immediate and unconditional U.S. withdrawal .....	3
8. How do you assess the present overall course of the administration?	
Too far left .....	24
Too far right .....	7
About the course I prefer .....	69

What do the returns themselves show on the basis of the figures just submitted?

For foreign policy, a definite "hard" line; go ahead with the ABM to keep our defenses strong; do not, through expanded trade, give our sworn enemies the possible support to turn on us at some future date; and, for Vietnam, by almost two to one, fold up the table at

Paris and get on with steps for a military victory.

On my "hot spot" question, the major source of concern is the Middle East. It is feared by many that this battleground is in danger of flaming again. We are dealing there with centuries-old animosities and hatreds, in an area that has resounded almost constantly to the clash of arms and the tramp of conquering or retreating armies.

Domestically, patience is short with student disorders at colleges and universities. There is considerably more sympathy with the officials of the schools than with the students themselves. At the same time there is a very real sentiment for some "get-tough" tactics before the entire higher educational system is put in any further jeopardy.

It was significant that on the two questions dealing with "the welfare problem," the percentages were exactly identical. The idea of a federally financed guaranteed annual income is not new by any means; I asked that question in a previous poll and I asked it again this year to see if sentiment had changed. It had not. The prospect of the Federal Government taking over all responsibility for all welfare programs—handling both cost and administration—letting all other governmental units drop such responsibility—is relatively new. It is also every bit as unpopular as a guaranteed annual income.

Opposition to this idea, I noted, was based primarily on two things. First, there was the easily understood and often-correct mistrust of the Federal Government's being able to handle welfare properly. The present example of the war on poverty is foremost in many minds. Second is the reluctance to see yet one more instance of State-local responsibilities and duties surrendered to Washington.

Framing the very last question of the poll, "How do you assess the present overall course of the administration?" was difficult. Asking for a "yes" or "no" on specific courses the administration was taking would have meant a lengthy and unwieldy question card. So I turned to my congressional mail for comments on the administration and noted that while writers would generally comment on one specific thing, there were many instances when the writer would conclude by saying in effect, "Overall, the administration's course is about what I prefer," or "Too far left" or "Too far right." These are generalities but were frequently used. On this basis, then, I used them on the poll card.

The figures on the returns on this question were quite consistent, with small variation, but with one very notable exception. Prior to the President's November 3, 1969, speech on Vietnam, responses to this question had been:

	Percent
Too far left .....	23
Too far right .....	7
Course I prefer .....	62
No answer .....	8

Cards returned that were obviously marked and sent after the speech were separated and carefully checked to see if

the speech itself had a bearing on the replies. It did; immediately after the speech the figures were:

	Percent
Too far left .....	18
Too far right .....	7
Course I prefer .....	74
No answer .....	1

The result of this tally on question No. 8 was immediately communicated to the President. The "silent majority" in the Sixth District of Indiana had spoken out, and their support was obvious.

ISSUES AND ACTIONS RELATING TO THE POLL

One of the main functions of a poll is to generate mail from constituents on whatever subject they care to write. An amazingly large number of letters contained somewhere in their text this sentiment: "I have been going to write you for a long time, and your poll is a good incentive to do just that," or "I've marked my choices on the card; now here's how I feel on something else."

Among the matters most frequently emphasized in additional comments were crime, welfare, pornography, pollution and inflation. I want to point out what is being done and not being done to solve these problems.

CRIME

Few problems confronting the American people today are viewed more seriously than the spreading crime rate. This, together with concern over the failure of Congress to act, was reflected very strongly in the comments received with the questionnaire.

President Nixon has requested Congress to enact more than 20 pieces of legislation to enable the law enforcement officials to better enforce the laws and to protect the American public. For reasons that are difficult to understand, the Judiciary Committees of the House and the Senate in which these bills are languishing, have only reported one measure to date.

There is a growing call for Congress to act. Crime legislation and law enforcement should cease to be a political football. President Nixon and his administration, should be given the tools that they need.

WELFARE

A growing disenchantment with the mounting costs and seeming futility of the entire welfare program was clearly expressed in comments accompanying the returned questionnaire.

Nothing can so dramatize the sorry welfare situation as the following shocking paragraphs from a story in the Washington Post of June 1969, reporting the convention of the National Social Welfare leaders:

The platform had been taken over by dissident students, new organizations of militant workers, and welfare mothers . . .

In stunned silence, those who had devoted decades to helping the poor heard themselves called "racist pigs," and "fat cats," and member of the "white imperialistic oppressive society."

The full, obscene demand was shouted over a seized microphone last Sunday night as more than 5000 of the Nation's social welfare leaders convened to hear an opening address by their president.

The antipoverty program took \$24 billion of the Federal budget in fiscal year 1969. But, again to look at the very broad use of the term, "welfare" cost a truly astounding \$112.4 billion in calendar year 1968, when State, local, and Federal spending programs are added together. Our national concern is only intensified by figures such as those in New York City where the number of people on welfare has increased by around 75 percent in the last 3 years, and the welfare budget has doubled. The scene is set for a major social explosion unless some hasty defusing is done.

The problem was not helped one bit by a Supreme Court decision in April 1969, which struck down residency requirements in State welfare programs. The main effect of the Court's decision was to encourage the mass migration of indigent poor from one State to the other where they could get more pay with less incentives to work. This solves no problems and causes many more.

On August 11, 1969, the first major attempt at reforming the national welfare system since it began 35 years ago was presented by President Nixon. The President noted welfare costs have doubled since 1960, and welfare rolls have risen from 5.8 million to over 9 million—all at a time when unemployment was low. If such a pace continues, the President said:

By 1975 this would result in 4 million more Americans on welfare rolls at a cost of close to \$11 billion a year, with both recipients and taxpayers short changed.

The President pointed out the choices:

We could tinker with the system as it is, adding to the patch-work of modifications and exemptions. That has been the approach of the past, and it has failed.

We could adopt a "guaranteed minimum income for everyone," which would appear to wipe out poverty over night. It would also wipe out the basic economic motivation for work, and place an enormous strain on the industrious to pay for the leisure of the lazy.

Or, we could adopt a totally new approach to welfare, designed to assist those left far behind the national norm and provide all with the motivation to work and a fair share of the opportunity to train.

There is nothing really new about the welfare problem itself, but it demands new approaches. Really, though, the question was answered centuries ago, by the great 12th century Jewish philosopher, Moses Ben Maimon. From his "Charity's Eight Degrees":

Anticipate charity by preventing poverty; assist the reduced fellowman, either by a considerable gift, or a sum of money, or by teaching him a trade, or by putting him in the way of business so that he may earn an honest livelihood and not be forced to the dreadful alternative of holding out his hand for charity. This is the highest step and the summit of charity's golden ladder.

"So that he may earn an honest livelihood"—the summit.

There is the summit, so let us get it out of the hands of demagogic radicals, and avoid the temptation to make it a partisan political issue.

As yet, Congress has not acted on the President's recommendations.

#### PORNOGRAPHY

About 50 million pieces of pornographic material are mailed annually. There are 60.4 million households in the United States. It is an odds-on chance, then, that sooner or later your household is going to be subjected to unsolicited and unwanted pornographic mailing, and almost an equally good chance that most of our American youth are standing in danger of exposure to this vile torrent, whose content would make the great sewer of Ancient Rome, the Cloaca Maxima, which was synonymous with filth, seem clean by comparison.

Under present Supreme Court decisions, material cannot be considered obscene unless it is totally without redeeming social importance, appeals solely to prurient interests, and affronts all contemporary community standards. A recent Court decision, however, found the new Chief Justice taking a definite strong stand against pornography; this portends welcome changes for the future.

The Post Office Department received almost a quarter of a million complaints about pornographic material in the mails, in the period June 1968-July 1969; 95 percent of these complaints were against 18 major distributors. One has been convicted, 11 have been indicted, and U.S. attorneys have in their hands the cases of the remaining six. In the last 9 months the Post Office Department has also issued 170 orders against foreign obscenity dealers. The Department of Justice says that at present pornography dealers are being indicted at the rate of one a month.

In addition, the Post Office Department is using legislation permitting families to remove themselves from pornographic mailing lists. Any recipients may request a "prohibitory order" in which the postmaster directs the mailer to remove the name from any list he owns, controls, or rents. If this is not obeyed, then, when it is called to the postmaster's attention, legal proceedings are invoked. About 200,000 such orders have been issued in 1969, and 2,000 cases of violations have been referred to the Justice Department for prosecution.

Over 200 antiobscenity measures have been introduced in the Congress this year. President Nixon has asked adoption of three new legislative proposals. First, prohibit outright mailing of such material to children under 18; second, prohibit mailing of advertising designed to appeal to prurient interests in sex; third, give the citizen the right to file notice with the Post Office Department that no sexually oriented advertisements should be delivered to his home.

The administration is preparing to move on another front, too. I have received complaints from individuals disturbed and outraged over some of the dialog found at times in television shows.

The Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Dean Burch, disclosed just recently that the Department of Justice may prosecute radio or television stations that broadcast profanity. Chairman Burch told a Senate subcommittee that he had recently met

with Deputy Attorney General Richard Kleindienst and Assistant Attorney General William D. Ruckelshaus on the matter, and found them willing to prosecute such a case, criminally or civilly, if FCC referred one to them. Assistant Attorney General Ruckelshaus commented later that one element to be considered would be a possible invasion of the sanctity of the home if offensive language were broadcast into a home, especially if children were present.

I believe the sentiment of the great majority will be "It's about time." It seems to be the trend in the media—art, movies, theater, literature—to come up with material that would send the hard-bitten viewers of a stag smoker reeling and retching into the streets. The American people want no part of this in their homes, and there is no reason in the world why they should have to put up with it.

#### POLLUTION

The depth of the problem of waste disposal and avoiding pollution of the lands and seas can be expressed in one stunning fact given me recently: It costs the city of New York more to dispose of one Sunday's discarded New York Times than it costs the Times to print it.

It is no accident that "America the Beautiful" is one of our favorite and most beloved songs, and it is equally no accident that more and more persons, keenly aware of the great natural beauties and resources of our Republic, are deeply concerned over their preservation.

There's no problem as such due to lack of money. Right now, today, total national expenditures for disposing solid wastes, public and private, run about \$4.5 billion a year. Since 1957, 9,400 waste-treatment projects have been constructed, with help of \$1.2 billion in grants from the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, and total value of these projects is set at \$5.4 billion.

There was a great deal of controversy in Congress recently over attempts to appropriate a full \$1 billion of Federal money for construction grants for waste treatment plants for this fiscal year. However, the Secretary of the Interior himself pointed out, and I quote from his letter to the Appropriations Committee:

State, local and private sectors could support no more than \$1.5 billion worth of new municipal waste-treatment plant construction during . . . 1970, so that no more than \$600 million in Federal grants effectively could be used.

In spite of this, the bill that went to the White House contained \$800 million. We can increase the amount of money that can be effectively spent in succeeding years. But States and local communities need time to prepare to carry out their part of the project.

It is easy, very easy indeed, to approach the pollution problem with the simple sentiment that "more money" will end it all. We always have those who would solve every problem by merely appropriating more and more of the taxpayer's money.

Today many industries are cooperating with the Federal, State, and local

effort to curb pollution. The American Iron and Steel Institute says its member companies have authorized \$327 million in air and water pollution control spending—\$100 million more than a year ago. In Indiana the Bethlehem Steel plant at Burns Harbor "programmed" air and water control devices into its original construction. Its water quality project cost \$37 million and today game fish are caught in Lake Michigan within sight of the mill.

The complete solution to the problem is, admittedly, still a long way off. But at the same time I believe that "America the Beautiful," so long such a national joy and treasure to all of us, will be preserved, and will not disappear in the mists of smog and exhaust gases, be strangled by polluted streams and rivers, nor be buried under mountains of waste.

#### INFLATION

Letters accompanying the poll returns show few problems are causing the American people more trouble than inflation. Inflation hits everyone; it is fools' gold, in a sense, giving a false sense of financial security. And it may be compared to an economic drug: once taken, it requires increased dosages to retain that euphoric sense of well-being.

Perhaps no single factor is more responsible than Government deficit spending—spending more than it takes in. The last year we had a balanced budget, that is, more receipts than expenditures, was fiscal year 1960. For fiscal year 1961, the national deficit was \$3 billion and fiscal year 1968 it had soared to \$25 billion.

A tax cut in 1962 reduced Government income by about \$9 billion. This increased the deficit; the Government had to borrow more, at a rising interest rate.

Each year, the annual deficit, together with renewal of Government bond issues coming due—which the Government could not pay—forced more debt, and higher interest. Today, Government interest has risen from about 3 to 8 percent; the end probably is not yet in sight.

The debt has gone from \$290 billion in 1960 to \$369 billion today; over the same period of time, annual interest on this debt has gone from \$9 billion in 1960 to \$17 billion today.

In the past 10 years the Federal Government has spent \$79 billion more than it has taken in. President Nixon has insisted Congress meet its responsibility and work toward a balanced budget.

However, some Members of Congress vote to increase all appropriations, and lower all taxes. Unless Congress resists demands for spending money we do not have, then we are on a certain collision course with disaster. In spite of this, Congress did appropriate—to name just one instance—\$1.3 billion more than the administration requested for Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations, which the President did not request, did not want, and yet would be forced to spend. It was the largest increase made by Congress in any of President Nixon's budget recommendations for 1970, and the largest excess over

a Presidential request ever provided by Congress for HEW.

And this was also done in spite of the fact that outlays for HEW were estimated to increase in fiscal 1970 by \$6.1 billion over those of 1969. So all the talk about the administration cheating the Nation's schoolchildren is misleading propaganda.

This feeds the fires of inflation, this excess appropriation. It contributes to an inflation that means you have not received a real increase in wages or salary since late 1965. And your real take-home pay in December 1969 was 1.1 percent lower than in December 1968.

Now, there is a choice, both for Congress and the administration. Yet, it is not really a choice at all when the two alternatives are considered. Taking needed measures to stop inflation means temporary unpopularity with some segments of the population. Retaining popularity and doing nothing about it means certain financial disaster for every last citizen of the American Republic. I believe the American people recognize what has to be done, support those who have the courage to do it, and will register their approval of actions, and persons, who put long-range economic stability of the country over short-range personal interest.

#### GOLDEN EGGS FOR ALL WILL KILL THE GOOSE

No country on the globe has an economy that could furnish to all deserving people all the things they might need. There are limits to what can be done and there are limits to the number that can be reached. It is irresponsible, demagogic, misleading and cruel for persons to infer otherwise.

It is easy to say, for instance, that "this is good, but something more will be better." However, it is not always true and it is not always sound, either. There are wide and usually unbridgeable gulfs between what a person really needs and what he thinks he needs. And the gulf is equally vast between what persons think should be done and what can be done with the resources at hand.

You do not, as the old fable pointed out so well, get more golden eggs by killing the goose. If the peasant had been less eager for instant wealth—if he had put aside his ax and been more concerned with the long-range health of the goose—he would have been a rich man.

So it is with the economies of nations and that of the American Republic is no exception. Observe the limits of your Nation's wealth, wisely use its available resources to do what can and must be done, and takes measures to keep the economy strong, and the Nation will remain strong. Ignore the limits, though, and squander the resources, and the result is disaster for the Nation and every one of its citizens.

#### SPIRIT OF THE SEVENTIES: QUALITY, NOT QUANTITY

The sixties might come in time to be known as the Decade of Quantity—the time when more things were promised to more people than ever before in the history of the American Republic. It was also a time when quantity overrode quality. If one dared question the assumption that merely because more persons would

be brought under more Federal programs—and more money would be spent—and would ask, from time to time, "But is this sound? Is it thought out in advance?" he opened himself to being attacked as a foe of progress and humanity.

To paraphrase Sir Winston Churchill we might speak of the decade of the sixties and say: "Never before in the history of the American Republic had so few promised so much to so many." And, I might well add, "delivered so little."

Quantity? To be sure; for instance, quantity is evident when we compare \$19.9 billion spent by the Federal Government in fiscal year 1960 for programs dealing with health, welfare, education, and manpower, compared with its increase of \$30.6 billion to a total of \$50.5 billion in fiscal year 1968. But is there any quality involved when the number on welfare rolls for ADC—aid to dependent children—alone increased in this same period from 3.1 million in 1960 to 6.1 million in 1968?

Quantity? In 1960, the Federal Government spent \$291 million on law enforcement; in 1968, \$531 million. Quality? In 1960, offenses against persons totaled 285,000; in 1968, 589,000—an increase of 106.5 percent. In 1960, offenses against property were 1,729,000; in 1968, 3,878,000—an increase of 124.2 percent.

I have long believed that for the great majority of our citizens, the "How" something gets done is equally if not more important than the fact of getting it done in the first place. Results do not automatically follow good intentions. As the irrepressible Dr. Samuel Johnson once snapped: "Sir, Hell is paved with good intentions" and promises never guaranteed paradise for anyone, nor for any society.

The watchword of the sixties, "quantity," was conceived by the Federal Government and thrust upon the American people whom, I believe, were by and large basically cautious and skeptical of the theories behind it. What I believe will be the watchword of the seventies, "quality," has been generated by the people and presented to their Government.

We enter, then, into a new decade with this new spirit, which I believe heralds an era of mutual trust between Government and governed. This, we must have, if we are to hope to leave a strong and goodly heritage to those who will come after us. I have faith in my fellow Americans, and I believe we will.

#### THE MAIL SERVICE—WHO DO YOU BELIEVE AT TIME, INC.?

#### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the subject of U.S. postal service is a convenient football for many members of the media.

This is notwithstanding the fact that the media generally is one of the greatest beneficiaries of day-in and day-out mail service with a lot of special concessions, including rates.

A recent issue of Life magazine featured a front page picture and story about "The U.S. Mail Mess."

This was an excellent opportunity for this publication to tell the American public the real story of what is troubling our postal service. And, furthermore, to point out that the postal service is delivering the mail in spite of its handicaps. But the editors did not do that.

When the story was called to my attention, I took the liberty of calling the editor of Life and asking him if he would care to hear the other side of the mail story.

He said he would and arranged to send a senior editor to spend half a day trying to catch up with the fountain of information—and recommendations—which our Post Office and Civil Service Committee compiled during 8 months of hearings and executive sessions last year.

This senior editor assured me that there was indeed another side of the story which needed to be told. He assured me he would make every effort to find a way to present it to Life readers in the near future.

Interestingly, just to show that the departments of Time, Inc., obviously are not always in communication with one another, I would like to call the attention of Members to a letter which a Time executive sent to many postmasters last month. Following is the text:

TIME, INC.,

Chicago, Ill., December 10, 1969.

DEAR POSTMASTER: A change will be made in the publication schedule for Sports Illustrated and Life Magazines that would normally be delivered the last two weeks of December 1969 and the first two weeks of January 1970.

Sports Illustrated will again combine the year-end issues so that your office will not receive an issue of Sports Illustrated the week of December 21.

Life will also combine the year-end issues plus two issues in January so that your office will not receive Life the week of December 28, 1969 nor the week of January 11, 1970.

Your continued fine cooperation in providing prompt handling and on-time delivery of Time, Inc. publications in your area is greatly appreciated.

Our staff joins me in best wishes for a happy and successful holiday season.

Very truly yours,

F. R. STRUPECK,

Traffic Manager, Subscriber Division.

The criticism in the Life feature story and the commendation to postmasters by the Time executive make an interesting story in itself which is featured, with a photocopy of the letter to a postmaster, in the current issue of the Postal Supervisor, published by the National Association of Postal Supervisors. Following is the text from the January issue:

#### THE U.S. MAIL MESS

Life magazine (November 28, 1969 issue) joins in the popular indoor sport of shooting at the post office. The shooting took place in a front-page featured article bearing the above title. Open season for this unsportsmanlike type of hunting obviously extends from January 1 to December 31 of each year.

Although it has been a popular sport for many years with members of the press (who seem to always have the right answers for everything), the pastime has won even more devotees the last year or two thanks to two of the last three Postmasters General.

Postal employees have been accustomed over the years to the blasts from the newspapers and magazines (which, incidentally receive the largest mail subsidy of all), but the criticism and dire predictions of "collapse" and "catastrophe" from officials who head the postal establishment are very hard to take.

The article in Life begins with an unqualified statement that it requires nine days for an airmail letter, properly ZIP-coded, to go from Seattle, Washington to Washington, D.C.

This statement is a bald-faced lie. It is quite possible that it took a letter nine days to make this route.

It could take nine days for a letter to go nine miles or to go anywhere when it has been mishandled or distributed in error, but to imply that it takes nine days for all airmail letters to go from Seattle to Washington, D.C. is a deliberate misrepresentation of the facts.

For the past eleven years N.A.P.S. has had a National Vice President residing in Seattle, Washington. This officer corresponds with N.A.P.S. national headquarters in Washington, D.C. on an average of once or twice each week.

In eleven years it has never taken one of his letters nine days to reach Washington. We challenge anyone—magazine and newspaper writers included—to mail an airmail letter from Seattle to Washington every day for one month and to then publish the results.

The misstatement of fact in the first paragraph of the Life article is not the only misrepresentation. Articles like this would not be read if they were not filled with exaggerations. Another side of the question which readers of the article would never know indicates without a doubt that the Production and Traffic Department of Time, Inc., publishers of Life, does not share the opinion of the post office which its Editorial Department does.

The following letter from Time, Inc., received by a number of postmasters throughout the country last month, tells an entirely different story.

Maybe some day a reporter who is getting ready to retire will write an article on the inconsistencies of the magazine publishing business entitled "The Time and Life Mess!"

DR. JAMES A. VAN ALLEN

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the statement on the future of U.S. space programs by Dr. James A. Van Allen of the University of Iowa at the 11th annual meeting of the Panel on Science and Technology of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, on January 28, 1970. Dr. Van Allen is the discoverer of the Van Allen earth radiation belt, and one of United States outstanding scientists and astronomers:

#### STATEMENT OF DR. VAN ALLEN

The Panel on Science and Technology had its beginnings in 1959 at the time that the Hon. Overton Brooks of Louisiana was the Chairman of the then newly formed House Committee on Science and Astronautics. In the first fumbling efforts of the Panel, I believe that all of us found it both exciting and strange to be on a man-to-man footing with Congressmen within their own exalted precincts.

During the subsequent ten years under the powerful and genial leadership of Chairman George P. Miller, this relationship has flourished and become progressively more significant. I am personally very grateful to him and to his able colleagues for the opportunity to be a small part of this operation.

About 15 years ago my good friend Ed Ney of the University of Minnesota gave a popular lecture on the use of large balloons for scientific research at high altitudes. And he made brief mention of recent manned balloon flights by Jean Picard, by Col. Simon and by Cdr. Malcolm Ross—each one a very considerable achievement of skill and courage.

At the end of the lecture a polite old lady arose to ask a question:

"Professor Ney, I have a question for you. Is there anything that a man can do at high altitude that an instrument can not do?"

He replied as follows:

"Yes, Madam, there is! But I see no reason why a man should wish to do it at 100,000 ft. in the gondola of a balloon!"

The wisdom of this remark has been amply demonstrated by the hundreds of unmanned scientific balloon flights that have been made since that time and are continuing at the present date.

I submit that an analogous remark is relevant to the current situation in space exploration in this year, 1970.

The culmination of the manned space flight programs of the United States in the dramatic successes of Apollo 8, 11 and 12 has discharged in full measure the romantic aspiration of man to set foot on the moon and the nine-year old commitment of the United States to be the agency for this accomplishment.

All honor to the thousands of devoted persons who have done this job!

No less impressive to many of us, though not nearly as widely known, has been a 12-year procession of automated and commandable spacecraft of immense capability and spectacular success in scientific discovery and in the performance of utilitarian functions in communications, navigation and meteorology. Some of the more noteworthy ones in the scientific area are the soft-landed Surveyors to the moon, the Lunar Orbiters, the Mariners to Venus and Mars, the far ranging Pioneers and the Orbiting Astronomical Observatory. The latter, during some thirteen months of earth-orbiting lifetime, has responded obediently to thousands of commands, has done hundreds of remarkable angular maneuvers with great precision and has thereby made impressive contributions to knowledge of the ultra-violet spectra of hundreds of celestial objects. My fellow panelist, Fred Whipple, has had a central role in this achievement. Also, I cannot refrain from mentioning a heroic little fellow, Explorer 35, which has been orbiting the moon since 22 July 1967—now over 30 months—and which is still ticking along beautifully. I am especially devoted to a little package on Explorer 35 that was devised and built in 1965-67 by several students at Iowa and myself. Two students have earned their Ph.D.'s from study of its data and three more will likely do so during the present year. The package weighs 2.2 pounds and uses 7/10 of one watt of electrical power. It does not sleep, it requires no oxygen, no food, no toothpaste and no sanitary facilities. It now appears likely that its useful life span may be terminated only by administrative decision rather than by technical failure.

With these brief remarks as background and in consideration of the prevailing era of governmental austerity with regard to science, I urge the re-examination of our operations in space with two, and only two, central objectives firmly in mind:

First: The fullest economically feasible exploitation of our space capabilities for useful applications in rapid and efficient

communications, in navigation, in the analysis and forecast of the dynamics of the world's weather, and in terrestrial reconnaissance and survey in the broadest sense.

Second: The enlargement and extension of scientific knowledge and human perception of the larger physical universe. Here I am thinking especially of the study of our earth itself as a planet, of the moon, of each of the other planets in turn, and of other elements of the solar system by direct approach; and of the sun and other celestial bodies by remote means—basically in the historical tradition of astronomy. I may say here that I am devoted especially to the planets, each one of which is different from every other one and each of which is a complex and distinctive new world of great intrinsic fascination. All are available to direct in-situ study within the current state of space technology.

If, on a purely pragmatic basis, one or more men in the spacecraft is the cost effective technique for conducting any one of these missions, let it be done in that mode.

But if, as I anticipate, this is not the case, let us not grieve nor devote ourselves to the invention of specious and inane reasons to the contrary. Rather let us get on with our two basic objectives in the most sensible and rational framework that we can devise.

This is my stand! It has been for many years—at least twenty.

Thank you.

#### RETIREMENT WITH WORK

### HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, Judge Gerald J. Boileau, dean of Wisconsin's circuit court judges, has retired—after a fashion.

Judge Boileau reached retirement age this month after presiding over the 16th judicial circuit for more than 27 years. He stepped down from that post but did not step out of the public life that began in 1923. Indeed, he assumed new duties as a reserve judge in Milwaukee, where he has agreed to sit this month and next to help clear the criminal docket.

Among his many achievements, Judge Boileau won election to Congress from Wisconsin's Seventh District in 1930 and represented it until 1938, returning to Marathon County to practice law. In 1942 he ran for circuit court judge to fill an unexpired term, won election, and then reelection ever since.

Mr. Speaker, there are several Members still serving in the House who were colleagues of Gerry Boileau's during the years from 1930 to 1938. I know they remember him for his integrity and firm convictions. I should like to insert an article from the Wausau Daily Record-Herald concerning Judge Boileau for the benefit of those who served with him.

#### JUDGE BOILEAU TO CELEBRATE RETIREMENT WITH WORK

(By Win Freund)

Judge Gerald J. Boileau, dean of Wisconsin's Circuit Court judges, reached retirement age Jan. 15 and he will celebrate by presiding in one of Milwaukee's criminal courts.

Judge Boileau, who presided over the state's 16th Judicial Circuit for more than 27 years, swore in his successor, Judge Ronald D. Keberle, Friday, and begins his duties as a reserve judge in Milwaukee Monday.

He has agreed to sit through January and February to help clear the Milwaukee criminal docket.

The jurist's public life began here in 1923 when he went to work in the district attorney's office. He accepted the position a few months after arriving in Wausau following his graduation from Marquette University Law School.

In 1926 he was elected district attorney of Marathon County. He was the first full-time district attorney in the county and the first in Wisconsin outside Milwaukee County.

Recalling that election, Judge Boileau admits he could have done without the honor.

"I would have preferred to be a part-time district attorney because as a fulltime official a lawyer couldn't build a law practice," he said.

However, the job gave him an opportunity to meet many persons and officials, which stood him in good stead when he sought election to Congress from the Seventh District in 1930.

Having sought office on a non-partisan ticket the past 27 years, Judge Boileau doesn't like to use party labels when discussing his early political life. He will admit to still being a liberal.

He ran for Congress in 1930 as a Republican and won. He was 30 years old and, like the present congressman from this district, David R. Obey, was the youngest man in the house.

Boileau was on the Republican ticket when he was reelected in 1932, but with the organization of the Progressive Republican party he won on that ticket in 1934 and 1936.

There was a liberal bloc in Congress at that time, made up of Progressives and Farmer Laborites, which numbered about 22, and about 25 liberal Democrats.

Judge Boileau was recognized as the floor leader of this Progressive group, taking over from Fiorello La Guardia, who left Congress to gain fame as New York City's mayor.

When regular Democrats and Republicans split along party lines, this Progressive bloc often held the power of decision.

In those earlier days the Democratic party wasn't even considered in the Seventh District. The voters just decided which Republican they wanted.

However, with the coming to power of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Democrats in the district began to flex their muscles and began looking to Washington for postmasterships and other plums. Some became so bold they put up a Democratic candidate for Congress in 1938. This split the vote three ways, Republican, Democrat and Progressive, and it was Boileau's undoing.

He lost and returned here to practice law. He remained popular with the electorate. Judge Boileau remembers that in 1938 the Marathon County Board of 72 members and unanimously supported him.

When he ran for Circuit Court judge in 1942 to fill an unexpired term he was elected and he has been re-elected without opposition ever since.

As a native of Minocqua he had many friends in his Circuit, which includes Lincoln, Vilas and Oneida counties, besides Marathon.

Judge Boileau has won a reputation as a trial judge and a student of the law. In years past he presided over grand juries in Milwaukee and Kenosha which returned indictments for malfeasance against officials.

The jurist played a major role in the revision of the state's criminal code, serving as chairman of the advisory committee to the Legislature on the revision of the criminal

code. The committee of 16 men spent several years bringing up to date the statutes which had not been revised since 1848. All decisions of the Supreme Court, many of which had the effect of changing the statute through interpretation, were incorporated with the revised statute.

Judge Boileau is also chairman of the committee preparing uniform jury instructions in criminal cases and he has been asked to continue in that capacity. With the flow of decisions from the U.S. Supreme Court it is likely this committee will never reach the end of its role.

It has drawn up instructions now used by all judges and directed to defendants before they make a plea of guilty. They are long and detailed and, hopefully, are so inclusive a trial judge will not make a mistake.

"You must not only make sure a defendant is aware of his constitutional rights," Judge Boileau said, "but the court must be convinced of the man's guilt before he can accept a plea of guilty. The new instructions will save considerable money in the long run because there will be very few appeals."

He has served as chairman of the Board of Circuit Judges, as chairman of the Board of Criminal Court Judges and as the Circuit Court representative on the State Judicial Council.

Speaking of justice, Judge Boileau said he believes people get the kind of justice they demand. If a law is not popular, he said, it will be difficult to enforce. He pointed to the prohibition laws and currently the marijuana laws with their stiff penalties for first offense users.

He said he believes Wisconsin's court system is efficient and serves well in the administration of justice. The work done in preparing instructions for juries in criminal and civil cases has helped to remove errors and eliminated the terrific expense of new trials.

#### CONGRESSIONAL HEARING ROOM PROVIDED HANOI AGENTS

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I have previously called to the attention of the House the national shame of our spineless betrayal of those Americans who were taken captive while fighting for our country in Vietnam.

For the first time in our history, the wives of captured Americans are required to treat with the enemy in their desperate attempts to afford to their men the protection which our country finds it politically inconvenient to provide.

We have sunk to such depths that these valiant women are even forced to treat with the enemies at home—to plead with Hanoi's "dear American friends" for word of their loved ones.

Now press reports indicate that two of these brave wives appeared at a press conference arranged by three of our colleagues in a hearing room here, again to defend and protect their men.

To our shame, our colleagues had arranged the conference as a platform for the use of Hanoi's "dear American friends" and to further the subversive aims of the enemy in this country.

I include the newsclipping in my remarks:

**A MISSING FLIER'S WIFE SOFTLY BEGGED  
TO DIFFER**

The wife of a captured U.S. flier stood up in a congressional hearing room yesterday and emotionally contradicted an anti-war leader who had just reported on her visit to a prisoner-of-war camp in North Vietnam.

"Mrs. Weiss, you're so very wrong on so many things," Mrs. Martha Doss said, in a soft quivering voice.

Cora Weiss, of Women Strike for Peace and one of the leaders of the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, was one of three American women who traveled to North Vietnam in December. They visited a detention camp and spoke with three U.S. prisoners.

In a congressional hearing room provided by three New York congressmen, Mrs. Weiss and Mrs. Ethel Taylor met with reporters and local Women Strike for Peace members to describe their trip.

Mrs. Weiss, of New York City, spoke of relatively healthy and satisfied Americans in what she acknowledged might be the best detention camp in North Vietnam. She said the prisoners lived in a spotless camp lined with palm shade trees and followed a routine that included daily exercises and afternoon naps.

When reporters had asked Mrs. Weiss the last of their questions, Mrs. Doss arose, was recognized and made a brief statement.

She said her husband, Navy Lt. Cmdr. Dale Doss, was shot down more than two years ago. A few months later, she told Mrs. Weiss, she saw a picture of her husband and his appearance shocked her.

Mrs. Doss, an attractive and slender brunette from Virginia Beach, Va., sat down. She was surrounded by reporters.

"Oh God, I can't believe the things she is saying," Mrs. Doss said. "I know better."

She said the North Vietnamese "did a beautiful job" on Mrs. Weiss. "We heard the same things in Paris," when Mrs. Doss and several other POW wives made a fruitless trip to Paris to learn something of their husbands from the North Vietnam delegation to the Vietnam peace talks.

Mrs. Sue Shuman, also of Virginia Beach, said of Mrs. Weiss: "She's pro-communist." Her husband, Cmdr. Edwin Shuman, was shot down with Ross.

**FROM KATYN FOREST TO SOUTH  
VIETNAM**

**HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for more than 50 years the Communists have adhered to their same tactics of the end justifies the means. Only the names and places of the innocent victims have changed.

We are constantly reminded of the Katyn Forest massacre where 15,000 gallant Polish officers were slaughtered at the hands of the treacherous Russians and the brutal methods employed. We are also reminded that toward the end of World War II, the masters of deceit called the Polish underground army to arms against the Nazis with promises of support from the Russian Army. The support never came and as a result, 250,000 patriotic Poles were slaughtered by the Nazis and every building in Warsaw

was reduced to rubble, save those buildings which housed the Nazis.

With virtually all vestiges of the intelligentsia removed by these two incidents, the hordes of Stalin were free to take over Poland and set up a Communist regime, and the rape of Poland was complete.

For more than a decade, we have been witnessing the same prolog to the epilog in South Vietnam. The Communists have systematically slaughtered many thousands of the South Vietnamese leadership and intelligentsia—not to forget the innumerable other victims—in preparation for a Communist takeover. The Hue massacre, similar to the Katyn massacre, was merely a culmination of Communist strategy to divide and conquer. We know the bloodbath that will ensue if we leave South Vietnam at the mercy of the Communists—the same type of bloodbath that is rife throughout Communist history.

Today, I should like to place in the RECORD an excellent article which appeared in the magazine, the Immaculate. The article compares the similarity between Katyn and Hue and the continuing Communist tactics of terroristic assassinations as a means to achieve their ends. We must never be beguiled by those who would have us believe that the Communists are civilized people; at best they are huns.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows.

**FROM KATYN FOREST TO SOUTH VIETNAM**

Although the Russians vehemently denied the charge of the Germans in 1942 that they had killed over 14,000 Polish officers and intellectuals in the Katyn Forest in the Soviet Union, there was plenty of evidence to prove they were lying. When the Polish government in exile in London demanded that the international Red Cross should examine the graves of the murdered Poles, the U.S.S.R. broke off diplomatic relations with the Polish Government in exile.

It is, of course, a well established fact today that Stalin ordered the Red army to kill these elite of the Polish nation—lawyers, educators, doctors, and businessmen who were army reserve officers. For they would inevitably supply the leadership that would oppose a Communist takeover of Poland.

The same tactics are being used in South Vietnam by the Viet Cong. The former Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, noted that "in 1960 alone, terrorists assassinated 1,400 local government officials and kidnapped 700 others, while armed guerrillas killed 2,200 military and security personnel." In 1964, from January to October, 429 village and hamlet officials were assassinated and 1,482 kidnapped. These were all local officials elected by the villagers. Not only civil servants, village officials but the natural leaders (who do not hold office, but because of age, sagacity or strength of character, are the ones the people turn to for advice) are selected for elimination. As the U.S. Mission magazine puts it, "Steadily, quietly and with a systematic ruthlessness, the Viet Cong in six years have wiped out virtually a whole class of Vietnamese villagers. Many villages today are virtually depopulated of their natural leaders."

In this underdeveloped country, sapped by a continuous war of over twenty years, the most valuable asset is good, dedicated and qualified personnel in every aspect of

life. There is an acute shortage of teachers, doctors and medical technicians. Yet, from 1959 to 1965, the Viet Cong destroyed 123 schools, and killed 240 teachers, 115 nurses, and 27 doctors. Fr. Cletus Haly, S.J. concludes:

"Here is manifest evidence of the Communists' lack of genuine concern for the people. However, if it is not welfare of the people that they seek but political control (and it is!), it must be admitted that their operation is very shrewd. Without leadership the people are reduced to an amorphous mass, incapable of organized resistance, helpless in the presence of a well-organized ruthless enemy."

If official leadership and natural leadership are the prime targets for elimination by the Communists, the local inhabitants in general are secondary targets. In December, 1962, the "National Liberation Front" (NLF) issued orders for an increased use of terror on the hapless people. A State Department document describes the resulting terrorism:

"Its application takes many forms: . . . Grenades lobbed into cars stopped for traffic lights;

"Grenades set in the night with trip-wires across the common paths where peasants and school-children walk in the morning;

"Village men and boys kidnapped and forced into Viet Cong military service;

"Villages harassed night after night with sporadic gunfire and loudspeakers taunts and threats;

"Schools and health stations bombed;

"Busloads of civilians blown up by electrically controlled mines. . . .

"Harassing villages probably has been the most common form of terror used by the Viet Cong. The most common form of harassment is small-arms fire. . . . It creates a great sense of anxiety within the village, keeps villages awake at night, impairing their farming and normal daytime activities. And it builds confidence within guerrilla ranks."—State D., July, '67, p. 1, 3.

The greatest single act of terrorism occurred when the Viet Cong gained temporary control of the city of Hue in 1968. More than 1,000 men and women were executed. So far only 350 victims have been found, identified and given proper burial.

Democratic Congressman, Roman C. Pucinski, from Illinois, who was the chief investigator of the Katyn Forest massacre back in 1952 for the House Select Committee on Communist Aggression, was struck by "the tragic similarity between the methods used by the Communists in the Katyn Forest in 1940, and the methods used by the Communists against the South Vietnamese in Hue." The victims at Katyn, as in Hue, were killed with a single bullet in the back of the head, while kneeling with their hands tied behind their backs. They were then pushed into mass graves, in some cases while still alive.

The discovery of the mass graves in Hue is dramatic evidence of what the Communists have planned for the one million refugees (over 700,000 Catholics) who fled North Vietnam to join the hundreds of thousands of South Vietnamese in clearly establishing their opposition to the Communists.

May the United States abandon these people to such a cruel fate, after we have definitely promised them our protection and aid? Hardly, if we still wish to be considered Christian. For as Pope Pius XII so aptly put it:

"A people threatened with an unjust aggression, or already its victims may not remain passively indifferent if it would think and act as befits Christians. All the more does the solidarity of the family of nations forbid others to behave as mere spectators, in an attitude of apathetic neutrality."