

into the United States be free of phosphorus; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 15683. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 15684. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 15685. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to establish standards of conduct for military officers dealing in an official capacity with defense contractors, to prohibit employment of retired officers by defense contractors unless such officers have been certified as not violating such standards during their service careers, to establish a board to make such certifications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H.R. 15686. A bill, Cumberland Island National Seashore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H.J. Res. 1074. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to authorize Congress, by two-thirds vote of both Houses, to override decisions of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 1075. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution requiring that Federal judges be reconfirmed by the Senate every 10 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, Mr. WIGGINS, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. REES, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. VANIK, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM):

H. Res. 813. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. CULVER, Mr. SCHADEBERG, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. OBEY, Mr.

POFF, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. WINN, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. KING, and Mr. KEITH):

H. Res. 814. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Res. 815. Resolution providing expenses for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LOWENSTEIN:

H.R. 15687. A bill for the relief of Piedad V. Montesdeoca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 15688. A bill for the relief of Dr. Stuart Tsau-Shiong Chen and his wife, Yeh Jung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE LATE DISTINGUISHED MAYOR
JOHN SMITH OF BECKLEY

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed shocked yesterday morning to learn of the unexpected death of the Honorable John Smith, the distinguished mayor of the city of Beckley, W. Va., located in Raleigh County.

Mr. Speaker, Mayor Smith has provided unsurpassed leadership not only to his home city of Beckley, but also to the County of Raleigh and the entire State of West Virginia. Mayor Smith gave every ounce of energy to bring about his noble objectives and it was my privilege to work closely with this most distinguished public servant. During our association, I always found that he enthusiastically took that extra step for the benefit of his home city. I have lost a most wonderful personal friend and I extend my sympathy to his widow in Beckley.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the enclosed article which appeared in the Raleigh Register on Monday, February 2, be included at this point in my remarks:

MAYOR JOHN SMITH DIES

Beckley Mayor John Wesley Smith, serving his second term as chief executive of the city, died in a local hospital at 2:30 a.m. today.

The mayor had been hospitalized since Wednesday but was believed to be in satisfactory condition Sunday, according to a member of the family who said his death apparently was caused by a cardiac arrest.

Smith was known to have suffered from diabetes since the end of World War II in which he served as a Navy transport pilot for four years. Smith also was a member of the U.S. Naval Reserve with the rank of lieutenant.

His career in public life began with his appointment to City Council in 1953 and his subsequent election to two four-year terms

on the Council prior to his election as mayor in 1963. He was re-elected in 1967.

Tributes have poured into the newspaper offices from a shocked constituency and associates in government.

Former Governor Okey A. Patteson said, "I regret to hear of the untimely death of my good friend Mayor Smith. His loss will be keenly felt by his host of friends. His untiring efforts and accomplishments on behalf of the city of Beckley make him hard to replace. The city of Beckley and the entire area have lost a truly dedicated leader. My heartfelt sympathy goes out to his wife and family."

Smith was a cousin of another former governor, Hulett C. Smith who was overwhelmed by shock and grief.

City Recorder-Treasurer, Larry F. Stover, who will serve as acting mayor until Council holds a special meeting to appoint a successor, said he has "lost not only a fine leader but also a close personal friend."

The special meeting is expected to be held the latter part of the week. City Attorney E. M. "Ned" Payne III explained that the city charter provides that Council may appoint "a member of Council or any qualified person" to fill the mayor's post until the next regular election in June, 1971. The newly elected mayor will take office July 1, 1971.

"The city has lost a fine, courageous mayor who did a great deal for the city of Beckley," Payne said. "He gave of himself unselfishly and there is no question he did only what he thought was right and best for the city even though this was not always the easy and popular course. He added improvements and contributed to the city's growth bringing reform and improvements to administration.

"From the family standpoint," Payne said, "we have lost a friend and neighbor, a great personal loss."

Senator Jennings Randolph said "I share with citizens of the Beckley area and our state a genuine sadness and loss in the passing of mayor John Wesley Smith. He was a dedicated and able public servant, who worked diligently for the betterment of the community and its citizens. There is tangible evidence in Beckley of his accomplishments and his constructive leadership. I was privileged to cooperate with Mayor Smith on many programs and projects. It was always a pleasure working with him.

"I join with the many people of the Beck-

ley area in extending sympathy to Mayor Smith's wife and daughters, his mother and other members of his family."

The mayor of Charleston, Elmer Dodson, worked with Mayor Smith in the West Virginia League of Municipalities and attended a National Cities League convention with him. "I was impressed with Smith," Dodson said, "in his quiet way he did as much or more than most of us. I have lost a friend."

The executive director of the State League of Municipalities, William E. Ross of Morgantown, commented on the strong support Smith gave the League and his diligent work.

Another man who knew Smith well through activities in the Democratic Party, 1968 gubernatorial candidate James Sprouse, called Smith "one of the outstanding leaders of West Virginia who personified in many ways the type of new leadership that I had been seeking in my public activities. I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Smith and his daughters, Anne and Joan."

"The mayor had a wonderful facility for always looking on the bright side of things," Raleigh County Delegate and House Finance Chairman Lewis N. McManus observed, "I will miss him personally and I'm sure the community will not soon forget him."

Members of Council were equally dismayed and saddened by Smith's death. Councilman-at-large J. S. "Syd" Larrick, who had served in municipal government for 10 years with Smith, hailed him as "thorough, and in my opinion one of the best mayors the City of Beckley ever had."

Another councilman-at-large, Ross Irie, who had known Smith, "since boyhood," said he admired "his judgment and energy and interest in Beckley."

He instituted many new programs and had plans for more improvements in the future."

The city's only Republican councilman, Bill Wilbur, said he was "deeply saddened by the loss of a man I have worked with and considered a friend for many years."

"He was a good man and a good mayor," Councilman Al Ellison said. "He had the people's interests at heart and this is a better city, a better place to live because of his programs."

One of Smith's duties as mayor was to head the City Sanitary Board. When he entered his first term he uncovered gross neglect in billings over a period of years and instituted steps to collect thousands of dollars due the city.

J. Russell Neely, a member of the Sanitary Board, called Smith "a good honest man, capable and conscientious and a mayor the city will miss."

Dr. Charles W. Merritt who was a member of Council in Smith's first term cited Smith as "honorable and fair, progressive, and a man who wanted to do as much for Beckley as possible."

During the Smith administration the city began construction, now under way, of a secondary sewage treatment system. City boundaries have been extended in a continuing program of annexation, the parking building between East Main and East Prince Streets was built, and the Exhibition Coal Mine completed, giving the city a slogan of which the mayor was particularly proud, "The City with a Mine of Its Own."

The new municipal building, begun while Smith was a member of Council, was completed during his administration. A ladder truck was purchased and other fire prevention measures instituted which allowed fire insurance premium rates to be lowered. Fire losses in the city now stand at approximately 25 per cent of the national rate and the mayor had hoped for a further reduction in rates as a result.

The city's one-way traffic pattern was put into operation, city streets improved, particularly by straightening a hazardous curve in Harper Road, new street lighting has been installed, building codes adopted and dilapidated buildings torn down, and a program of sidewalk repair continued.

New building codes for the city have been adopted and a city building inspector appointed. The mayor also was a leader in efforts to support the Raleigh County Library.

Funeral arrangements are incomplete but friends may call at the Keyser Bryant Funeral Home after 3 p.m. Tuesday.

The mayor was the owner of Smith's Grocery and Meat Market at 106 South Fayette St., a business founded by his late father, William J. Smith. He was born Oct. 23, 1918, at Riley in Raleigh County, attended Beckley schools and National Business College, Roanoke, Va., graduating from Bowling Green Business University in Bowling Green, Ky. He also was a graduate of American Airlines Training School, Fort Worth, Tex.

Smith was a member of the Beckley Elks Lodge, the Lions Club, Raleigh County Horseman's Association, Flat Top Lake Association and the First Christian Church.

Survivors are his wife, Dorothy Sheffer Smith; two daughters, Joan Addison Smith and Anne Wallace Smith, both college students; his mother, Mrs. William J. (Eura) Smith, Beckley; two sisters, Ann Strobel and Coralee Smith, both of New Orleans, La.; four brothers, William J. Jr., Evansville, Ind; Reuben, Knoxville, Tenn.; Raymond E., Crow, and David, Prosperity.

He lived at 905 Woodlawn Avenue.

HUNGER—COMMITTEE AND CONFERENCE

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs was established to conduct a 1-year investigation of hunger and to recommend some solutions. The committee has been working toward those ends for 13 months and is now requesting an additional year to complete the penetrating investigation it has begun. I cosponsored and strongly supported the original leg-

islation creating this committee and now strongly endorse its extension for 1 year.

The hearings held by the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs focus public attention on this great problem and the data already gathered has influenced such legislation as the Food Stamp Amendments of 1969 and the welfare reform legislation and others.

However, the select committee has not had enough time to complete its work. In its interim report of last August, the select committee indicated plans to examine, evaluate, and make recommendations in the areas of family food assistance, child nutrition, nutrition education, nutrition-related research, nutrition and the delivery of health-care, nutrition and farm policy, and much more.

Equally important, however, is the committee's desire to review the recommendations of the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health held just 2 months ago, December 2 to 4, 1969. There has not been enough time for the select committee to study the many recommendations which this conference produced.

As a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, which is at present considering Senate Resolution 323, to extend the select committee for an additional year, I state my wholehearted support of this legislation and extension.

Mr. President, at this point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks a letter and a newspaper interview from my constituent, Mrs. Joseph H. Young, who was the chairman of the task force on voluntary action by women for the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health. I believe her candid comments are interesting and valuable.

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

SCRANTON, PA.,
December 17, 1969.

Senator HUGH SCOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SCOTT: I was Chairman of the Task Force on Voluntary Action by Women for the recently concluded White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health. In that role I was one of the six Conference leaders that met with the President to present the unanimous Conference resolution calling for immediate executive and legislative action on hunger. We felt the President was personally very interested in our message.

Also, Mrs. Nixon was the Honorary Chairman of our particular Task Force, and we have had a couple of meetings with her in which she has expressed her deep concern that there are hungry people in our nation.

I believe the Conference was a great success. I am enclosing a local interview that gives some of my views. Briefly, I feel several very important things happened at the Conference, namely: the work accomplished was thorough and impressive; the reality and urgency of the issue was established; the unity of purpose of all the delegates was demonstrated not only in the panel recommendations but in the new relationships forged between people; and the willingness of the participants, especially women, to return home and become personally involved in the solutions was very evident.

Surely the most important thing that happened was in terms of human relationships as individuals, out of great diversity of back-

ground and self-interest, began to really listen to each other. It took courage on the part of the President, and especially Dr. Mayer, to create such a potentially explosive Conference, but I am confident its success has provided us with a positive pattern for dealing with other basic American issues.

Sincerely yours,

(Mrs.) PATRICIA YOUNG,
Chairman, Task Force on Voluntary
Action by Women.

[From the Abington Journal, Dec. 11, 1969]

HUNGRY SAID ON WAY TO REVOLT

(By J. R. Freeman and William Scranton 3d)

In an exclusive interview, Mrs. Joseph Young, a Scranton resident and chairman of the national Volunteer Action by Women Task Force, told two staff members of Northeastern Newspapers about her hour-long discussion with President Nixon during the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health. Mrs. Young outlined some of the problems facing a meaningful program to feed 10 million hungry Americans.

A long-time advocate of local participation in self-help endeavors for the poor, Mrs. Young, wife of architect Joseph Young, was chosen as one of a group of six participants to represent the conference before the President. She was the spokesman for the conference members, and also the delegate chosen to meet the press.

Following is a question and answer report of the discussion:

Question. Can you give us some ideas in what ways you think the White House Conference was a success, or, if you will, in what ways you think it was a failure?

Answer. The first way that it was a success is that it accomplished what it set out to do, which was to study the whole panorama of nutrition and health in the United States in 26 sections and to come up with substantial recommendations in all of these areas. The document that will be presented to the President at the end of the year is a very substantive document dealing with surveying the health, nutrition education in all of its aspects . . . concern for the health of especially vulnerable groups such as pregnant and nursing mothers and the elderly, the whole work of the food industry from food safety, packaging, labeling, new foods, and of course, especially all of the programs dealing with the delivery of food to the hungry.

Question. Since you are an authority on a rather voluminous report to be submitted to the President, can you give us your opinion as to what you think must be done currently to curb hunger in the nation that we are now aware exists?

Answer. In terms of the immediate issue of those people really suffering from hunger and malnutrition we must use whatever avenues we have to get either commodity programs or food stamp programs or emergency food programs into every county in the nation. In terms of a long range answer to the program, that's a much more complicated area.

Question. Do you think that the government is moving in this direction to involve itself in each county as such.

Answer. This is one of the pledges the President made to the conference last week, that within six months, and we hope much faster than that, there will be a food program in every county.

Question. In the study that has recently been done do we get an indication as to where the really serious problems are occurring, what part of the country they are in, and how bad off the people really are?

Answer. You'll find it every place from the Indian reservation to the Southwestern part of the country, Appalachia, in the South; you'll find it in urban areas as well as rural areas. You'll probably find those with no income at all most often located in the South,

but you will find across the board in every community some people, at least, who are unable to buy an adequate diet out of what money comes into the home.

Question. This includes northeastern Pennsylvania as well?

Answer. Yes, it does.

Question. Have you been involved, to any extent, from a local standpoint with the problem of hunger?

Answer. I have been attempting to motivate groups to do a survey of what the local condition is based on the fact that we do have food stamp programs and since, in Lackawanna County, we have over 9000 people on welfare. This statistic in itself indicates that they don't have an adequate amount for food because the food dollar is the first one cut and welfare payments are not adequate to have housing, clothing, and medicine and so forth without cutting into the food dollar.

Question. You mentioned Lackawanna County. Do you have the figures for Luzerne County as well?

Answer. No, I do not. The welfare proposal at present in Pennsylvania overall allows 21 cents per meal, but this includes not only money for food but for household products and other items like laundry soap, tooth paste, etc.

Question. There seemed to be some discontent among the people who attended the conference who complained that the conference was a lot of talk when hunger was a terribly pressing problem in America today. What was your reaction to those people who seemed to be impatient with what going on?

Answer. First of all, I was completely sympathetic because I have been in the Southwest and the South and I have seen the hungry babies. There were over 400 people of the legitimately hard corps poor at the conference; Indian-Americans, Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, blacks, Appalachia blacks and whites. They all had the same complaint that there are people actually going hungry. When you yourself or your children are literally hungry and going without meal after meal, it's awfully hard to see people talking about how much iron should go into the milk that you buy. They just want food, fortified or unfortified. And so the dynamics of the situation of bringing this confrontation contributed, I'm sure, greatly to the fact that I feel it was the most spiritual experience that I have ever been a part of.

Question. When six of you had your hour-long conversation with the President did you present this point of view? Did you let him know the feelings of the more militant participants, and if so, what was his reaction?

Answer. This was really the main thrust of our conversation; the call for him to take emergency action. It was based not only on the militant voice but the fact that even if it was a man who had a multimillion-dollar income as a result of being president of a food company or if it was a poor, illiterate person, there was total unanimity in the call to do something now about hunger. This was the main thrust of our message because the publicity that had come out indicated that it was just a lot of angry voices criticizing the President, and the implication was that these angry voices were only the poor. But it was really a universal call, and so we emphasized to him that this was not an abstract question, that it was a guts kind of question. I got so serious about it that I even cried a little. But the fact that we did not come back from the meeting with a specific promise by the President in words to do something that day continued to frustrate the poor because they felt that we had not done the job we were sent to do.

Question. When the conference was over, what was the reaction on the militant side?

Answer. Still frustrated. They had felt all along, and wrongly I might say, that the conference was structured to keep their voice

out. This wasn't true. Dr. Mayer (chairman of the conference) from the very beginning had tried to include them at every level. But, they've had so many written words and technical discussions and structure meetings, none of which have come out with any answers, and then the fact that they had the meeting and we still didn't come out with something they could hang onto. They were frustrated. They don't have enough faith in this administration or enough faith in this system that it can work for all the people. This is what we have to demonstrate by taking action, and not just by the President and Congress taking action. It has to happen at the local level, too.

Question. I recall that Senator McGovern, shortly after his trip to the South earlier this year, said that he was very much afraid of the same thing . . . that the people were in arms against the system rather than against any one administration. Did you get this same feeling?

Answer. When you have been kept out of the system and its benefits for so long I think this is understandable.

Question. In what order of priority would you put ending hunger insofar as what the government must do for America today?

Answer. Since food means life and if we can't guarantee life to our citizens I'd say it was first priority. But, in a general sense, the priority of individual human worth is, to me, the important thing whether you are discussing the issue of Vietnam or how a welfare program is administered or anything else that Americans should be interested in. It is the fact that each individual life is important.

Question. If you had the opportunity to draw up a program for attacking hunger that you knew would be instituted immediately, how would you go about setting it up?

Answer. Most of the recommendations are good that have been made about simplifying the food programs under a federal eligibility standard so that local politicians can't keep somebody out of the program. We need a certification that is a simple statement of need rather than all of the fantastic red tape. We must make the food program easily available not at a certain day of the week at an out of the way location, but when and where it is convenient to the hungry.

Question. Where would the money come from?

Answer. The amount of money actually needed to reach the 10 or 12 million hungry with food stamp or food commodity programs is not that great . . . \$2 or \$3 billion a year. In two or three years Dr. Mayer, who is my authority, estimates we really could do it. So it is not a major amount of money. It is a matter of making sure the programs reach the people they are intended to reach.

Question. Since the needed money is not that great, do you think the problem lies in a lack of commitment or is the system set up just inefficient?

Answer. The first thing is that, as of now, a lot of people that would be eligible for the programs are not even aware that they are eligible because there has been, I don't know whether it is a deliberate effort to hide the programs, but there certainly has not been a deliberate effort to publicize them. We are suggesting as women at the conference, among other things, to get this to be a spot announcement on radio and television like the Peace Corps or Vista, just to educate the people that it is available. Then there is the problem that sometimes you need an advocate to help you go to a bureaucracy and ask to be included. When you have a limited amount of money the mere cost of transportation to and from the source of food may keep you from having enough money to get the food. There are a lot of ways that just the public sector can enter into helping people.

Question. Is the \$2 to \$3 billion figure that

you use the estimate to completely eliminate hunger in the United States?

Answer. The hunger of the hardcore poor. Now, there are estimates that maybe there are 25 million Americans on incomes that keep them from getting an adequate fully nutritious diet. But that is different from those people that just are undernourished or with no nourishment part of the month.

Question. How many hard-core hungry are there locally?

Answer. It is just the same as nationally. We have not done the survey to determine who they are, and so just as the poor were frustrated by all this technical business about surveying and monitoring programs nationally, this is a very good illustration of why there has to be a survey to find the people locally.

Question. In the 9000 people that you mentioned that are on welfare in Lackawanna County, are you aware whether or not there is any individual ethnic group that makes up the majority of this number?

Answer. I think it goes across the ethnic lines because I know we have been doing some surveying in terms of our inter-faith program for meals-on-wheels for shut-ins and we're doing that in West Scranton. We are discovering, just as we knew, that there were elderly people on an inadequate diet because of inadequate income.

Question. You mentioned long range program. Can you elaborate on that.

Answer. In the area of surveying and monitoring, we, as a nation, have done over 30 surveys of hunger in other nations and only one in our own country. So, number one, we have to look for the specifics in our own country, and this has been begun by Dr. Shafer of the Public Health Service. On the basis of his first study he says it is a conservative estimate that there are 10 million hungry in this country. In terms of reaching special groups, one of the specifics is that we now have adequate pre-natal care for only 55 percent of our pregnant women. This must be increased at a rapidly rising rate because it has now been documented that if a pregnant woman or an infant up to one or two years old does not get adequate protein they are permanently retarded physically and mentally. Education . . . it's not just the poor who must have knowledge about the right foods to buy, it's all of us, but a corollary to that is that the right foods must be there to buy. Thirty years ago we were enriching our milk and having iodized salt, and today it is not unusual to buy non-fortified milk, non-fortified bread and salt which has not been iodized, which effects our health.

Question. President Nixon said that he would work toward eliminating hunger in America altogether, and he has pledged that county by county throughout the country. Within six months he will be involved county by county throughout the country. Has he, in your opinion, shown that he means what he says? Did you get the impression from your conference with the President that he would really push on this hunger program?

Answer. Very definitely. I asked him specifically what I could say to the press about the promises he was making to us. He said that he would immediately investigate the suggestions that we had made for emergency action, but that he wasn't interested in saying something without backing it up with action. Secondly, that as soon as he got the report he would include the recommendations in his budget message to Congress.

Question. Getting back to President Nixon's pledge to eradicate hunger in America, did you come back from this conference with the impression that the country would be well on its way towards solving this problem by the end of Mr. Nixon's current term?

Answer. Yes, because we are already up to about the \$2 billion figure on the basis of the

adjustment between the House and Senate bill which will be some place between \$610 million and \$750 million, and this will have to come in the last six months. If you cost that out over where it is projected for the next fiscal year it is a tremendous increase, up close to the \$2 billion figure. Financially, therefore, we have a good start. Most of the reforms that I suggested are written into either the administration bill or the McGovern bill. Therefore, most of the reforms will take place. The President's pledge to follow through on some of the other programs, like a survey that will tell us precisely where the people are . . . all of these things combined should. . . . But I still say that it cannot be done alone by a conference or by a President. It is going to take local people caring. The fact that if we discover that there are any people in that desperately poor, hungry group it should not be morally acceptable for us to sit still and allow it to happen. It's just that simple; whether or not we can move the American conscience, I've been saying in a lot of speeches that I think we are moving into a new isolationism that bothers me far more than the isolationism I was aware of when I lived in the midwest before World War II where we sort of put two oceans to separate us from everybody. Now I think we are closing our front doors. Whether we are doing it because we say the problems are too big and therefore my puny efforts aren't going to affect it or whether we are doing it because we say I've got all I can do to take care of my family and my own and I just can't be bothered; either way to me is a frightening attitude. I would think that the concern for hunger would be the kind of issue that might draw us out and make us realize that we are, in our single effort, able to affect the problem, and that it is our problem if our brother is hungry.

POLLUTION CONTROL AND POWER

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Americans are widely concerned about environmental "pollution." They are also concerned about providing the vast amounts of electric power needed to maintain and advance our standards of living. Congress is likewise concerned, and recent hearings before the Joint Atomic Energy Committee explored both problems.

It was refreshing to learn of the initiative of one of the Nation's major companies in new and exciting areas. I refer to the testimony of Mr. John W. Simpson, president, power systems, Westinghouse Electric Corp., who told the Joint Committee that Westinghouse believes that the same talents and determinations which have brought us the world's greatest standard of living "can also bring us equally impressive achievements in the protection and preservation of our natural environment."

Mr. Simpson announced that Westinghouse has established an environmental systems department to enlist all Westinghouse skills in environmental technology to assist utilities and State and Federal agencies in finding constructive solutions for pollution problems associated with power generation.

Westinghouse also announced establishment of a School for Environmental

Management at Fort Collins in conjunction with Colorado State University to train personnel from electric utility companies in the legal and technological aspects of environmental management.

In addition, Westinghouse is pioneering with Consolidated Edison of New York to find ways to make use in our urban systems of the thermal waste discharged from powerplants—in the treatment of sewage, for instance.

In the Great Lakes area, Westinghouse is working with Commonwealth Edison of Chicago to investigate potential beneficial uses of cooling water from electric powerplants in the development of aquatic life.

These are important steps, and with the imagination and initiative of companies like Westinghouse, we may be able to transform some of our "problems" into benefits, particularly in the building of new cities as envisioned by Mr. Simpson. I commend to Members of Congress and others Mr. Simpson's testimony before the Joint Committee on January 30:

TESTIMONY OF JOHN W. SIMPSON, PRESIDENT, POWER SYSTEMS CO., WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP.

Mr. Chairman, I am John W. Simpson, President, Power Systems, Westinghouse Electric Corporation. With me is Dr. James H. Wright, Director of Westinghouse's newly established Environmental Systems Department. It is a pleasure to appear again before your committee. Among my many other appearances, I recall testifying at hearings on safety matters nearly 20 years ago when I was associated with Admiral Rickover and the naval reactors program, and nuclear power was then in its infancy. Your first concern has always been the public health and safety.

Your current hearings are timely. There is good reason to be concerned about our natural environment and the pollution of our water, air and land. Your hearings are important. They offer an opportunity for the presentation, for your evaluation, of facts and proposals on matters affecting every person in this country and in a very real sense, affecting generations to come.

I think it important in this discussion to distinguish between the *natural* environment and the *total* environment. Improvement in the total environment in the United States has been one of the wonders of the world. We have all witnessed within our lifetimes revolutionary changes in agriculture, medicine, housing, transportation, communications and information systems, to name a few. These improvements have resulted in a standard of living unparalleled in history. A dominant factor in each area has been the ready availability of electricity.

To achieve these historic improvements in the total environment, we have placed additional burdens upon our natural environment. We see these in the form of air and water pollution and aesthetic degradation. I believe that we in the United States have the wealth and resources—and now the determination—to minimize to a socially acceptable degree the burden on our natural environment which our high standard of living has created. Historically, economic considerations have ruled most of man's activities. One of the great challenges now before us is to find and develop a mechanism for balancing our priorities.

Electrical power generation epitomizes our dilemma. The production of electricity is both necessary to maintain our standard of living, which the public demands, and responsible for a portion of our environmental pollution, which the public condemns. Each form of power generation has its distinct environmental consequences, some of which have been the cause of much public con-

cern. Reaction to recent power shortages, brown-outs, and black-outs, however, is ample evidence that the nation will not tolerate a lack of adequate power. With the demand for electricity doubling every ten years, by the turn of the century we will have to increase our electrical generation eightfold. Certainly, no one would advocate a comparable increase in our pollution levels.

The public concern for environmental quality has intensified the developments of standards limiting the emission or concentration of pollutants. Each standard is based on the best technical and scientific information available. We must also recognize that in the setting of any standard there is an inherent judgment of social values whether the standard involves the purity of food or the thermal discharge from a power plant. Thermal and air pollution standards are fairly recent and based on criteria established only within the last few years. The relationship of these pollutants to public health and environmental quality is not well established. Although there is considerable subjective judgment in these standards, they do represent a first, constructive step in the control of thermal and air pollution.

In contrast, ionizing radiation standards are based on a prodigious quantity of experimental data and have existed for many decades with continuous review by competent bodies of scientists. The extensive analysis that these radiation standards have received encompasses a far greater quantity of technical information than any other comparable standard promulgated to date by anyone. Limits on ionizing radiation emissions are set only after the most painstaking evaluation by the world's leading scientists.

Mr. Chairman, your committee has held extensive hearings and has published literally thousands of pages of testimony and reports on the basis of which laws were enacted governing the standards development process. Your efforts resulted in a further improvement in that process through statutory provision for the Federal Radiation Council. The Council provides for consideration of the public health, social, economic, defense, labor, natural resources, and agricultural benefit and risk factors as well as the scientific in the development of guidance for federal agencies. There is the opportunity in this process for anyone to introduce new facts, evidence or opinions for evaluation in the same careful way.

I feel that calling attention to public health and environmental quality questions is right and necessary. Once an issue has been raised, however, it is time to determine which claims are indeed valid and which are mistaken alarms. The standards-setting procedures I have mentioned afford an opportunity to make this determination. I think the academic and scientific communities should be reminded that inherent in their freedom of expression and their desire for participation in social decisions is a responsibility for examination of controversial issues amongst their own peers and qualified bodies. I would propose to those dissatisfied with the existing process that all claims be submitted to scientific evaluation and examination by, for example, a committee of the National Academy of Sciences and National Academy of Engineering.

The Federal Radiation Council has established guides for human intake of radioactivity. The Atomic Energy Commission uses the guides in establishing regulations limiting the emission of radioactivity to the environment. Both groups have urged industry to keep these releases to the lowest practicable level. The nuclear plants developed by Westinghouse are designed to release but a small fraction of the allowable AEC concentrations. The operation of these plants by the utility companies verifies that the radioactivity releases have been significantly below these concentrations. Westinghouse continues to investigate and develop ways and

means for further reducing these very low radioactivity releases from nuclear plants.

With regard to the accident safety of nuclear power reactors, I believe the licensing procedures of the Atomic Energy Act provide assurance that all of the knowledge and experience gained over the past 20 years of reactor development programs are applied and that the public health and safety are protected. In its regulatory role the Atomic Energy Commission and its statutory Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards have conducted searching inquiries. In some cases, regulatory requirements, design changes and retrofiting have cost the industry millions of dollars. I believe, and I think anyone who closely examines these regulatory mechanisms would agree that the Atomic Energy Commission well serves the public. I know of no other regulatory operation of government where there is such a thorough assessment of a system prior to operation.

With regard to thermal waste, we are faced with the question of what to do with enormous amounts of heat discharged from both fossil-fuel and nuclear power plants. No one suggests that heat be discharged anywhere without planning. More must be done to ascertain both the benefits and the adverse effects on the ecology. We at Westinghouse believe that thermal "waste" can be developed into a major, beneficial byproduct and, perhaps, one of our greatest resources.

We recently decided to focus all the Westinghouse experience and skills in environmental technology through a single department headed by Dr. Jim Wright who will report directly to me. I have charged the Environmental Systems Dept. with the responsibility for assisting electric utility companies and state and federal agencies in evaluating and seeking constructive solutions for environmental problems associated with power generation and transmission. The department will work with utilities in providing preliminary environmental evaluations and surveys for siting of power generation and transmission facilities. In addition the department is available for assistance in developing and directing environmental monitoring programs to provide baseline data and to assess the possible impact and environmental stress points resulting from power generation facilities. We already have environmental field programs underway and are studying uses of waste heat in projects economically or socially beneficial.

Believing that education is the key to problem solving, the Department has created a School for Environmental Management at Fort Collins in conjunction with Colorado State University. We will train personnel from electric utility companies in the legal and technological aspects of environmental management. The course will be made available to government and industry executives. The initial four-week course will be offered for the first time in June on the campus of Colorado State University and will feature nationally recognized authorities in such fields as ecology, marine sciences, public health, meteorology and environmental law. Field trips, seminars and laboratory work will be an integral part of the course.

Today, Mr. Charles Luce and I are announcing the formation of a joint Consolidated Edison of New York/Westinghouse Task Force to pioneer in waste heat utilization in urban systems and identify a project for possible early demonstration.

As of this month, Commonwealth Edison and Westinghouse have entered into a project definition program to investigate the potential beneficial uses of cooling water from electric power plants for aquaculture purposes.

These are some of the steps Westinghouse is taking to help assure the best possible environment. But the task requires all of the imagination our country can muster. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that it would be help-

ful to call a national conference of all parties interested in finding ways to develop beneficial uses of thermal discharges. I think the conference would include not only engineers, but also scientists of various disciplines, conservationists and fish and wildlife experts. We all recognize the problem. We should also recognize the opportunity. Let's put our heads together in a constructive way and find the best possible solutions.

No discussion of this subject should overlook environmental problems of the United States in their totality. I believe that our biggest environmental problem is the inability of our cities to interrelate their metropolitan services. In our big urban concentrations the electrical system, transportation, sewage, water and housing—to mention a few—are operated as separate entities. Each system impinges upon the environment.

Curiously, the nuisance of one system or service may be a potential benefit to another system or service. For example, airports may benefit from waste heat to provide all-weather operation and waste heat might be used in sewage disposal.

But urban services designed in the last century may be extremely difficult to retrofit. If we were to build new cities, I have no question that modern technology would provide vastly improved systems and services with little damage to the environment. I would hope that we in this country could soon begin the planning and development of at least one new city of 350,000 people to demonstrate how well-planned municipal systems can enhance our total environment.

Mr. Chairman, the same talents and determination which brought us in the past decades such extraordinary achievements in our total environment can also bring us equally impressive achievements in the protection and preservation of our natural environment. The congressional interest manifested by these hearings, the stated goals of the President, and the determination of industry such as ours make it abundantly clear that the country recognizes the problems and has set the highest priority for their solution. Westinghouse believes the job can and will be done.

Mr. Chairman, thank you.

ORANGE JUICE IN THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, recently the Department of Agriculture agreed to purchase frozen concentrated orange juice for use under the national school lunch program. Since Florida is one of the largest orange producing States, this news was indeed appreciated by those in my State engaged in this industry.

The nutritional value of the orange has long since been proven and, therefore, I am sure that all will agree that the inclusion of orange juice in the school lunch program is a most beneficial step forward in improving the health of our young people.

At this time I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House, the following resolution I received from the Florida Citrus Commission, which was passed by the Members on December 10, 1969, expressing their appreciation and thanks:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has offered to buy frozen concentrated

orange juice for use in the national school lunch program, and

Whereas, the purchase of orange juice for the nation's school lunch system should have a stabilizing effect on this season's record orange crop, and

Whereas, such action by the USDA is the result of numerous communications and conferences between delegations of Florida state leaders and U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Clifford M. Hardin,

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the members of the Florida Citrus Commission, in meeting duly assembled, that we express our appreciation to Secretary Hardin, to members of the Florida congressional delegation in Washington, and to Florida Governor Claude R. Kirk, Jr., for their roles in this action, and that this appreciation be made evident in this resolution which signifies the esteem of the entire citrus industry of the state.

Be it further resolved that each of these persons be given a true copy of this resolution and that it be spread upon the minutes of this meeting.

Attest:

MARVIN A. McNAIR,
Secretary.
O. D. HUFF, Jr.,
Chairman.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT PROPOSAL NOW HAS SUPPORT OF MORE THAN ONE-FOURTH OF THE HOUSE

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have believed that Congress, because of its current diffusion of committee responsibility for environmental problems, is not equipped to assume a role of leadership in the most complex business of attacking pollution and other forms of environmental deterioration on a broad front.

To rectify this situation I proposed, last April 28, that we add to our list of standing committees a Committee on the Environment. This committee would have jurisdiction to consider all measures relating to the quality of the physical environment of the United States, including water quality, air quality, weather modification, waste disposal, pesticides, herbicides, and acoustic problems. Since April, I have been joined in this proposal by 120 other distinguished Members of the House.

Meanwhile, a spectacular acceleration of national concern over the quality of our physical environment has occurred in recent months. The pages of the national news media have been filled with stories and pictures about our environmental problems. And the President's state of the Union message left little doubt but that the administration considers environmental quality the foremost domestic crusade for the 1970's.

It seems to me that Congress, in order to respond adequately to the challenge, needs a full-time standing committee, a Committee on the Environment, in not only the decade but perhaps the century to come. Anything short of a standing committee with full legislative powers would not provide sufficient "horsepower" to get the job done. No longer

can we afford to handle the complex, interrelated problems of our environment as secondary concerns of our diverse committees.

Admirable legislation to upgrade the quality of our environment already has been passed, but it is just a small start. I am sure that all Members recognize the invaluable assistance provided them by the professional staffs of the committees on which they now sit. The time has come to concentrate similar expertise to assist Congress in attacking the important environmental questions facing our Nation.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing resolutions identical to my original House Resolution 375 which would amend the rules of the House to create a Committee on the Environment. I am pleased to announce that the following 30 Members have joined in cosponsoring these resolutions:

NEW SPONSORS

Mr. BENNETT of Florida, Mr. BEVILL of Alabama, Mr. BRASCO of New York, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, Mr. COLLIER of Illinois, Mr. CULVER of Iowa, Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska, Mr. DELLENBACK of Oregon, Mr. GAYDOS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan, Mr. KEITH of Massachusetts, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MACGREGOR of Minnesota, Mr. MESKILL of Connecticut, Mr. OBEY of Wisconsin, Mr. OTTINGER of New York, Mr. PETTIS of California, Mr. POFF of Virginia, Mr. RAILSBACK of Illinois.

Mr. REES of California, Mr. SCHADEBERG of Wisconsin, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. VANIK of Ohio, Mr. WEICKER of Connecticut, Mr. WIDNALL of New Jersey, Mr. WIGGINS of California, Mr. WINN of Kansas, Mr. WYDLER of New York, Mr. YATRON of Pennsylvania.

Another 90 Members joined in this proposal at earlier dates. They are:

Mr. ADAIR of Indiana, Mr. ADDABBO of New York, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ARENDS of Illinois, Mr. BEALL of Maryland, Mr. BIESTER of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLACKBURN of Georgia, Mr. BRADENAS of Indiana, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. BUCHANAN of Alabama.

Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Utah, Mr. BUSH of Texas, Mr. BUTTON of New York, Mr. CAHILL of New Jersey, Mr. CAMP of Oklahoma, Mr. CARTER of Kentucky, Mr. DON CLAUSEN of California, Mr. CONTE of Massachusetts, Mr. COUGHLIN of Pennsylvania.

Mr. COWGER of Kentucky, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DENT of Pennsylvania, Mr. DEVINE of Ohio, Mr. DINGELL of Michigan, Mr. ESCH of Michigan, Mr. FISH of New York, Mr. FOREMAN of New Mexico, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN of New Jersey, Mr. GOODLING of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROVER of New York, Mr. GUBSER of California, Mr. HALPERN of New York, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HASTINGS of New York, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HOGAN of Maryland, Mr. HORTON of New York, Mr. HUNT of New Jersey.

Mr. KLEPPE of North Dakota, Mr. KUYKENDALL of Tennessee, Mr. KYROS of Maine, Mr. LLOYD of Utah, Mr. LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. LUKENS of Ohio, Mr. McCLORY of Illinois, Mr. McCLOSKEY of

California, Mr. McDADE of Pennsylvania, Mr. McKNEALLEY of New York.

Mr. MANN of South Carolina, Mr. MATHIAS of California, Mr. MATSUNAGA of Hawaii, Mr. MAYNE of Iowa, Mr. MIKVA of Illinois, Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio, Mr. MOLLOHAN of West Virginia, Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts, Mr. NELSEN of Minnesota, Mr. PELLY of Washington.

Mr. PIKE of New York, Mr. PODELL of New York, Mr. POLLOCK of Alaska, Mr. QUE of Minnesota, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. RIEGLE of Michigan, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROTH of Delaware, Mr. SAYLOR of Pennsylvania, Mr. SANDMAN of New Jersey.

Mr. SCHEUER of New York, Mr. SCHNEEBELI of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SEBELIUS of Kansas, Mr. SHRIVER of Kansas, Mr. STANTON of Ohio, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. STOKES of Ohio, Mr. TAFT of Ohio, Mr. TALCOTT of California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. TIERNAN of Rhode Island, Mr. WHITEHURST of Virginia, Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania, Mr. WOLD of Wyoming, Mr. WRIGHT of Texas, Mr. WYATT of Oregon, Mr. WYMAN of New Hampshire, Mr. ZWACH of Minnesota.

In the course of reviewing this list of sponsors, Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that both of our great political parties are well represented. Members from each of our existing standing committees and from 42 of our States are included. Interestingly enough, the committees which currently consider one or more of our environmental problems are well represented.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Rules Committee to hold hearings on this proposal at the earliest possible date. Unless Congress establishes the necessary procedural machinery, it will never be able to properly assert itself on the substantive problems.

GOV. ALBERT BREWER OF ALABAMA
ON RACIAL BALANCE

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has announced that it will not consider a suit filed by Alabama Gov. Albert Brewer which would require all States to be treated equally by the Justice Department and HEW. While this decision came as no surprise, I am disappointed that the Supreme Court continues to demand that the South be treated one way and the rest of the country treated another way.

In his suit, Governor Brewer contended that while schools in Alabama and other Southern States are required to have a racial balance in all classes, schools in other States are not. Governor Brewer made a statewide television address to the people of Alabama last week, and pointed out that there are large numbers of all-Negro schools in cities like St. Louis, Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York. Yet, in Alabama, all-Negro schools have been closed to achieve a racial balance.

Although his suit has been dismissed,

Governor Brewer raised many good points in his speech. I would like for every Member of this House to read his remarks, and include them in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS OF GOV. ALBERT BREWER

My Fellow Alabamians, I come to you tonight as your Governor and as a parent, to discuss with you the situation facing us in public education in Alabama.

Many of you have expressed your concern and anxiety to me about these conditions. Martha and I share your concern.

Three years ago, 99 of our school systems were put under statewide court order. All of the other systems in Alabama are under individual court orders also. Pressure from the United States Supreme Court has brought about chaotic conditions in our schools. We have seen the closing of \$15 million worth of school buildings resulting in overcrowding to the extent that we have 40 to 50 students in many classrooms in Alabama today.

We have seen students and teachers herded about like cattle to bring about a racial balance in the schools. We see gymnasiums, auditoriums, libraries, and even lunchrooms being used as classrooms. We have seen the demoralizing effect on parents, students, and teachers alike.

And through it all, we've maintained our strong and fundamental belief in public education—recognizing that the strength of our state is in the education of our young people so that they may enjoy the opportunities that exist for them in the tomorrow.

Now, we face further assaults on our school systems. Three of our systems, the Jefferson County system, the Bessemer system, and the Mobile system are under orders to implement plans by February 1. The other systems will be under similar orders for the next school year beginning in September.

Now we do not at this time know what these plans may be. But I urge you tonight to be calm. Do not panic. Let's remember that we will not get results nor solutions in the streets, but through legal processes.

I've been meeting with your school boards on several occasions to help plan with them ways to meet these threats to the continuation of our public school systems. And I want to assure you tonight that your Governor stands four-square with your local boards of education in meeting these crises. And also, your Governor stands with you in preserving public education as we have known it in Alabama.

QUALITY EDUCATION

The question is not integration or segregation. The question is quality education. What kind of education are our young people going to get in our public schools in Alabama?

We look about us in the other states of this nation and we find that in St. Louis, 86 per cent of the Negroes attend all-Negro schools in that city, while we're told in Alabama that there can be no all-Negro schools.

That in Chicago there are 208 all-Negro schools and we in Alabama are told we can't have any such schools.

In Los Angeles, California, there are 228 schools with no Negro faculty members and we're told that in Alabama we can't have such schools.

In New York there are 114 all-Negro schools. And yet we're told in Alabama that regardless of the wishes of the parents and students of both races we will have racial balance in each school in each system in Alabama.

And we look to the Congress in Washington and see such liberals as Senator McGovern and Senator McCarthy and Senator Percy who send or have sent their children to private schools. We see a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, even Thurgood Marshall, who has sent his children to a private school.

DOUBLE STANDARD

We ask ourselves the question, "Why?" Many of you have asked me the question, "Why?" Why is more required of us in Alabama than of those other states? Why is one standard adopted for Alabama and another standard for most of the other states of this Nation? Why is there a double standard in use today insofar as the operation of our school systems are concerned?

It was Theodore Roosevelt who said, "No man is above the law and no man is below it." We in Alabama know that we're not above the law, but neither are we below it.

The Congress of the United States in 1964 adopted the Civil Rights Act. In Title Four of that Act, the Congress prohibited the bus-ing of students to achieve a racial balance in the schools. And that policy was reaffirmed by the Congress in 1968 in the appropriations bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Under the Constitution of our country, a state is given the right to file an original action in the United States Supreme Court against residents of another state when those persons have aggrieved the citizens of our state.

ORIGINAL ACTION

Accordingly, today, I have filed in the United States Supreme Court the place where all our troubles began, an original action against the Attorney General of the United States and the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare alleging the discrimination that has been practiced against Alabama—alleging the double standard that has been employed insofar as our school systems are concerned—setting out the things that are required of us that have not been required of other states—and asking the Supreme Court of our land to enjoin those two defendants from further prosecuting any suits or taking any actions in Alabama unless and until they take similar action in the other states of this nation.

This is a novel approach. It has never been tried in suits involving our school systems. But it's a right that's given to us under the basic document that rules our country. It's a right we have to pursue, and I'm pursuing it tonight on behalf of the people of Alabama to assert our right to equal treatment under the law along with all the other citizens of this country.

AT PROPER TIME

Some months ago, I announced that at the proper time I would qualify as a candidate for Governor in the elections to be held this year. I'm coming to you tonight before the campaign begins because with you tonight are above politics.

I have never misled you or given you false hope. I will never mislead you or give you false hope. No office is worth that.

At the same time I will not jeopardize the safety or welfare of our school children of either race in order to gain political advantage or to create a political issue.

And tonight my friends, I assure you, I promise you that I will not use our school children for political purposes.

Instead, as your governor, I will assert our rights as a people to the equal protection of the laws—no more, no less—as is our right as citizens of the United States.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks:

"How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,400 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

DAVID A. MORSE, DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF THE 1969 NOBEL PEACE PRIZEWINNER, THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I know that you and our fellow Members were as thrilled as I when word was received last year that the Nobel Prize for Peace had been awarded to the International Labour Organization.

It has been my privilege to represent the House as a congressional observer to the ILO Conference for the past several years and I am grateful for that honor. In my association with the ILO, I have come to have a great regard for Mr. David Morse, a very capable Director-General. I think that the award of the Nobel Prize to the ILO is due in no small measure to the splendid service which Mr. Morse has rendered to the international community of nations.

I am pleased to place before the House a commentary of Mr. Morse which appeared in the October issue of Report From Rutgers, a communication of our State university in New Jersey. The article reads as follows:

DAVID A. MORSE, DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF THE 1969 NOBEL PEACE PRIZEWINNER, THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION

Ralph Waldo Emerson, in his essay on self-reliance, wrote, "An institution is the lengthening shadow of one man." That thought has commonly expressed the relationship between what a man created or guides and the man himself.

Since 1948, guidance of the International Labour Organization has been in the hands of Director-General David A. Morse. The ILO recently won the Nobel prize for peace for 1969, the year when it reached the age of 50. The past 21 years is a period long enough to justify calling the ILO the "lengthening shadow" of Morse.

The line separating an individual Nobel laureate from the individual directing an organizational Nobel laureate is a fine one. Morse's role in ILO activities will probably justify his representing the organization at the Oslo ceremonies on Dec. 10.

David Morse is a product of Rutgers University in 1929, capping by his graduation an undergraduate career that combined scholastic honors, varsity football and lacrosse, membership in the glee club and campus theatrical experience. He had come to Rutgers by way of his birthplace, New York City, and early years at Somerville, N.J., where he graduated from high school. The trip from Somerville to New Brunswick took place in his father's furniture truck.

He roomed at Rutgers with a cousin, David A. (Sonny) Werblin, who gained fame in his own right for putting together the championship New York Jets team of the American Football League.

Morse entered Harvard Law School right after his Rutgers graduation. After obtaining his law degree, he entered Government

service as a member of the staff of the solicitor of the U.S. Department of Interior.

In 1934, he became chief counsel of the Petroleum Labor Policy Board, an appointment that began his life-long involvement with labor and labor relations. Within that labor-interest sphere, Morse was regional attorney in New York for the National Labor Relations Board, and entered labor arbitration work as the impartial "man in the middle" for the milk and dry-cleaning industries.

Labor occupied him during World War II as an Army officer. He reorganized labor from the wrecked remains of post-war Italy and Germany. In Italy, he drafted the program that replaced Fascist corporate syndicalist system with a democratic labor organization. In Germany, the Nazi Labor Front was finished by the defeat; Morse replaced it with a new labor policy for West Germany.

Recognition of his accomplishments brought him the Legion of Merit after the war, and appointment by Harry S. Truman in 1946 as Assistant Secretary of Labor for International Affairs.

Two years later, Edward J. Phelan announced his resignation as Director-General of the ILO. The search for a successor narrowed down to Morse, who was tapped for the role, accepted, and has been in Geneva ever since.

Morse's tenure at ILO covers the period in which war-devastated countries have rebuilt their industrial machinery and economies; newly emerged and newly independent countries were building new industrial plants and economies. These modern plants were competing with those in countries that had escaped unscathed from the destruction wrought by war, but not from obsolescence.

ILO discovered a tremendous need for labor education, managerial development and generation of a healthy labor-management relationship.

It has established programs, developed teaching materials and created opportunities for laborers to learn about their increasingly heavy economic and social responsibilities.

ILO seeks to promote sound principles and techniques of management, focusing especially on raising productivity and on the training of supervisors.

The labor-management relations program at ILO is intended to foster a better understanding of industrial relations by all who must know.

Shortly after the announcement of the Nobel award, Morse appeared on the NBC "Today" show with Hugh Downs and Pauline Frederick. On that occasion he described his concern with the possible role of ILO in attacking two pressing problems. One is the spread of automation. The other is the prevalence of unemployment and underemployment in the world, with part of the problem related to the automation he had mentioned.

Both these problems contribute to the unrest endemic in many countries. ILO has attempted to improve, through international action, the conditions under which people labor so as to promote economic and social stability. This is the contribution that ILO can make as one of ten specialized agencies associated with the United Nations.

ILO was established in April, 1919, when its constitution was adopted as part of the Treaty of Versailles, several wars ago.

David Morse was once described as one who had made a profession of impartiality. He had been an impartial arbiter in the metropolitan New York milk industry and in the dry-cleaning industry.

He is now an impartial arbiter, confronted with the problem of reconciling world-wide differences in the attitudes toward work, in the relations between employer and employee and in the power or lack of it that labor has in different countries. He must force himself to forget his own unconscious bias about these differences.

The task almost demands a background developed in a vacuum, to prevent injecting

a point of view that may interfere in any particular situation. But, skilled arbiters don't come from a vacuum.

David Morse came from Rutgers, with stops along the way that provided additional experience to wrestle with the world's woes.

HARRIS JUST WON'T HEDGE ON CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the January 18, 1970, issue of the Tulsa World carried an excellent article by Lee Slater on Oklahoma's distinguished senior Senator and chairman of the Democratic National Committee, the Honorable FRED R. HARRIS.

The article describes the 10-day tour Senator HARRIS made through our native State of Oklahoma during the adjournment of Congress. Regardless of whether one agrees or disagrees with the Senator's stand on some of the major issues of the day, it is impossible not to be greatly impressed with the reception he received during his visit and with the straightforward and courageous manner in which he discussed and defended his position on the issues.

Mr. Speaker, I believe all Members will be most interested in this article and I include it at this point under the unanimous consent agreement:

HARRIS JUST WON'T HEDGE ON CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

(By Lee Slater)

"This may sound a little corny," admitted a well-known Democratic figure, "but it takes courage to do what he's doing. I think the people like that."

"I keep expecting him to hedge, but he's not," winced another. "You gotta respect him for that."

So it was in the wake of a 10-day foray through his home state by Fred R. Harris, Oklahoma's energetic and controversial senior U.S. senator and national Democratic chairman.

Harris was not just refusing to budge from controversial stands on the Vietnam war, the national war moratorium and military spending. Rather, he was carrying the fight into those areas where his rhetoric was supposed to have been in hot political water.

Relaxing—as much as Harris ever relaxes—in a room at Western Hills State Lodge before concluding his tour Saturday, the senator allowed he was making "missionaries."

"Around the coffee shop . . . they'll be better able to defend their positions—and mine," he said.

If it was "missionaries" Harris' tour produced, the result was not a rough spot in the texture of his Oklahoma visit.

Harris' deep speaking delivery, making up with a ring of sincerity and urgency what it loses in finesse and polish, often resembled the evangelical orations of a country preacher at revival time.

Time and again Harris talked in somber tones about that "day of accounting" when "all of us must ask ourselves whether we served our stewardship."

Winding up a half-hour dissertation defending his dovish Vietnam stance, Harris always declared, "If a man won't speak out for what his conscience tells him in matters like these, matters of life and death, war and peace, he oughtn't serve in public office."

CXVI—147—Part 2

And—in direct contradiction to reports of the political jeopardy created by his Vietnam stand—he frequently drew applause, with an occasional standing ovation.

The stand that created so much controversy:

Harris wants all U.S. combat ground troops withdrawn from Vietnam by the end of 1970 on an announced, systematic basis. He thinks President Nixon's withdrawal has been too slow. Harris would leave 250,000 tactical and support troops to be withdrawn later.

The Senator also claims Nixon's "Vietnamization" policy isn't working. As evidence, he cites President Thieu's claim that U.S. troops must be prepared to remain in Vietnam for "many years."

Perhaps the most significant aspect of the senator's lengthy tour was the size of the crowds which gathered to greet him as he coursed Oklahoma from Altus to Ponca City, Woodward to McAlester.

Repeatedly, crowds overflowed the meeting space reserved for the occasion. Rarely were the audiences all white. Black people, Mexican-Americans and Indians turned out to hear the man who has championed many of their causes.

Part of it, even Harris conceded, may have been in response to the barrage of criticism to which he has been subjected.

In his home town of Lawton, for example, some anti-Harrisites got a basketful of publicity from a handful of signatures on a petition urging a boycott of the senator's address to the Chamber of Commerce. The result: a backlash of support that drew more than 350 people for the luncheon—the biggest chamber crowd ever for an installation program.

With some exceptions, Harris followed the same routine in the 36 cities he visited. After handshaking his way through the crowd, he spoke formally for 20 minutes or so, hitting heavily at the Republican administration's economic policies, then fielded questions from the audience.

When it developed early in the tour that his crowds were somewhat shy about asking questions about his Vietnam stand, Harris began opening the question and answer sessions by saying, "Ask me about anything on your mind, the Vietnam war or anything."

If several questions went by without the war cropping up, Harris reminded them again, "You're an easy crowd. Ask me about something like the Vietnam war."

Most often the question came gingerly: "I've got a 19-year-old son whose birthday is Sept. 14. That's the first day drawn in the draft lottery. Naturally, his mother and I are concerned about the Vietnam situation. We know you are, too, but we'd like for you to tell us exactly what you think."

Or: "Senator, I think a lot of people don't understand why you stand the way you do on Vietnam. Will you tell us so we can explain it to them?"

But, occasionally, the same queries were pointedly blunt:

"Why did you condone the moratorium?"

And, privately, some of Harris' friends were grumbling, "The next time he's going to do something like that (speak on Moratorium Day), I want him to give me 10 days' notice so I can get out of town," one western Oklahoma Harris booster said.

The one thing that Harris adamantly refused to do was duck. He fired back his views in terms no one could misunderstand, although political expedience might have suggested a softer course.

"People are decent enough and smart enough themselves," Harris said. "That's why I talk straight to people . . . Harry Truman always said what he felt . . . That's the thing, in retrospect, people admire most about him."

The tour, Harris continued, "renewed my faith in people. They'll do the right thing

when they have the facts. You needn't be embarrassed about talking straight to them."

People who hold public office are "leaders and followers" who have a "responsibility to educate . . . to come home and report," the senator said.

When he spoke about inflation, Harris repeatedly brought up the name of the late Robert S. Kerr, his predecessor in the Senate and Oklahoma's biggest political giant. "Bob Kerr," Harris would say, "fought against high interest rates in the last Republican administration. Bob Kerr predicted they would cause a recession, and he was right."

The economy and the war, Harris discovered, were the two issues Oklahomans wanted most to talk about. After that, in no particular order, came agriculture, draft reform, the My Lai incident, health and education, oil imports, his plans for 1972 and the national Democratic chairmanship. And, in Waurika, it was the Waurika Reservoir and in Okemah, a Public Health Service Indian hospital and in Checotah, the status of Arrowhead and Fountainhead Lodges.

The main function of the trip was for Harris to meet the people. Some suspected it was to ball him out of impending political disaster.

Is the senator, whose term doesn't expire until 1972, in political trouble?

"Not as much as some would like," Harris chuckled. "I am much encouraged. The most important thing . . . is not what the polls show at the moment—though our last polls were all right—but how strong the people who are for you are for you."

"Fred's supporters are confused by what they've read and seen on television," a friend said. "This trip does a lot of good. They can talk with him. He's convinced a lot of people, and they'll convince a lot of other people."

"By speaking your mind plainly, you inspire some people because you're on their side," Harris said. "You inspire some because you're forthright. And all of them go away thinking you believe you're right."

"I think," allowed a prominent Oklahoma Democrat Saturday, "Fred has in Oklahoma a great silent majority."

BIAFRA ASKS CHINA'S HELP

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the problems of Nigeria and Biafra are of concern to us all, I think that the following article which appeared in the Washington Post on September 30, 1968, should be kept in mind. It follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 30, 1968]

BIAFRA ASKS CHINA'S HELP

UMUAHIA, BIAFRA, September 29.—Biafran leader Lt. Col. Odumegwu Ojukwu has appealed to Communist China for cooperation in the war against Nigeria and the struggle against "Anglo-American imperialism and Soviet revisionism."

The encircled Biafrans announced today that Ojukwu had sent a letter to Chinese Party leader Mao Tse-tung in which he expressed:

" . . . Our deep gratitude to you personally and to our dear comrades in China for the increasing understanding and sympathy that you are showing in our struggle against Anglo-American imperialism and Soviet revisionism."

Ojukwu's 450-word letter gave the background to Biafra's secession from the Nigerian federation in May, 1967, and the start of the civil war about two months later.

Ojukwu compared Biafra's struggle for independence to the Communist revolution in China and appealed for help.

"In this struggle, Biafrans count on the cooperation of all socialist progressive peoples, in the forefront of which is the government of the People's Republic of China," he said.

The letter noted that "revisionist Russia" has supplied Nigeria with jet bombers and fighter planes.

The Biafran National Union of Students also issued a statement yesterday calling on the Peking regime to openly support Biafra.

"We assure the heroic Chinese people that we shall not relent in our struggle against imperialism, neocolonialism and revisionism, and like all paper tigers these forces shall be smashed on the altar of our indomitable will to survive," the statement said.

SECRET SURVEY FINDS FLAWS IN NIXON WELFARE PROPOSAL

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the membership a recent United Press International analysis of President Nixon's welfare proposal:

SECRET SURVEY FINDS FLAWS IN NIXON WELFARE PROPOSAL

(By Michael L. Posner)

President Nixon's priority welfare reform plan might break up poor working families, put some college students on welfare and indirectly finance purchase of color television sets, according to a secret congressional study.

The nonpartisan analysis was prepared by the staff of the House Ways and Means Committee, now considering Mr. Nixon's proposal for a minimum income plan for working families. Several congressmen called the study "devastating."

The analysis, prepared for the committee's private use but obtained by UPI, attacks a basic premise of the Nixon proposal designed to encourage fathers to stay at home and support their families. "A case could be made that subsidizing the working poor may actually encourage desertion, rather than discourage it," the study says.

The analysis says that by extending welfare to working families "the government, in a sense, would be telling a working father that he is officially not capable of supporting his family at what the government believes is the necessary level. One possible reaction of some fathers may be to let the government take over the job of completely supporting his family."

The report also says the plan raises a possibility that two brothers rooming together at college could qualify as a family and receive welfare. Another criticism says some families might buy goods to lower their cash assets—"a color TV for example"—to qualify to sign up for welfare.

Under Mr. Nixon's family allowance plan, working families with children—where a mother and employed father are in the home—could be covered under welfare for the first time. Now, a working father with a mother in the house rules out the family for federal welfare payments, even if the income is low. However, some states pay welfare to working families from their own funds.

The Nixon proposal would include the working poor and provide a family of four, for example, a minimum \$1,600 income a year. The payment would be reduced as the fam-

ily earned more but it could earn up to \$3,920 before the allowance is cut off.

The analysis raises a number of so-called "issues," rather than conclusions, about Mr. Nixon's proposal.

Among the points raised:

No evidence has been presented that fathers in working poor families desert to qualify their families for welfare. In fact, the study says, evidence shows the desertion rate higher in states which now cover the working poor under all-state-financed programs.

"Under the proposal the only way the father who wants to stay with his family can increase his net income is to have more children." The report states the father in a poor working family can't earn more money under the proposal because presumably he is earning as much as he can. "When he looks at how the program applies to his family, he may soon realize that the only way for him to increase his income is to have a larger family."

"Government supplements to the wages of the working poor could create a subsidized pool of cheap labor to employers."

TIMBER PINCH

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, many of us representing timber-producing areas are urging favorable consideration Thursday of H.R. 12025, the National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act of 1969.

Although some might believe that this is a move to assist the economies of communities dependent upon national forest timber for their very existence, it should be stressed that the prime, motivating factor behind drafting of this legislation was the Nation's critical shortage of housing and the concept which evolved in the legislation which will be considered by the House of Representatives Thursday grew out of congressional hearings on the housing crisis.

Sunday, February 1, the San Francisco Examiner in an editorial outlined the reasons for the housing crisis noting a lack of adequate lumber as one of the four prime causes of the situation.

Mr. Speaker, in order to share with my colleagues the views of a metropolitan newspaper on the legislation which we are considering this week, I will include at this point in the RECORD this editorial:

TIMBER PINCH

The painful pinch on housing is bruising not only the poor and aged but singles and families with healthy incomes. They've got the jobs and the money is in their pockets, but the living quarters just can't be found.

The vacancy rate in San Francisco is as low as one percent in some neighborhoods and that's the desperation point for the homeseeker. The same situation applies in New York. The national vacancy rate for all types of housing is 2.4 percent.

The shortages can be laid to the Four L's—Land, Labor, Lumber and Lucre (meaning money). In the case of lumber, attention zooms in on a recently completed study by private consultants of public land timber policies. It criticizes U.S. Forest Service timber cutting policies as inflexible and overly conservative.

"If the national requirements for forest products during the next 30 years are to be

met, forest management will have to be intensified," the study says. Particularly at issue is the annual cut from old-growth softwood forests in Oregon, Washington and Northern California. The survey criticizes federal agencies, principally the Forest Service, for being overly protective of old-growth stands while private timber has been harvested rapidly and efficiently.

Certainly the country must husband its timber resources. No one is talking about wanton exploitation and destruction. But the demand for timber is urgent and legitimate. Surely it can be met within the bounds of sound conservation practices. Authors of the timber study insist that "by intensifying timber management, USFS could double its timber harvest."

The federal government is dedicated to increasing the housing supply, but seems to be defeating its own purpose by under-use of a major construction material—timber. Shortages mean higher prices. Here at least is one problem posed by the Four L's that seems subject to solution. Congress should look into it.

MR. WEIDENBAUM GOES TO WASHINGTON

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the Washington University magazine, located in St. Louis, Mo., carries a most interesting and enlightening profile of Dr. Murray L. Weidenbaum.

Dr. Weidenbaum is a former chairman of Washington University's Department of Economics and was appointed by President Nixon last year as an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Economic Policy.

Now on leave of absence from the university, Dr. Weidenbaum has become a key official of the Nixon administration. He has been referred to as "the Nation's foremost academic specialist on military spending," by the New York Times.

For a close and interesting look at a professor in the Nation's Capital, I recommend the reading of this article:

MR. WEIDENBAUM GOES TO WASHINGTON

(By Dorothy Brockhoff)

Some weeks ago Saul Bellow, the novelist, declared that "American intellectuals don't enter government service very willingly, and they look on government as a cold-blooded monster." Murray L. Weidenbaum, formerly chairman of the department of economics at Washington University and currently on leave of absence from the faculty to serve as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Economic Policy, disagrees.

Now serving his third tour of duty in Washington (he was with the Bureau of the Budget from 1949 to 1957 and in 1964 was staff director of a presidential Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament), Weidenbaum recently devoted an entire speech at Rutgers University to "The Role of the College Professor in the Nixon Administration." Stating categorically that he believes "the substantial infusion of academic talent is one of the hallmarks of the Nixon administration," Weidenbaum carefully enumerated dozens of university and college teachers who have left their classrooms for key jobs in the nation's capital.

Included on Weidenbaum's list were many of his friends, including Arthur Burns of Columbia University appointed to the new

cabinet-level position of Counselor to the President soon after Nixon took office and now head of the Federal Reserve System; three members of the Council of Economic Advisers, Chairman Paul W. McCracken, from the University of Michigan, Hendrik S. Houthakker of Harvard University, and Dr. Herbert Stein, on leave as a Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution; and Treasury Department colleague Edwin S. Cohen of the University of Virginia's Law School.

Weidenbaum's observation was one which he, himself, admitted had been generally overlooked, and consequently it came as quite a surprise. This ability to come up with original and unexpected conclusions, however, is by now a well-established Weidenbaum trait and undoubtedly one of the basic reasons why President Nixon created a new place for him in the administration as the Treasury Department's key adviser on economic policy.

Perhaps the best-known example of Weidenbaum's fresh approach to difficult problems is his analysis of one phase of the military-industrial-complex: weapons procurement. In 1966 and 1967, as he attested in a mid-November address in Chicago, his was "a voice in the wilderness" which warned "of the inflationary nature of the economic and financial impact of the defense buildup then underway." This contention, supported by basic research made possible through a NASA grant, led him to conclude that large defense firms are extensions of the public bureaucracy. In support of this thesis, he declared: "In some ways, the Federal Government is taking on the traditional role of the private entrepreneur, while the companies are behaving less like other corporations and more like government agencies or arsenals."

This reasoning has had far-reaching implications. John Kenneth Galbraith, for example, has used Weidenbaum's argument as a springboard for recommending that the whole military-industrial-complex be nationalized. Weidenbaum on the other hand would, he says, "orient it more toward private enterprise." Each economist has his share of supporters, nearly all of whom agree that as a result of his scholarly investigations Weidenbaum has become, in the words of the *New York Times*, "the nation's foremost academic specialist on military spending." It was this reputation that led a writer for *Dun's Review* to intimate not long after Weidenbaum's appointment to his present Washington post that his principal job would be to serve as a kind of "Pentagon watcher" acting as the Treasury Department's check on its outlays.

Such an interpretation of Weidenbaum's duties is quite obviously a gross over-simplification. His responsibilities are extremely broad, varied, and demanding. His primary concern, which is shared by other economic policy makers in the government, is how to bring the inflation in this country under control without precipitating a recession. "This is going to be very tricky," Weidenbaum said, "because in the past you couldn't do both. We think we're on the right track—the economic policy we have adopted we call gradualism. It is one of moderation. Our view is that you don't turn the economy upside down. You don't have massive unemployment. What you do is cool it down."

Weidenbaum sees signs that the restrictions which the government has imposed to curb inflation are beginning to work. "Most measures of real economic activity—GNP in constant dollars, industrial production, employment, and man hours—no longer are registering the strong gains which were being made during 1968. Perhaps this is best summarized," he continued, "by the decline in the rate of real economic growth to little more than two percent during the first three quarters of 1969, as compared with about five percent in the preceding three."

He made clear, however, that the easing of inflationary pressures might be reversed if Congress did not approve a responsible fiscal policy. Weidenbaum warned, "this is no time for a large tax reduction. Unfortunately, some of the people who have been pushing for big, new expenditure programs have also been advocating large tax reductions. You just can't have both. One of my jobs is to remind people that they must make a choice." Weidenbaum conceded that preaching such doctrine is bound to make him unpopular. "You begin to sound like Mr. Scrooge," he concluded.

Weidenbaum admitted that leaders in the administration are genuinely concerned over the "slowing" pains, as President Nixon recently described them, that may accompany the transition to a less inflationary economy. But he predicted that unemployment would not rise above five percent, and he emphasized that "changes recommended by the administration in the unemployment insurance system would improve the ability of the federal budget to act as an automatic stabilizer during periods of decline in economic activity."

During the first half of 1970 he foresees a pause in the economy as "inflation is squeezed out of the system." But he looks for an upturn about the middle of the year. And his long-range concerns are directed towards devising a policy "that will get the economy expanding again." Weidenbaum believes that the Treasury Department can do a great deal to bring about a healthy economy through a sound tax policy. "We can work up a tax system that is positive—that encourages job creation," he emphasized, "and that's one of the things I'm giving a great deal of thought to now."

Looking ahead—as far down the road as 1975—was one of the first assignments that Weidenbaum was given as a member of the Nixon administration. With Maurice Mann of the Budget Bureau he served on a three-man committee headed by Herbert Stein, asked by the President to study the peacetime economy in the aftermath of the Vietnam war. They predicted tight federal budgets even after the fighting ends in Southeast Asia, something that Weidenbaum prophesied in the *Washington University Magazine* a few issues ago in an article which he said really "scooped" the nation's press. Summing up their position, Stein told *Washington Post* reporter Carroll Kilpatrick that there would be substantial savings after the war ends, "but we are already committed to spending most of it." Their view was echoed by Daniel P. Moynihan, formerly counselor to the President on Urban Affairs Council and now Burns' successor, who predicted that the "peace dividend would turn out to be evanescent like the morning clouds around San Clemente" (the California headquarters of the Nixon government). The President himself endorsed this view a few days later when he told the National Governors' Conference: "Dreams of unlimited billions of dollars being released once the war in Vietnam ends are just that—dreams. True, there will be additional money—but the claims on it already are enormous. There should be no illusion that what some call 'the peace and growth dividend' will automatically solve our national problems or release us from the need to establish priorities."

Such candid talk brought sharp criticism from those who wanted to believe that big budget savings would soon be available for cities, transportation, education and other social needs. While there will be no huge bonanza for beleaguered mayors and governors from post-Vietnam surpluses, the Nixon government has promised aid from another source. Help could come through a revolutionary revenue-sharing plan which President Nixon sent to Congress last August. Weidenbaum headed a special task force set up by the President to develop this proposal

and is considered one of its chief architects. He spends much of his time explaining how the plan would work to "V.I.P.'s" all over the country.

Weidenbaum nearly always prefaces his remarks with a statement emphasizing that this plan is the financial heart of what the President calls "the New Federalism."

"The idea," as Weidenbaum explained, "is to shift the balance from the federal government back to the state and local governments." The concept is actually quite simple. A percentage of personal taxable income, the same base used to calculate federal income taxes, would be set aside for return to the states and cities. A formula based on population and comparative tax effort would determine how much money would go to each state. The states, in turn, would be required to pass on a percentage of their share to all counties, cities, and towns within their borders. The amount each city and county would get is dependent on how much general revenue each unit collects.

One of the reasons why Weidenbaum is so enthusiastic about the proposal is that it reflects opinions which he expressed in papers published while he was at Washington University. "I called for a reallocation of public sector resources to the states and cities," he explained, "and it is nice to have the opportunity of carrying out these ideas." This point is part of a thesis on the need to decentralize the federal government which Weidenbaum regards as the fundamental message of his new book, *The Modern Public Sector*, published recently by Basic Books of New York. The volume, also prepared while Weidenbaum was on the Washington University campus, not only lays the conceptual foundation for the reform proposal for revenue sharing, but also emphasizes the current trend towards involving non-governmental institutions in the solution of society's problems.

Weidenbaum has another book in mind, but it will have to wait because in his present position he has very little time for the kind of reflection necessary to produce a weighty tome on economics. In fact, one of his concerns is how to find a few spare moments for contemplation in a work week that averages 65 hours, with each day stretching from 9 a.m. to 7 p.m. As one solution, Weidenbaum hit on the idea of riding the bus from his Chevy Chase home to the massive pile of rock which is the Treasury Department's headquarters just east of the White House. In rank-happy, status conscious "D.C." this decision was regarded as highly irregular—administrators at Weidenbaum's level simply don't travel on public transportation. Or if they do, "they lose face," Weidenbaum explained with a mischievous grin.

The whole business of formal protocol strikes Weidenbaum as ludicrous, but for the sake of convention he now wears conservative banker gray suits instead of blazer jackets, and always remembers to don his well-tailored coat when he leaves his very proper office. His black hair, once cropped in a crew cut, is now a more conservative length, which gives him a Brooks Brothers look. He appears changed, but conversations with him reveal that he's not so very different after all from the professor who used to make his headquarters in McMillan Hall.

The sense of humor is very much in evidence and the candor. "A job as an assistant secretary was sometimes just a political payoff," he observed. "That wasn't true in my case," he declared with a grin. Of his pace, which leaves his aides hardpressed to keep up with him, Weidenbaum remarked, "Ordinarily there's just turmoil around here. Today it's pandemonium."

Asked to compare his life in the capital with that on the campus, Weidenbaum said, "Different it surely is, but more difficult?—no I don't think so." What he notices most is that life in Washington, is far more rou-

tine. "At Washington University the pace was much more personally determined," he said. "I could come whenever I felt like it if I didn't have a class, stay late at night preparing lecture notes, and write a paper over the weekend. And if I ever thought faculty meetings were a bit much, imagine what life is like now! And there's a different kind of meeting here which I call public contact work. Since I'm a policy-maker I spend a lot of time explaining what I'm doing to the press, Congress, and public interest groups."

"Actually, I don't find the substance that different. I was not a theoretical economist. I was always policy-oriented and interested in what was happening in the economy. But my role was different. There at the University I could be detached and just say whatever I believed to be the proper course of policy. Now, of course, no one censors my speeches, but still there is self-imposed restraint because you know that anything that you say of any consequence will be picked up and interpreted as the view of the administration. You simply aren't speaking for yourself alone." But Weidenbaum made clear that he is determined not to compromise his integrity. "I have an implicit understanding—again self-imposed—that I will not publicly criticize the administration nor will I publicly support something that I don't believe in."

Weidenbaum is skillful at fielding questions at press conferences and makes clear that he rather enjoys tangling with critics. "Good clean fun" is what he calls it, whether it be locking horns with Mayor John Lindsay on the same rostrum at the Forty-Sixth Annual Congress of Cities out in San Diego, or trading quips with Martin Agronsky on television.

Probably what he enjoys most, however, are the "T-2" (Troika Two) sessions when he and Stein and Mann get together to thresh out economic policy. Their combination is known as the "working level" troika. Above them is still another top-level troika team, abbreviated as "T-1," composed of the Council's McCracken, Treasury Secretary David Kennedy, and Budget Director Robert Mayo. When they meet with the Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur Burns, they become the Quadriad.

In early December when Weidenbaum was interviewed for this article, he and his "T-2" counterparts were preoccupied with the three major policy statements that a President makes in a given year. These are the State of the Union message, the budget message, and the economic report. Weidenbaum indicated that the work was proceeding smoothly. Indeed, quiet efficiency seems to be a characteristic of the Nixon administration. Even a message from the President announcing a major change in administration policy and requesting a prompt reply is delivered to Weidenbaum without furor. "That never would have happened during the Johnson administration," he observed, "and I think that fact is very significant," he added.

It suggests, as *The New York Times'* White House correspondent Robert B. Semple, Jr. pointed out in a Sunday magazine piece not long ago, the "muted style" of the Presidency. But as this reporter went on to remind readers, the Presidency, nevertheless, has very clearly become Nixon's Presidency.

It is Nixon's photograph which looms on the walls of offices all over the Treasury headquarters and presumably all the other key department buildings in Washington, and it is Nixon's philosophy which sets the tone of this administration. Perhaps it was best expressed in the midst of a conversation which Mr. Nixon had with several of his aides last July when the President is reported to have said, according to his counsel, John Ehrlichman: "Let us not fall into the dreary rut or just manage the chaos a

little better. Let us use the great power of this place to do something for the nation." Administration officials like Murray L. Weidenbaum could ask for no better direction nor any clearer reason for coming to the banks of the Potomac to shoulder the responsibilities of public service.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, DECEMBER 1969

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I include a release highlighting the December 1969 civilian personnel report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures:

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, DECEMBER 1969

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of December totaling 2,925,081. This was a net decrease of 1,057 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of November.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1970, which began July 1, 1969 follows:

| Month | Employment | Increase | Decrease |
|-----------|------------|----------|----------|
| July 1969 | 3,062,319 | 9,276 | |
| August | 3,028,521 | | 33,798 |
| September | 2,958,386 | | 70,135 |
| October | 2,940,413 | | 17,973 |
| November | 2,926,138 | | 14,275 |
| December | 2,925,081 | | 1,057 |

Total federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of December was 1,662,292, an increase of 8,080 as compared with the November total of 1,654,212. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in December was 1,262,789, a decrease of 9,137 as compared with 1,271,926 in November.

Civilian agencies reporting the largest decreases were Commerce Department with 3,632, Department of Health, Education and Welfare with 1,232, and Agriculture Department with 1,160. These decreases were offset by a seasonal increase in Post Office Department with 13,056 and an increase in Treasury Department with 1,422.

In the Department of Defense the largest decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Army with 4,413, Navy with 3,722 and Air Force with 656.

Total employment inside the United States in December was 2,682,961, an increase of 1,093 as compared with November. Total employment outside the United States in December was 242,120, a decrease of 2,150 as compared with November. Industrial employment by federal agencies in December was 566,999, an increase of 5,832 as compared with November.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

FULL-TIME PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT

The total of 2,925,081 civilian employees reported for the month of December 1969 includes 2,606,795 full-time permanent employees. This represents a decrease of 2,219 in full-time permanent employment from the preceding month of November. These figures are shown in the appendix (p. 17) of the accompanying report.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,925,081 civilian employees certified to the Committee by federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 108,516 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during December who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in November was 110,933.

THE OLD STORY OF THE LITTLE RED HEN

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, one of South Dakota's most able weekly editor's, Merle Lofgren, has a special talent for editorial writing. His columns are often spiced with humor, but also convey a sound philosophy. His editorial in the January 22 issue of the Corson County News particularly merits the attention of my colleagues and I am, therefore, taking the liberty of inserting it in the RECORD as follows:

THE OLD STORY OF THE LITTLE RED HEN

There is a growing acceptance in the United States of the idea that there should be a guaranteed national income. People who do not earn an amount determined to be needed to maintain a reasonable standard of living will get a check from the government to make up the difference between what they earn and what somebody thinks they should have. There are those who believe this program can work and we can still have a free enterprise system and maintain a society of ambitious people.

Washington, our nation's capital, is of course not the only source of fables.

Consider one of the fables of Aesop of ancient Greece. It has survived for these many years because of its appeal to reason and common sense—another quality one sometimes cannot attach to the fables coming out of Washington.

Here is Aesop's fable with a little updating and our apologies to the good Greek.

Once upon a time there was a Little Red Hen who scratched about and uncovered some grains of wheat. She called her barnyard neighbors and said, "If we work together and plant this wheat, we will have some fine bread to eat. Who will help me plant the wheat?"

"Not I," said the Cow. "Not I," said the Duck. "Guaranteed annual bread," said the Goose.

"Then I will," said the Little Red Hen—and she did.

After the wheat started growing, the ground turned dry and there was no rain in sight. "Who will help me water the wheat?" said the Little Red Hen.

"Not I," said the Goose. "Not I," said the Duck. "Not I," said the Pig. "Equal rights," said the Cow.

"Then I will," said the Little Red Hen—and she did.

The wheat grew tall and ripened into golden grain. "Who will help me reap the wheat?" asked the Little Red Hen.

"Not I," said the Cow. "Not I," said the Duck. "Out of my classification," said the Pig. "I'd lose my ADC," said the Goose.

"Then I will," said the Little Red Hen—and she did.

When it came time to grind the flour, "Not I," said the Cow. "I'd lose my unemployment compensation," said the Duck.

When it came time to make the bread, "But that's overtime for me," said the Cow. "I'm a dropout and never learned how," said the Duck. "I'd lose my welfare benefits," said the Pig. "If I'm the only one helping its discrimination," said the Goose.

"Then I will," said the Little Red Hen—and she did.

She baked five loaves of fine bread and held them up for her neighbors to see.

"I want some," said the Cow. "I want some," said the Duck. "I want some," said the Pig. "I demand my share," said the Goose.

"No," said the Little Red Hen. "I can rest for a while and eat the five loaves myself."

"Excess profits," cried the Cow. "Capitalistic leech," screamed the Goose. "Equal rights," grunted the Pig.

And they hurriedly painted picket signs and marched around the Little Red Hen singing, "We shall overcome," and they did.

For when the Farmer came to investigate the commotion he said, "You must not be greedy, Little Red Hen. Look at the oppressed Cow. Look at the underprivileged Pig. Look at the less fortunate Goose. You are guilty of making second class citizens of them."

"But—but I earned the bread," said the Little Red Hen.

"Exactly," said the wise Farmer. "That is the wonderful free enterprise system: anybody can earn as much as he wants. You should be happy to have this freedom. In other barnyards you would have to give all five loaves to the Farmer. Here you give four loaves to your suffering neighbors."

And they lived happily ever after, including the Little Red Hen who smiled and smiled and clucked "I am grateful, I am grateful."

But her neighbors wondered why she never baked any more bread.

DENTAL FUNDS FOR VIETNAM VETERANS SHORT IN MONTANA

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, 1970, I apprised my colleagues of the apparent shortage of funding in the Veterans' Administration to give prompt and proper dental care to our returning Vietnam veterans, and I cited funding shortages in Georgia which had come to my attention through a letter I received from the mother of a Vietnam veteran.

Apparently, Mr. Speaker, the Georgia situation is not an isolated instance. I have just received a letter from Henry Sawyer, director of Montana's Veterans Welfare Commission, advising the Committee on Veterans' Affairs that there are mammoth dental backlogs at the VA hospitals in Fort Harrison and that many Vietnam veterans are having to pay for emergency dental care out of their own pockets. This is a deplorable situation.

Mr. Speaker, if the Veterans' Administration needs more money to give our returning Vietnam veterans the dental care they are due on a timely basis, they should so inform the Congress. They will have the opportunity to do so when they ask for fiscal year 1970 supplemental funds.

Mr. Speaker, the letter from the director of the Montana Veterans Welfare Commission follows:

THE VETERANS' WELFARE COMMISSION,
STATE OF MONTANA,
Helena, Mont., January 27, 1970.

Chairman OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House Committee on Veteran Affairs,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE TEAGUE: The Dental Service at Fort Harrison has received an allotment of \$17,500.00 for out patient dental treatment of veterans. This is ridiculous under the circumstances.

According to a Veterans Administration circular veterans of the Viet Nam Era who are now being discharged every day are entitled to needed dental care if they apply within 6 months of discharge and have a dental examination within 8 months of discharge. These recently discharged veterans almost all tell the same story that they were told the Veterans Administration would give them dental treatment after their discharge.

Since August, 1969 there has only been enough money for the Veterans Administration at Fort Harrison to pay for dental examinations or for emergencies. Believe me emergencies are few and far between.

The service officers of the Veterans Welfare Commission of Montana, as per my instructions, have been contacting veterans shortly after their discharge to assist them in filing for any benefits due them. I would say that 90 percent file a 10-2827 for dental treatment, then from Fort Harrison an examination is authorized by the veterans local dentist. There the benefit has stopped since August. A back log of dental treatments has built up and is steadily increasing. The result is that a number of veterans could not wait for an uncertain treatment date sometime in the future. They have had dental treatment at their own expense. Now when the Dental Department at Fort Harrison notifies them to appear for treatment it has already been done. The Veterans Administration thus saves the expense of the treatment. This possibly will make the dental appropriation go further for those who could wait, but it is obviously unfair to those who could not. It is impossible to call many into the dental clinics at the Veterans Administration hospitals at Fort Harrison and Miles City. Distances are great in Montana, so there would be a great expense in travel allowance. Besides the dentists are busy with patients in the hospital and could not treat very many on an outpatient basis.

The Chief of the Dental Service at Fort Harrison is very concerned over the financial situation. I have talked with him several times about the problem. He is doing the very best he can with such limited funds.

I listened to President Nixon on television last evening when he vetoed the HEW bill. I realize that it is going to be a miracle if more money can be obtained for the Veterans Administration. Yet it is a shame that documentary promises are made that this dental work will be done if the veteran timely applies. The joker is that the veterans do not realize that the treatment may be delayed 6 months or more after the preliminary examination. That can be a long, long time to nurse a set of teeth needing filling that should have been done in the service.

It may be corny to wave the flag but after all in this Viet Nam affair these boys left the security of home to serve under some of the worst conditions possible. They all hoped that things would be much better at home when they return. They can tolerate and understand some of the changes that occur while they are gone. A tooth with a cavity getting larger every day and aching intermittently is another story. It is only a small thing, maybe, but in many cases this will be the veterans only medical

treatment by the Veterans Administration. If he doesn't get timely treatment, after being promised it, he will never trust the Veterans Administration medical treatment again.

In addition it puts service officers and Veterans Administration contact personnel in a very poor light. A veteran comes in to apply for schooling, and in the course of the conversation about all benefits he is asked about his teeth. He admits he needs treatment, so an application is made. He is notified to report to a local dentist for a dental examination. The dentist tells him he needs extensive treatment and also notifies the Veterans Administration. I have already outlined what happens then. Something must be done to convince the Bureau of the Budget that a promise by the government of the United States is an obligation to these young veterans. Sufficient funds to grant the one time dental treatment must be forthcoming to take care of the promise.

This has been a long letter but this has been building up within me for a long time. I had hoped that sufficient funds would be allocated and very disappointed when I called the Chief of the Dental Service yesterday to find how little was furnished. You probably have been getting the same story from all parts of the country, but this is my addition to the growing pile. I hope Congress can do something about the problem.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY E. SAWYER,
Director.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION— SOMETHING MORE ENLIGHTENED?

HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the recommendations of four Presidents, the Congress, until the recent vote of the House of Representatives sustaining the President's veto of the HEW appropriations bill, had not voted to make any change or correction in the law that grants impacted aid to school districts. The reason most attributed for this has been that a majority of the Congressmen have districts benefiting from this program and, thus, they could not, or would not, vote a change because of the pressure from back home. I do not deny, Mr. Speaker, that those of us having districts receiving impacted aid have heard from such school districts and communities, but not all take such a parochial point of view. Evidence of this is a fine editorial appearing in the Watertown, N.Y., Daily Times, published in a community which itself "benefits" from impacted aid because of its proximity to the 1st Army's major training center at Camp Drum, N.Y., and the U.S. Air Force radar installation at Dry Hill, N.Y. The editorial follows:

[From the Watertown (N.Y.) Daily Times, Jan. 29, 1970]

FEDERAL IMPACT AID

The biggest consideration in the education aid fight between the White House and the Congress has emerged as impact aid. Although this form of assistance to certain localities has existed since 1950, hardly anyone has paid any significant attention to it. Impact aid has nothing to do with Head Start, school enrichment programs, or other imaginative attempts to improve the teaching and learn-

ing process. What it has become is a federal grab-bag for those who search for ways and means to get federal help for the school district.

Jefferson County has a theoretical allocation of \$215,000. The eligibility is determined by the number of pupils who either live or whose families work at Camp Drum or Dry Hill. Theory of the aid program is that the federal government, not paying taxes at either base, recognizes that it should support the schools by payments in lieu of taxes. This impact aid was undertaken 20 years ago and has proliferated to the point that it is now paid in 385 of the 435 congressional districts.

President Nixon mentioned impact aid of \$6,000,000 to Montgomery County, Maryland, a suburb of Washington. This county has the highest per capita income of any in the nation, and it also received the biggest impact payments. This is also the home of many legislators and government employees and their school taxes are reduced to the extent that the impact aid provides a source for school revenues.

Legislators have been subject to pressures from the school districts where aid payments have been received to override President Nixon's veto. They were also pressured for \$600,000,000 in impact aid. Nevertheless they sustained the president's veto. The figure he requested was \$200,000,000. In order to lighten some of the pressure on congressmen, he has made some form of a commitment to double the \$200,000,000, splitting the difference, as it were.

The superintendent of public schools in Watertown has commented that the city has received as much as \$30,000 impact aid in the past, but that "you never know what you are going to get." The supervising principal of the Carthage Central School made the comment that most school administrators and boards of education spend most of the year figuring out where the school money is coming from. These school officials and others cannot be blamed if they seek impact aid. Neither claims the money is to improve education opportunity, but to listen and watch the argument in Washington, one would get the impression that these federal funds are for no other purpose than to lift higher the level of instruction and programming than what states and localities can afford themselves.

President Nixon mentioned that Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson all agreed that this impact aid was unfair. The president further said that in the case of Montgomery County, Maryland, the \$6,000,000 benefits a half million who live in the richest county, and only \$3,000,000 in impact aid goes to benefit the 3,000,000 people who live in the 10 poorest counties in the United States.

This, then, is clearly the time to correct this form of educational assistance. This old system must not be perpetuated. Federal aid to education is supposed to be something more enlightened.

TOWARD POSTAL REORGANIZATION

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a Methodist minister who is a constituent of mine, Rev. Melvin Lee Steadman, Jr., of Dunn Loring, Va., has furnished me with a copy of an article published in the January 28, 1970, issue of the Christian

Century entitled "Toward Postal Reorganization."

This article, written by J. George Butler, a retired Methodist minister, reviews the history of the Post Office Department as a service organization and urges that the service element be retained regardless of what form of reorganization takes place as a result of the various bills which have been introduced in the Congress.

Our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has been considering postal reform for a number of months and I am hopeful that we will be able to favorably report an acceptable bill to the House within the next few weeks. It does seem that we should retain the service concept in any measure adopted by the House and I insert the article by Mr. Butler in the RECORD in full for the information of my colleagues:

TOWARD POSTAL REORGANIZATION—DEPENDABLE MAIL SERVICE WILL RETURN TO THE BODY POLITIC FAR GREATER WEALTH THAN THE RELATIVELY FEW DOLLARS IT MAY COST TO "SUBSIDIZE" A SERVICE BENEFITTING ALL THE PEOPLE

(By J. George Butler)

In the report it issued in June 1968, the presidential commission appointed to consider reorganization of the U.S. post office department summed up its conclusions in a single sentence: "We recommend that a postal Corporation owned entirely by the Federal Government be chartered by Congress to operate the postal service of the United States on a self-supporting basis." So far, the last three words of this sentence have been all but totally ignored in public discussion of the proposal. Yet these three words, "self-supporting basis," may well prove to be of paramount importance not only for the postal system but for the whole U.S. body politic. For no matter what the mechanics of moving the mails, it is the philosophy back of them that is significant.

The philosophy embraced by the presidential commission (popularly known as the Kappel Commission, after its chairman, Frederick Kappel) and adopted by the Nixon administration is, I suggest, a radically wrong philosophy. Moreover, it runs counter to the history of our postal service and indeed to a tradition that is older than the republic itself. In the past it has been generally recognized that the post office is not a public utility like any other, providing benefits that should be paid for by those who profit by them. It is above all a service organization. Directly, it serves business and is ancillary to business prosperity, but indirectly it serves to foster the economic, political, social and intellectual well-being of the country. To require the postal enterprise to be self-supporting would be to hinder it from rendering this latter service and to risk bringing great harm to our democratic society and institutions. This is a view that history supports.

I

Many years before the Revolution, Benjamin Franklin sought the position of postmaster in Philadelphia so that he might send his newspapers through the mails free. Other, less scrupulous men in similar positions barred their competitors' papers from the mails. Not so Franklin. And when he became deputy postmaster general for the colonies, he extended to all papers the right to use of the mail at below-cost rates, because he saw the postal system as a means of educating and enlightening the people.

In 1794 President Washington's postmaster general prodded Congress into declaring that the postal facilities should be extended, even if it cost money to do so. This idea—that the

post office is a service for all the people—took hold, and Congress reaffirmed it repeatedly. True, now and again Congress has favored the public utility concept. But the great weight of postal history comes down on the side of the service concept. All our ablest postmasters general have insisted that the post office is a service whose value cannot be measured in dollars and cents.

By 1812, practically every road east of the Alleghenies had been built by the federal government as a post road for the transportation of the mails. By 1813, the first steamboat line had been recognized as a post road and a great system of canals had been sponsored by Congress. Fifteen years later, in 1828, John McLean, the then postmaster general, admitted that large sums could be saved by withdrawing mail service from sparsely inhabited regions, but declared that to do so would not be in the public interest. The next year President Jackson reinforced McLean's position in his message to Congress: "[The post office] is to the body politic what the veins and arteries are to the natural. . . . Through its agency we have secured to ourselves the full enjoyment of the blessings of a free press."

In 1844 a congressional commission reported after thorough study of the postal situation: "The U.S. Postal Service was created to render the citizen worthy, by proper knowledge and enlightenment, of his important privileges as a sovereign constituent of this government. . . ." It found that the post office was a vital public service and should be maintained, at whatever cost in money. Whereupon, in 1845, Congress reduced rates. Within two years, revenues were just as high as under the old, exorbitant rates, and the volume of mail multiplied.

In 1847 the United States following the English lead, issued adhesive postage stamps (their use was not obligatory until 1856), and four years later Congress, also following the English lead, reduced the domestic rate on letters to 3 cents. More important, it passed an act establishing the principle that the post office is a service to be operated without undue concern for costs. It specifically sanctioned postal deficits and forbade the postmaster general to reduce or curtail postal service.

Incidentally, it was a postmaster general who, by risking deficits, saved California for the Union at the time of the War Between the States. This was Aaron Brown, President Buchanan's postmaster general. Brown spent the then fabulous sum of \$2,184,000 to open six routes to California. While these routes brought the revenues of only \$339,000 annually, they paid for themselves many times over by keeping the west coast on the Union side.

II

Lincoln's postmaster general, Montgomery Blair, left his mark on the service by inaugurating postal money orders, so that troops in the field might send money home safely. President Johnson's postmaster general, Alexander Williams Randall, was likewise a man of vision. He saw the postal service as a "great public necessity" and rejected as "erroneous" the notion that the post office should be self-sustaining. Unprofitable mail routes, he said, "invite settlement and encourage material development, so there come back to the people in real wealth, almost as many millions of dollars as the Government expends thousands in this branch of service."

Grant's administration too was graced by a postmaster general, James Cresswell, who was years ahead of his time. He is best remembered as the father of the penny postal card, of which 31 million were bought the year it was introduced. (However, in 1951, the last year before the demise of this card, only 4 billion were sold.) But other of Cresswell's ideas were more important. Not only did he urge creation of a postal savings system (such as the British instituted 40 years

earlier); he recommended purchase by the government of all private telegraph lines so that they could be incorporated into the federal communications system—a step that had been taken in most European countries. It was never taken here, however. In this connection, let me point out that the Kappel Commission treads very gingerly here. It studied 14 foreign postal systems and noted that 12 received no appropriations from general tax revenues. "Costs," it stated, "are covered in a business fashion by charges to users When expenditures higher than anticipated result in deficits, these are generally covered by reserves or borrowing. Sometimes, deficiencies in postal operations are made up by profits from other services offered by the postal agency, for example telecommunications or banking." (Italics mine.) Last year, AT&T's net income was \$2.1 billion; the postal deficit was \$1.2 billion.

But to return to postal history. William Freeman Vilas, postmaster general during Cleveland's first administration, was another outstanding official who had the temerity to make a frontal assault on the all-powerful railroads. In 1886 he pointed out that the government paid nearly \$2 million a year rent for decrepit railway cars—cars that killed and maimed clerks so fast as to cause a national scandal—when for \$1.6 million it could build and equip a fleet of modern mail cars. Unfortunately, Vilas lost.

III

Probably the greatest postmaster general of modern times, and certainly the most farsighted since Benjamin Franklin, was President Harrison's John Wanamaker. This Philadelphia merchant prince—a man of great probity and an active Christian—brought to the office his great business acumen. But businessman though he was, he saw the post office as a public service, not as a mercantile operation. As he said in his first annual report: "The Post Office is not a money-making enterprise. It is not intended to be, and it is a mistake to expect it to be self-sustaining."

Wanamaker was the real father of rural free delivery service, though this was not authorized until 1896. He fought for the establishment of a postal savings system (such a system was finally set up in 1910), and succeeded in bringing into being our parcel post system.

In these days of deteriorating postal service, it is worth noting that Wanamaker strictly enforced his rule that all mail reaching a post office in daylight had to be delivered within two hours of its arrival. In New York and Philadelphia he installed pneumatic tubes to provide almost instantaneous movement of mail (emulating the Franco-German tube service between Berlin and Paris, which transmitted letters 750 miles in 30 minutes). He also instituted four-day transcontinental mail service. And he drove the enormously powerful and corrupt Louisiana lottery syndicate out of the mails, thus forcing it out of business.

In our century this same service concept has been espoused by postmasters general from Theodore Roosevelt's time to Harding's. The latter's Will Hays stated when he was sworn in: "The postal establishment is not an institution for profit, it is an institution for service, and it is the President's purpose to improve that service."

Daniel Roper, Franklin Roosevelt's secretary of commerce, clearly saw the economic utility of the post office. In his book *The United States Post Office* he wrote: "The Post Office Department, of all the branches of government, is most clearly participating with private business and industry in the production of wealth." And he quoted Arthur Twining Hadley, who was for years president of Yale and during his lifetime ranked as one of the nation's leading economists: "Our whole economic and political system has be-

come so dependent upon free and secure postal communication that the attempt to measure its specific effects can be little less than a waste of words. Whether the postal service is self-supporting or not, and whether it pays a profit to the government is of relatively small concern." Moreover, Roper pointed out, the postal service was necessary for foreign trade. Prior to 1914, for instance, our foreign trade was largely with Europe because the mail service between this country and Europe was prompt and regular. But trade with Latin America was negligible, because the mails to and from those lands were totally unreliable.

In sum, the history of the United States post office department shows (1) that its function has been one of service, and (2) that it has been a means of strengthening the nation's economic, political, social and intellectual life. The Kappel Commission is wrong when it says: "Mail service is principally a utility service. . . . The Post Office is a business. Like all economic functions, it should be supported by revenues from its users. The general mail user should not be subsidized by the taxpayer."

IV

Why is the Kappel Commission afraid of "subsidy"? No doubt because this is a word charged with emotion. A pamphlet, "Subsidy and Subsidy-effect Programs of the U.S. Government," prepared by the joint economic committee of the 89th Congress, is instructive here. It said: "Proponents of a Government program designed to aid a particular industry . . . avoid or indeed resent the term 'subsidy' . . . preferring to call it an aid or expenditure necessary in the national interest. . . . Opponents of the program in their use of the label 'subsidy' seek to stigmatize, or at least to suggest . . . that the program somehow benefits certain individuals at a cost offset, if at all, by doubtful benefits to the American taxpayer in general. . . . It is probably impossible to make an estimate of the total subsidy payments of the Federal Government during any single year. . . . Subsidies have expanded to the point where few segments of our economy are completely unaffected by them."

In doing research for this article, I encountered one glaring instance of how the government "subsidizes" private business and so contributes directly to the postal deficit. With a view to finding out how an efficient post office ran, I visited "Operation Turnkey," the highly touted automated or mechanized post office at Providence, Rhode Island. This facility, I learned, had been built by International Telephone and Telegraph and leased by it to the government. No one in Providence could answer my questions about costs and lease arrangements. A letter I wrote to Postmaster General Winton M. Blount was answered by a subaltern, who gave misleading round figures. So I enlisted the help of my United States senator, and finally received a direct reply from Mr. Blount. IT&T put up the building at a cost of \$15,508,636. The government pays IT&T an annual rent of \$1,445,986.17 and in addition reimburses IT&T for all property taxes it pays in excess of \$110,000 a year. In 1967, for instance, this excess amounted to \$53,607.97. Also, the government pays all service and maintenance costs on the building. To date, these have amounted to between \$650,000 and \$700,000 annually. These figures do not include custodial costs, which are additional.

So far as IT&T is concerned, this arrangement obviously represents a prime business investment. But to many of us citizens it looks like a government subsidy to private business, a fine example of business boondoggling. So is it any wonder that there is postal red ink?

V

With "subsidy" in mind, let us examine the President's recommendation for higher

postal rates. Rates would go up 12 to 20 per cent, with first-class postage raised to 7 cents. However, the director of the office of postal economics advises that, at 6 cents, first-class mail already covers 109 per cent and air mail 128 per cent of its allocated cost. First-class and airmail users are thus subsidizing other mail users on whose mail the department incurs losses. Why should they subsidize such losses further, if "subsidy" is so abhorrent to the government?

The post office department's greatest losses come from second-class mail. In line with the tradition established by Benjamin Franklin, newspapers and magazines are carried at below-cost rates; they pay but 26 per cent of their allocated cost. Thus, the government subsidizes second-class mail to the tune of \$450 million a year. Were rates raised enough to eliminate this deficit, they would have to go up nearly 400 per cent—enough to be prohibitive for many publishers.

In the days when America's postal motivation was service, we had one of the best postal systems in the world. But since 1950, when Congress became unduly concerned about red ink and making the post office self-supporting, our system has deteriorated and become one of the worst in the world. For two decades Congress has done everything save to attack the real cause of postal deficits: inefficiency. It was in 1950 that it ordered Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson to start curtailing service and raising rates. At a time when Great Britain provided as many as five home deliveries a day, the United States cut its deliveries from two to one. Directory service was abandoned and post-office window hours were shortened. Bulk users of the mails were forced to perform more and more postal functions, such as presorting, for themselves.

Curtailing service and raising rates, however, have not availed to end deficits. The net effect of these moves is glaringly apparent. Postal money orders, which amounted to \$6.6 billion in 1953, dropped a third, to \$4.5 billion, in 1965. Parcel post, which carried 6 billion pounds in 1953, also dropped a third, to 4 billion pounds in 1967.

Or consider third-class, so-called "junk mail." Since 1952 rates on this have been raised seven times. Commercial third-class mail now pays a 4-cent rate, which covers 73 per cent of the postal handling cost. The consequent deficit is \$231 million a year. On the other hand, third-class mail from church and fraternal organizations, which pays a basic 1.8 cent rate, costs the government just over \$100 million a year. But commercial third-class mail does not have to lose money. For two years now, the Independent Postal System of America, operating out of Oklahoma City, has been handling this "junk mail" at the government rate, moving it expeditiously and making a profit on it—and paying taxes to boot. The difference is that the I.P.S.A. is run efficiently, the U.S. post office department is not. Unless government legal action shuts it down, this private system will continue to demonstrate that "junk mail" need cost neither the post office nor the taxpayer a red cent to move. Let me add that, whatever one's opinion of such mail, it is the lifeblood of business. Now the second-largest advertising medium in the United States, it employs 5 million people and annually generates \$35 billion in sales.

VI

The conclusion from all this is that, instead of tinkering, Congress must first re-define its basic postal philosophy and then thoroughly overhaul the entire operation. The Kappel Commission said that 20 per cent of the postal costs—enough to eliminate the present \$1.2 billion annual deficit—could be cut were the post office run efficiently. As things are, efficiency is impossible. Postal managers do not have the power to manage. They have no control over pay rates, working conditions, workload, or the physical

facilities of the postal operation. They cannot plan capital expenditures nor can they make long-range plans for expansion. Red tape and political expediency stifle progress.

There is great merit in the suggestion, more and more frequently advanced, that a public corporation, similar in form to the T.V.A. or the F.D.I.C., be set up to manage the post office. Great Britain, whose lead in postal matters we have so often followed in the past, has just taken this step. Unfortunately, organized labor opposes it here, in the person of George Meany, head of the A.F.L.-C.I.O. Meany was a member of the Kappel Commission and as such registered his opposition to the "public corporation" idea in the commission's report. His view has not changed. There is, he avers, "positive value" in keeping the post office department within the President's cabinet. What that "positive value" is he does not say. But he hardly needs to. It is quite obvious that organized labor has learned, through necessity, how to win gains in wages and working conditions from a reluctant Congress. Postal unions now pack a potent political wallop, and labor is loath so see this system scrapped for one with compulsory arbitration under nonpolitical managers.

Sentimental idealists may prefer a service motivation to the utilitarian concept and the profit motive. But in the case of our postal service, as in the case of slavery, idealism and practicality go hand in hand. Slavery was economically unsound; it was doomed, whether or not abolitionists fulminated against it. So here. If the testimony of history is valid, the service concept is far more conducive to the well-being of the nation than the purely economic concept—the view that the post office is a utility that should pay its own way. Let the postal system be overhauled and made efficient. Good, dependable mail service will return to the body politic far greater wealth than the relatively few dollars it may cost to "subsidize" a service which benefits all the people.

**VIRGINIA HOUSE OF DELEGATES:
OLDEST LEGISLATIVE BODY IN
THE UNITED STATES**

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in an extension of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1969, I quoted a biographical sketch of John Pory, the first speaker of the first General Assembly of Virginia, which met at Jamestown on July 30, 1619, and consisted of the Governors Council and the House of Burgesses. The House of Delegates of Virginia, as the successor to the colonial House of Burgesses, is the oldest legislative body of the United States.

The principal address at the November 8, 1969, meeting of the Jamestown Society in Richmond was by Dr. Edward Alvey, Jr., former dean of the Mary Washington College of the University of Virginia at Fredericksburg and presently its professor of education. His subject was "The Assembly Meets at Jamestown 1619."

As the indicated paper by Dr. Alvey supplements the above mentioned biographical sketch of John Pory, was published under the sponsorship of the Mary Washington College, and should be of interest to students of government, I quote it as part of my remarks as follows:

THE ASSEMBLY MEETS AT JAMESTOWN, 1619

(By Edward Alvey, Jr.)

This year marks the 350th anniversary of the first legislative assembly in the New World, held at Jamestown in 1619. The occasion is significant for many reasons, chief among which is our heritage of representative government, for which the whole Western World owes a debt of gratitude to the hardy souls who convened in the church at Jamestown.

It is difficult to overestimate the courage of these early settlers. In these days of jet planes, it is hard to visualize the delays, frustrations, privations, and physical and mental hardships of a voyage across the stormy Atlantic. Even the process of getting started was enough to try the souls of the most optimistic. When the three little ships with 105 brave adventurers aboard sailed from Blackwall, near London, on December 20, 1606, they were unable to move from their anchorage off the coast of Kent for six weeks because of stormy weather. It was not until February of 1607 that the winds changed and the ships set sail. After stops at the Canary Islands, Martinique and Mona, the lands of Virginia was sighted in April 26, 1607. On May 14, the hundred-odd colonists were ashore at what was to be Jamestown and began the construction of a log fort.

The hazards they faced seemed almost insuperable: malarial mosquitoes, brackish water, hostile Indians, poor land, and an acute shortage of food. During that first summer colonists died by the score, probably of typhoid fever. When cool weather came in October, over half of the settlers had died, and all had been sick. By December the colony was in desperate straits. Only the masterful leadership of Capt. John Smith and the arrival of Capt. Newport with supplies saved the venture.

Determined settlers continued to arrive, in spite of all difficulties. However, the winter of 1609-10, called the Starving Time, decimated the colony. The food supply was insufficient for the recent arrivals. Relations with the Indians deteriorated. One group of thirty hungry colonists was massacred while bartering for food. The weakened settlers were struck repeatedly by killing diseases. Many died in their huts and were buried in common graves. Of the almost five hundred people in Virginia when Smith left in 1609, only 65 were alive six months later. When Lord Delaware arrived on June 10, 1610, he fell on his knees to thank God he had come in time to save the colony.

These were the hardy men and women who pioneered the first English settlement in America, or, what was in fact the first English colony. Later, when "the sun never set on the British flag," the experiences of the crown with its first overseas venture helped to shape the colonial policies of an Empire.

Life in the colony at Jamestown was rugged, with severe penalties for evildoing. Even in England, law and order in the early 17th century were maintained by harsh and often cruel punishments. Men were imprisoned, flogged, and even put to death for a long list of offences, many of which would be regarded as minor today. This attitude toward wrongdoing was particularly strong in the early days at Jamestown, where survival itself depended upon respecting the rights and possessions of others. Drastic punishments were inflicted upon wrongdoers, especially during the administrations of Sir Thomas Dale and Samuel Argall. To kill any livestock was punishable with death. For stealing food the most merciless penalties were imposed. As the historian Wertenbaker remarks, "Laws were more for a penal colony than for free Englishmen."

However, a brighter day was dawning. In 1618, under the leadership of Sir Edwin Sandys, the Virginia Company of London initiated new policies for the colony. Martial law was gradually relaxed. Individual land ownership was made possible. Tobacco grow-

ing was encouraged, and, by its export, trade was facilitated. The Company guaranteed that the settlers would enjoy the full common law rights of Englishmen at home. Most important, the company provided for a general assembly of the colonists. George Yeardley, appointed governor of Virginia in 1618, was entrusted by the Company with the task of initiating these new policies.

Yeardley was a wise choice for this responsibility. Educated in the English grammar school of the time, he had served in the Queen's army in the Netherlands prior to his commissioning as captain. It was as a soldier that he had come to Jamestown in 1610 where he served as captain of the Governor's Guard under Governor Gates, his former commander in the Netherlands. Subsequently, he received added responsibilities under Governor Dale. His trips had taken him to various parts of the colony, including the Eastern Shore of Virginia. When Dale left for England in 1616, Yeardley was appointed deputy governor of the colony, and he served until the arrival of Governor Argall in 1617. Captain Yeardley knew the problems of the settlers and was sympathetic with them. Energetic and popular, the young officer had the confidence and respect of the people.

Upon his return to England in 1617 Yeardley met with officers of the corporation and discussed land policies with them. He courted and married an attractive young lady with the improbable name of Temperance Flowerdieu (also spelled *Flowerdew*). By November 1618 it was evident that his appointment to the governorship of Virginia was certain. Later that month he was knighted by King James I. Sir Edwin Sandys had petitioned the King, and every knight in the Virginia Company signed the petition.

The new governor was assigned a 3,200 acre tract of land of his own choosing. He and Lady Temperance Yeardley proceeded to outfit themselves for the new role they would play in England's America. Historians report that Sir George expended nearly £3,000 for their clothing and furnishings, a large sum even in these days.

When Governor Yeardley disembarked at Jamestown on April 17, 1619, after a voyage of two months, he carried with him detailed plans for setting up a representative government in the colony. Almost immediately he began to put into effect the reform program that had been outlined in his commission.

The new leadership stimulated interest in Virginia. At the close of 1618, largely as a result of immigration during that year, the population of the colony stood at approximately 1,000 persons. During the year after Sandys's election, a total of 1,261 emigrants left England for Virginia. By the summer of 1622, the council could announce that over 3,500 people had migrated to Virginia since the spring of 1619.

The new plan for the government of the colony provided for "two Supreme Councils": "The Council of State, which was to consist, for the present, of the Governor and his Counsellors," chosen by the company court in England; and "the General Assembly [note the terminology used], which was to consist of the aforesaid Council of State and Two Burgesses chosen out of each Town Hundred or other particular Plantation." The Council and the General Assembly (the Burgesses) were required "to imitate and follow the form of government, laws, customs, and manner of trial, and other ministration of justice used in the realm of England." No law passed in the General Assembly should "continue in force" unless ratified and sealed by the Company. On the other hand, it was provided that "once the government of the Colony was well framed, . . . no orders of court afterwards shall bind the said colony, unless they be ratified in like manner in the General Assemblies."

The Charter provided that Governor Yeardley had the veto power over actions of the Council of State or the General Assembly. The following men served as Council mem-

bers of the first legislative assembly in the New World: Captain Francis West, Captain Nathaniel Powell, John Pory, John Rolfe, William Wickham, and Samuel Macock, with Governor Yeardley as the presiding officer.

The members of the Lower House, called burgesses, were selected on the basis of two representatives from each of the eleven major settlements. The company instructions stated that the burgesses were "freely to be elected by the inhabitants" of each plantation. It is thought that all unindentured male adults were permitted to vote, although the actual method of election is not clear. At the time, the planters dwelt in four major units or boroughs: James City, Charles City, Henricus, and Kecoughtan. Seven large plantations also sent two representatives each.

The original twenty-two burgesses who reported at Jamestown on July 30, 1619 for the General Assembly were as follows:

Borough of James City: Capt. William Powell and Ensign William Spense.

Borough of Charles City: Samuel Sharpe and Samuel Jordan.

Borough of Henricus: Thomas Dowse and John Polentine.

Borough of Kecoughtan: Capt. William Tucker and William Capp.

Martin-Brandon-Capt. John Martin's Plantation: Thomas Davis and Robert Stacy.

Smythe's Hundred: Capt. Thomas Graves and Walter Shelley.

Martin's Hundred: John Boys and John Jackson.

Argall Town: Mr. Pawlett and Mr. Gourgaing.

Flowerdieu Hundred: Ensign Edmund Rossingham and John Jefferson.

Capt. Lawne's Plantation: Capt. Christopher Lawne and Ensign Washer.

Capt. Ward's Plantation: Capt. John Ward and Lieutenant Gibbes.

John Pory, who served as Speaker of the Assembly, prepared a detailed record of the proceedings. Although he played a major role in organizing America's first representative assembly, Pory is little known today. We are indebted to William S. Powell, now curator of the North Carolina Collection at the University of North Carolina, for an account of Pory's life and contributions (See bibliography).

Born in Norfolk County, England, in 1572, Pory graduated from Caius College, Cambridge University, at the age of 20. He continued with his studies, and, upon receiving the Master of Arts degree in 1595, he became an instructor in Greek at the college. Two years later, Pory became associated with the historian, Richard Hakluyt, studying under him and assisting in the preparation of the last volume of his Voyages. Later, Pory himself published translations of geographical works.

In 1605, Pory was elected to Parliament and served for six years, until Parliament was dissolved in 1611. His experience in the House of Commons was of great value to him in setting the pattern for conducting the business of the General Assembly in Virginia. The committee system, now such an integral part of representative government, was introduced by Pory as a mode of operation for the Assembly at Jamestown. It had been used when the House of Commons was considering King James' demands while Pory was a member of that body. Pory also had travelled widely in France, Italy, and Turkey, serving as a professional news writer to inform prominent English men about developments in those countries.

It was young Pory's first cousin, Temperance Flowerdieu, who became the bride of George Yeardley. Upon Yeardley's appointment as Governor of Virginia, he recommended to the Virginia Company that Pory be named secretary of the Colony for a three-

year term. This was done, and when the new officers reached Jamestown on April 19, 1619 Pory was almost immediately made a member of the Governor's Council.

When Pory returned to England at the end of his three-year term in 1622, he went by way of Plymouth colony, and he wrote an enthusiastic description of the settlement there. He also worked on a dictionary of the language of the local Indians, finding many of their words similar to those used by the natives in Virginia. He returned to Virginia for a brief time in 1624 as a member of a royal commission to inquire into the state of affairs in the Colony. When the commission returned to England they learned that the charter of the Company had been vacated and Virginia was now under the rule of the crown.

The Assembly met in the Church at Jamestown, a building sixty feet in length and 24 in width. Large windows permitted sunlight to stream into the interior, with its communion table of black walnut, and pulpit, chancel, and pews of cedar. The governor was seated in the choir on a velvet covered chair, with his six Councillors arranged at his sides. Immediately in front of them and facing the popularly-elected representatives were seated the Speaker, John Pory; the Clerk, John Twine; and the Sergeant at Arms, Thomas Pierce. The twenty-two burgesses were seated in the pews ordinarily occupied by the congregation.

The session was opened with prayer by the Rev. Richard Buck, who, five years before, had officiated at the wedding of Pocahontas and John Rolfe. Pory reports that Mr. Buck prayed "that it would please God to guide and sanctify all our proceedings to his own glory and the good of this plantation." The Oath of Supremacy was then administered individually, as was customary for holders of a public office under the English crown. Each Burgess, without exception, swore his allegiance to the King not only as his civil sovereign but as his spiritual leader as well.

The Assembly then went into a committee of the whole to examine the credentials of the representatives. (In 1586 the House of Commons had asserted its right to determine the eligibility of its members, and the first General Assembly in America did likewise). The right of three members to be seated was challenged. After full debate, one was granted his place. The other two were denied membership because they represented Martin Brandon, Captain John Martin's Plantation, which had, under his patent, privileges not accorded to the other plantations. Thus the total number of representatives was reduced to twenty.

Speaker Pory then spoke to the Assembly regarding the occasion of their meeting and read aloud the provisions for establishing the General Assembly and the orders brought over by Governor Yeardley. To facilitate action, Pory divided the provisions of the Charter into four books, read them a second time, and then divided the assembly into committees to consider various sections of the company's instructions and determine which "might conveniently put on the habite of Lawes." The legislators were also asked to consider what laws any of the Burgesses wished to propose and decide what petitions were fit to be sent home for England.

The Assembly met for six days, from Friday, July 30, through Wednesday, August 4, with no Sunday meeting. One of its first acts was to prepare a petition of gratitude to the London Company for its revision of policy. It then directed its attention to various laws. Some 28 statutes were enacted. Eight of the laws were concerned with Indian relations. The Assembly commended and encouraged efforts to Christianize the natives and to give them opportunity, through the education of their children, to embrace Western culture. White settlers were instructed to treat the Indians with utmost

fairness. Settlers were forbidden to trade or give them any weapons "offensive or defensive," which even included English mastiffs or greyhounds.

Five laws related to agricultural control. Planters were directed to diversify their crops and, in addition to tobacco, grow a stated amount of grain, flax, hemp, and grapes. The penalty for ignoring these statutes, however, was simply "censure" by the Governor and his Council. Tobacco itself was placed under even stricter regulation. Its price was set at a fixed rate. Any grower who tried to market leaf that inspectors should find below a minimum standard would forfeit it for burning.

The Assembly was also concerned with labor policies, especially as they related to indentured servants. While these laws appear repressive today, almost like serfdom, they were really designed to protect the honest servant. Should he engage in illegal practices at the behest of his master and fall foul of the law, the planter who had lured him into doing so was held equally liable.

Land policies were a perennial problem in the colony. Three years earlier each settler who had come to Virginia before 1616 was given 100 acres of land. Those who paid their way and arrived after 1616 were given 50 acres for themselves, plus 50 more for each person's passage they paid, whether a relative or an indentured servant. Indentured servants signed contracts to give their services for four to seven years to pay for their passage to the New World. When their service was up they were given "freedom dues" in the form of shoes, three barrels of corn, farming tools, and sometimes land. The biggest problem for them was not to find free acreage but to procure more indentured servants to work it.

Curiously enough, there was a graded tax on wearing apparel, which never seems to have been enforced. It was taken for granted that the Assembly had the power to levy taxes in the form of tobacco for the support of the church and to pay for the assembly's meetings.

There was even legislation against "Idleness." The Assembly decreed that if a man was found to be doing nothing to contribute to the common good, he should be assigned to an employer until he showed signs of amendment. There were also statutes against drunkenness and profanity. In such cases the minister was first to remonstrate privately with the culprit; then followed open admonishment before the congregation. If these measures failed, excommunication, fining, and whipping might follow. It seems strange today to find the church as an adjunct in enforcing criminal law.

The relationship of church and state was close. In fact, the established Church of England was the official faith, and colonists were enjoined to frequent divine service on the Sabbath day, both forenoon and afternoon, lest they be fined or suffer corporal punishment. All Englishmen loyal to the Crown were presumed to be communicants of the Church of England.

Other matters of legislation related to trade, travel, and communication. An interesting statute provided a heavy fine of £10 for any freeman who passed through Jamestown without reporting to the Governor to receive such messages as he might wish to send to distant places. One of the actions of the Assembly was to petition the Virginia Company for a new name for the borough of Kecoughtan. It suggested the name of Elizabeth City, in honor of the King's charming daughter.

Interestingly enough, one of the items in the new charter of the Company set aside a tract of 10,000 acres at Henricus, next to the fortified site for a college (so-called) to educate and Christianize the Indians. The school site was 40 miles upriver from Jamestown at a spot now known as Dutch Gap. With

the enthusiastic backing of the king and the English clergy, funds were collected for the University of Henrico, and a prominent English scholar, George Thorpe, was sent over to direct the establishment of the school. With him came 50 men to cultivate the lands of the school and begin its construction. Unfortunately, the Massacre of 1622 put a disastrous end to this worthy project.

Among the last acts of the Assembly was to decree that each plantation be located ten miles from its nearest neighbor. As Fishwick notes: "Although Governor Yeardeley had some reservations about this proposal, recognizing that it would space the colonists so widely that mutual defense against the Indians would be difficult, most of the planters considered the provision wise since it protected them from encroachment by their neighbors. The plantations were developing as little worlds unto themselves: they produced their own food; they raised enough tobacco to require that ships from England and Holland stop at their separate wharves; and created a gentlemanly way of life that reflected English origins while also seeming an integral part of the new countryside." The massacre of 1622 showed how well-founded were the misgivings of Governor Yeardeley.

Strangely enough, the Assembly also functioned as a judicial body to hear complaints and impose penalties. A "treacherous servant" who had slandered his master and threatened his life was sentenced to stand for four days with his ears nailed to a pillory and to be whipped each day. A prominent colonist, Captain Henry Spelman, was found guilty of having spoken "very unreverently and maliciously" against Governor Yeardeley at an Indian village and was censured, relieved of military rank, and ordered to serve the Governor for seven years as an interpreter to the Indians.

On August 4, Governor Yeardeley decided that the session should end as soon as possible, "by reason of extreme heat, both past and likely to ensue," and by the decline in health of the members of the Assembly, one of whom already had died. Sir George himself was not well. Business was concluded as soon as possible, Speaker Pory was voted thanks for his services, and, on August 4, 1619, the historic session ended. Speaker Pory prepared for the London Company a detailed account of all that had occurred, a report that is now preserved in the archives of the State Paper Office of England in London. He also prepared copies of the laws that had been passed so that they could be distributed to officials throughout the colony.

Thus ended the first and most noteworthy legislative assembly convened in the New World. The ideal and practice of self-government, so dear to Englishmen and to Americans alike, was firmly transplanted to the soil of America where, in years to come, it would serve as an example to liberty-loving people everywhere.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The author wishes to acknowledge the assistance of the Historical Publications Division, Virginia State Library, Richmond, and of staff members of the E. Lee Trinkle Library at Mary Washington College. The following sources were consulted in the preparation of this address:

Andrews, Matthew Page, *Virginia: The Old Dominion*, Richmond, Va., Dietz Press, 1937.

Craven, Wesley Frank, *The Virginia Company of London, 1606-1624*, Williamsburg, Virginia, 350th Anniversary Celebration Corp., 1957 (Jamestown 350th Anniversary Historical Booklet, No. 5).

Fishwick, Marshall W., *Jamestown: First English Colony, 1606-1624*, American Heritage Series, Harper & Row, 1965.

Hatch, Charles E., Jr., *The First Seventeen Years: Virginia, 1607-1624*, Williamsburg, Virginia, 350th Anniversary Celebration

Corp., 1957 (Jamestown 350th Anniversary Historical Booklet, No. 6).

Neill, Edward D., *History of the Virginia Company of London*, Albany, New York, Joel Munsell, 1869.

Powell, William S., "Speaker John Pory," *Virginia Cavalcade*, XVIII, no. 5 (Summer, 1969), 16-19.

Scribner, Robert L., "Bee It Enacted a Lawe," *Virginia Cavalcade*, VII, no. 1 (Summer, 1957), 4-9.

Turman, Nora Miller, *George Yeardeley, Governor of Virginia and Organizer of the General Assembly in 1619*, Richmond, Virginia, Garrett & Massie, 1959.

Wertenbaker, Thomas J., *The Government of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*, Williamsburg, Virginia, 350th Anniversary Celebration Corp., 1957 (Jamestown 350th Anniversary Historical Booklet, No. 16).

COULD YOU BE PERSUADED TO HURT A STRANGER?

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit Free Press on January 28 carried an article written by Philip Meyer from the February issue of Esquire magazine regarding a scientific experiment to measure and study human obedience. The experiment was devised and conducted by Stanley Milgram, a social psychologist. The results of this study are most interesting as well as a frightening revelation on the actions of man in today's world. At this time, I would like to place the article in the RECORD for everyone to read:

[From the Detroit Free Press, Jan. 28, 1970]

COULD YOU BE PERSUADED TO HURT A STRANGER?

(By Philip Meyer)

In the beginning, Stanley Milgram was worried about the Nazi problem. He doesn't worry much about the Nazis anymore. He worries about you and me and, perhaps, himself a little bit too.

Stanley Milgram is a social psychologist, and when he began his career at Yale University in 1960 he had a plan to prove scientifically, that Germans are different.

The Germans-are-different hypothesis has been used by historians, such as William L. Shirer, to explain the systematic destruction of the Jews by the Third Reich.

The appealing thing about this theory is that it makes those of us who are not Germans feel better about the whole business.

But now, because of Stanley Milgram, we are compelled to wonder.

Milgram developed a laboratory experiment which provided a systematic way to measure obedience. His plan was to try it out in New Haven on Americans and then go to Germany and try it out on Germans.

If he could show that Germans are more obedient than Americans, he could then vary the conditions of the experiment and try to find out just what it is that makes some people more obedient than others.

But he never took his experiment any further than Bridgeport, Conn.

"I found so much obedience," says Milgram softly, a little sadly, "I hardly saw the need for taking the experiment to Germany."

There is something of the theater director in Milgram, and his technique was to stage a play with every line rehearsed, every prop

carefully selected, and everybody an actor except one person.

That one person is the subject of the experiment. The subject, of course, does not know he is in a play. He thinks he is in real life.

The experiment worked like this:

You read an ad in the newspaper or received one in the mail asking for volunteers for an educational experiment. The job would take about an hour and pay \$4.50.

So you make an appointment and go to an old Romanesque stone structure on New Haven's High St. with the imposing name of the Yale Interaction Laboratory.

Inside, you meet a young, crew-cut man in a laboratory coat who says he is Jack Williams, the experimenter.

There is another citizen, fiftyish, Irish face, an accountant, a little overweight, and very mild and harmless-looking. This other citizen seems nervous and plays with his hat while the two of you sit in chairs side by side and are told that the \$4.50 checks are yours no matter what happens.

Then you listen to Jack Williams explain the experiment.

It is about learning he says in a quiet-knowledgeable way. Science does not know much about the conditions under which people learn and this experiment is to find out about negative reinforcement.

Negative reinforcement is getting punished when you do something wrong, as opposed to positive reinforcement which is getting rewarded when you do something right. The negative reinforcement in this case is electric shock.

Then Jack Williams takes two pieces of paper, puts them in a hat and shakes them up. One piece of paper is supposed to say "teacher" and the other, "learner." Draw one and you will see which you will be.

The mild-looking accountant draws one, holds it close to his vest like a poker player, looks at it, and says: "learner." You look at yours. It says "teacher." You do not know that both slips say "teacher."

The experimenter beckons to the mild-mannered "learner."

"Wanted to step right in here and have a seat, please?" he says. "You can leave your coat on the back of that chair . . . roll up your right sleeve, please."

"Now what I want to do is strap down your arms to avoid excessive movement on your part during the experiment. This electrode is connected to the shock generator in the next room."

"And this electrode paste," he says, squeezing some stuff out of a plastic bottle and putting it on the man's arm, "is to provide a good contact and to avoid a blister or burn. Are there any questions now before we go into the next room?"

You don't have any, but the strapped-in "learner" does.

"I do think I should say this," says the learner. "About two years ago, I was at the Veterans Hospital . . . They detected a heart condition. Nothing serious, but as long as I'm having these shocks, how strong are they—how dangerous are they?"

Williams, the experimenter, shakes his head casually. "Oh no," he says. "Although they may be painful, they're not dangerous. Anything else?"

Nothing else. And so you play the game.

The game is for you to read a series of word pairs: For example, blue-girl, nice-day, fat-neck. When you finish the list, you read just the first word in each pair and then a multiple-choice list of four other words, including the second word of the pair.

The learner, from his strapped-in position in another room, pushes one of four switches to indicate which of the four answers he thinks is the right one.

If he gets it right, nothing happens and you go on to the next one. If he gets it

wrong, you push a switch that buzzes and gives him an electric shock. And then you go on to the next word.

You start with 15 volts and increase the number of volts by 15 for each wrong answer. The control board goes from 15 volts on one end to 450 volts on the other. So that you know what you are doing, you get a test shock yourself, at 45 volts. It hurts.

If, at any point, you hesitate, Williams calmly tells you to go on. If you still hesitate, he tells you again.

The object is to find the shock level at which you disobey the experimenter and refuse to pull the switch.

In all of this, of course, the "learner" actually receives no shocks.

When Stanley Milgram first wrote this script, he took it to 14 Yale psychology majors and asked them what they thought would happen. Out of 100 persons in the teacher's predicament, how would their break-off points be distributed along the 15- to 450-volt scale?

They thought a few would break off very early, most would quit someplace in the middle and a few would go all the way to the end. The highest estimate of the number out of 100 who would go all the way to the end was three.

"I'll tell you quite frankly," Milgram says, "before I began this experiment I thought that most people would break off at 'strong shock' or 'very strong shock' on the scale.

"You would get only a very, very small proportion of people going out to the end of the shock generator, and they would constitute a pathological fringe."

In his pilot experiments, Milgram used Yale students as subjects. Each of them pushed the shock switches, one by one, all the way to the end of the board.

So he rewrote the script to include some protests from the "learner." At first, they were mild, gentlemanly, Yale protests, but "it didn't seem to have as much effect as I thought it would or should," Milgram recalls.

"So we had more violent protestation on the part of the person getting the shock. All the time, of course, what we were trying to do was not to create a macabre situation, but simply to generate disobedience."

As it turned out, the situation did become rather macabre.

The only meaningful disobedience was to have the victim protest with great anguish, noise and vehemence.

The protests were tape-recorded so that all the teachers ordinarily would hear the same sounds, and they started with a grunt at 75 volts, proceeded through a "Hey, that really hurts," at 125 volts, got desperate with, "I can't stand the pain, don't do that," at 180 volts, reached complaints of heart trouble, at 195, an agonized scream at 315, and only heart-rending, ominous silence after that.

Still, 65 percent of the subjects, 20- to 50-year old American males, everyday, ordinary people, like you and me obediently kept pushing those levers in the belief that they were shocking the mild-mannered learner, whose name was Mr. Wallace, all the way up to 450 volts.

Milgram was now getting enough disobedience so that he had something he could measure. The next step was to vary the circumstances to see what would encourage or discourage disobedience.

He put the learner in the same room with the teacher. He stopped strapping the learner's hand down. He rewrote the script so that at 150 volts the learner took his hand off the shock plate and declared that he wanted out.

He rewrote the script some more so that the experimenter told the teacher to grasp the learner's hand and force it down on the plate.

"I had the feeling that very few people would go on at that point, if any," Milgram

says. "I thought that would be the limit of obedience you would find in the laboratory."

It wasn't. Milgram still remembers the first person to walk into the laboratory in the newly rewritten script. He was a construction worker, a very short man.

"He was so small," says Milgram, "that when he sat on the chair in front of the shock generator, his feet didn't reach the floor.

"When the experimenter told him to push the victim's hand down and give the shock, he turned to the experimenter, and he turned to the victim, his elbow went up, he fell down on the hand of the victim, his feet kind of tugged to one side, and he said:

"Like this, boss? Zzumph!"

The experiment was played out to its bitter end. Milgram tried it with 40 different subjects. And 30 percent of them obeyed the experimenter and kept on obeying.

"The protests of the victim were strong and vehement, he was screaming his guts out, he refused to participate and you had to physically struggle with him in order to get his hand down on the shock generator," Milgram remembers.

But 12 out of 40 applied the shocks. Milgram took his experiment out of New Haven. Not to Germany, just 20 miles down the road to Bridgeport. Maybe, he reasoned, the people obeyed because of the prestigious setting of Yale University.

Obedience, he found, was less in Bridgeport. Forty-eight percent of the subjects stayed for the maximum shock, compared to 65 percent at Yale.

But this was enough to prove that far more than Yale's prestige was behind the obedient behavior.

For more than seven years now, Stanley Milgram has been trying to figure out what makes ordinary American citizens so obedient.

The most obvious answer—that people are mean, nasty, brutish and sadistic—won't do. The subjects who gave the shocks to "Mr. Wallace" did not enjoy it.

They groaned, protested, fidgeted, argued and, in some cases, were seized by fits of nervous, agitated giggling.

"They even try to get out of it," says Milgram, "but they are somehow engaged in something from which they cannot liberate themselves.

"They are locked into a structure and they do not have the skills of inner resources to disengage themselves."

Milgram suggests that people behave in two different operating modes as different as ice and water. He says that ordinarily we operate in a state of autonomy, which means we pretty much have and assert control over what we do.

But in certain circumstances, we operate under what Milgram calls a state of agency:

"There's nothing bad about it, there's nothing good about it," he says. "It's a natural circumstance of living with other people.

"Just as water can turn to ice under certain conditions of temperature, a person can move to the state of mind that I call agency . . . The critical thing is that you see yourself as the instrument of the execution of another person's wishes.

"You do not see yourself as acting on your own. And there's a real transformation, a real change of properties in the person."

So, for most subjects in Milgram's laboratory experiments, the act of giving Mr. Wallace his painful shock was necessary, even though unpleasant, and besides they were doing it on behalf of somebody else and it was for science.

Stanley Milgram believes that in the laboratory situation, he would not have shocked Mr. Wallace. His professional critics reply that in his real-life situation he has done the equivalent.

He has placed innocent and naive subjects under great emotional strain and pressure in selfish obedience to his quest for knowledge.

When you raise this issue with Milgram, he has an answer.

There is, he explains, a critical difference between his naive subjects and the man in the electric chair. The man in the electric chair (in the mind of the naive subject) is helpless, strapped in. But the naive subject is free to go at any time.

As soon as he offers this distinction, Milgram anticipates the objection.

"It's quite true," he says, "that this is almost a philosophic position, because we have learned that some people are psychologically incapable of disengaging themselves. But that doesn't relieve them of the moral responsibility. . . .

"I had to make a judgment," Milgram continues.

"I had to ask myself, was this harming the person or not? My judgment is that it was not. Even in the extreme case, I wouldn't say that permanent damage results.

Sound familiar? "The shocks may be painful," the experimenter kept saying, "but they're not dangerous."

One thing that happened to Milgram back in New Haven during the days of the experiment was that he kept running into people he'd watched from behind a one-way glass in the laboratory.

It gave him a funny feeling, seeing those people going about their everyday business in New Haven and knowing what they would do to Mr. Wallace if ordered to.

Now that his research results are in and you've thought about it, you can get this funny feeling too. You don't need one-way glass.

A glance in your own mirror may serve just as well.

"The critical thing is that you see yourself as the instrument of another person's wishes. You do not see yourself as acting on your own."

NEW REMEDY FOR THE DEFRAUDED INSURED

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, we receive more and more letters complaining about insurance problems. I believe that my colleagues will be interested in the well-written articles from the December-January 1969-70 issue of *Trial* magazine which follow:

NEW REMEDY FOR THE DEFRAUDED INSURED

(By Merbert S. Denenberg, Loman Professor of Property and Liability Insurance, University of Pennsylvania)

The defrauded consumer has little chance of obtaining the remedy that he is entitled to. This is true of consumers of goods, services, realty, and intangibles, but especially of the defrauded insured.

A high percentage of all complaints submitted to state insurance departments involve accident and health policies or automobile collision and comprehensive policies in which the amount in dispute may be far too small to make litigation worthwhile, however, important it might be to the individual insured. In fact, one of the most common sources of complaint against insurers is unjustified failure to settle small claims.

Other sources of complaints may also not generate substantial damages for a single insured—for example, unjustified delay in

settling claims, and misrepresentation of the terms of policies. The hardship visited on the victim of these practices may be great even though actual legal damages may not justify resort to the courts. Litigation, or even legal advice, is likely to be prohibitively expensive for small claims.

Nor can the defrauded always rely on the insurance department of his state, which is charged with the responsibility of regulating and policing insurance companies. Although some states maintain active and well-staffed consumer complaint sections within the state insurance departments, many do not.

Insurance regulation is notably uneven, and its inadequacies have been documented by a long list of studies and investigations. Many state insurance departments lack even the staff needed to properly regulate companies in order to maintain solvency; their resources may be totally inadequate for the detailed, time-consuming work necessary to properly process and investigate individual complaints.

Even if adequate resources and staff are available, the state insurance department may not be responsive to consumer needs. The regulated industry often captures the regulator, and this is nowhere more true than in the area of insurance.

The commissioner, who heads the state insurance department, often comes from the ranks of the industry and intends to return upon the conclusion of his term. He is typically involved in a continuing dialogue with the insurance companies he regulates, but often not with the insured public. And often he is more concerned with the problems of the industry than the problems of the consumer. However dedicated and well-meaning the insurance regulator may be, the very nature of the regulatory process may produce an industry-oriented viewpoint.

Even if the regulator had the resources and the inclination to effectively process consumer complaints, there are still good reasons for providing new and alternative remedies. As the President's National Advisory Panel on Insurance in Riot-Affected Areas found, the typical insured is probably not aware of the complaint department (if there is one) of his state insurance department. The department may not be conveniently located or there may be an office in only one city in the state. Moreover, it does not ordinarily pay attorneys to become involved in the assertion of small claims before administrative agencies such as insurance departments, and they may not be highly motivated to educate the public on the availability of administrative remedies.

The complaint department remedy has a further disadvantage: It may not provide a sufficiently strong deterrent to potential wrongdoers. The individual complaint may be separately handled and adjusted without penalty or with only a resulting restraining order for the future. Some insurance departments do not even maintain records that would be adequate to establish a pattern of conduct and thus justify more severe penalties.

But there is another good reason not to rely too completely on the regulatory activity of the state insurance department. A system of regulation should strive to be self-policing wherever possible, in order to be able to concentrate its limited time and resources on problem areas requiring tailor-made attention. At the present time, the regulator barely has the capacity of resolving broad issues of general application.

The insurance regulator and the insurance industry face massive problems of crisis proportions in virtually every line of insurance. This means minimal resources can be committed to adjusting individual complaints when there are entire markets in jeopardy.

There has been a chronic shortage of crime insurance and continuing problems of pro-

viding fire and extended coverage protection in urban core areas.

There are severe problems in the area of medical malpractice insurance that may even have an adverse effect on the practice of medicine.

There is an inadequate supply of airline liability insurance for the new jets that will carry as many as 400 passengers.

Health insurance, including Blue Cross-Blue Shield protection, has been subjected to premium increases that threaten to destroy segments of the private insurance market.

Life insurance and title insurance are also now under fire.

The problems with automobile insurance are well known.

This battlefield of problem areas is likely to keep most insurance regulators too busy to get down to the nitty-gritty of individual complaints.

There are also special difficulties in mobilizing an adequate consumer voice within the existing system. Insurance is complicated merchandise which the public rarely understands. Even organized consumer groups, unions, and others have not managed to gather the expertise and the facts needed to bring effective countervailing power into the arena of insurance regulation and legislation.

Thus, the consumer often has no effective voice on insurance matters. Existing remedies, such as the individual lawsuit or the submission of a complaint to a state insurance department, have not succeeded in providing the consumer with an effective advocate. Nor have other sources of help proven to be any more effective.

Senator Joseph Tydings (D.-Md.) has therefore introduced the Class Action Jurisdiction Act (S. 1980), designed to help the defrauded consumer by providing him with a new form of legal remedy and more effective legal representation. Under this act, the claims of all defrauded insureds, victimized by the same company in the same fashion, could be asserted by one or more consumers on behalf of the entire group, thus providing the class of insureds with a realistic remedy, and with an effective representative.

The act provides: "The [federal] district court shall have original jurisdiction, regardless of the amount in controversy or the citizenship of the parties of civil class actions brought by one or more consumers of goods, services, realty, or intangibles on behalf of themselves and all other consumers similarly situated, where . . . the action is brought on behalf of numerous consumers of goods, services, realty or intangibles, who were or will be injured by the defendant(s) in substantially the same manner. . . ." Sec. 2 (b) . . .

One insured could sue on behalf of all those affected by an insurer's policy of delaying payment of claims or refusing to pay small claims, or on behalf of all those adversely affected by a deceptive policy provision.

These insureds would no longer have to rely on understaffed insurance departments which may be oriented toward industry, rather than the consumer. They would no longer have to rely on individual litigation, which in most cases would be prohibitively expensive. They would have a new and effective advocate, the individual attorney, who would be properly motivated and rewarded by the method of compensating the attorney under S. 1980: "If a class of consumers prevails in a class action, the court shall award to the attorneys representing the class a reasonable fee, based on the value of their services to the class." (Sec. 2(f)) . . .

It has been said that no one should underestimate the resources and ability of the individual attorney representing his client when the "blue chips" are down. The "blue chips" have been down for the consumer for

a long time. It is time to see that the consumer gets the representation and the remedy that he is entitled to.

S. 1980 would benefit all legitimate interests involved in the insurance process. It would help protect the consumer against improper practices by providing him with a new and effective remedy when he is one of a class adversely affected by improper practices. It would make legal advice more readily accessible to the consumer, and provide greater incentive for both consumer groups and attorneys to educate and advise the public on insurance and other consumer problems. S. 1980 would help mobilize the consumers to obtain long-needed countervailing power in the insurance regulatory process.

It would also relieve the understaffed and underfinanced insurance regulator of part of his heavy burden, and make the regulatory system more fully self-policing. It would help protect the great majority of insurers and agents against the adverse public-relations impact of the small group who indulge in fraudulent practices that would become subject to the new remedy; it would provide a new and strong deterrent to potential wrongdoers.

I strongly urge that S. 1980 receive prompt and favorable action by the Congress.

(NOTE.—For more details on the inadequate voice of the consumer in insurance regulation, see Denenberg, "Insurance Regulation: The Search for Countervailing Power and Consumer Protection," *Insurance Law Journal*, May 1969, pp. 271-278. This article also appears in the *International Insurance Monitor*, July-August 1969, pp. 165-168.)

SENATE COMMITTEE COMPLETES PROBE AND PREPARES 1970 LEGISLATION

The Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee Chairman, Phillip A. Hart (D-Mich.), probed deep during November and December into profits, premium and investment income, business expenses, company surplus funds, group insurance, bureau rating practices and structures, and car and personal injury compensation policies of the nation's largest insurance companies.

The probe—which consumed ten hearing days—will be the last of a series of hearings before the Subcommittee writes and presents corrective legislation to Congress in the early 1970's. The massive accumulation of data and testimony from insurance executives, finance experts, lawyers, actuaries, insurance professors and research organizations will be used to tie up any loose ends resulting from committee hearings that started in the early months of 1969.

A staff analysis of auto insurance activity from 1959-1968 (presented by staff counsels Dean Sharp and Charles Bangert) and subsequent testimony disclosed the following facts:

Motorists paid more than \$81.2 billion in auto premiums during the decade.

From this premium income: claimants had received \$47.7 billion (approximately 60%); \$33 billion was expended for business expenses and \$500 million had been paid as an underwriting profit to the companies (after taxes).

Insurance firms had made a \$3.2 billion investment profit on the premium income (after taxes).

From the \$47.7 billion paid in net benefits: \$27.5 billion went for bodily injury and property damage liability claims; \$15.2 billion went to pay for policyholders' car damage (collision) claims; and \$5 billion was paid to plaintiff lawyers for protecting claimants' legal rights (about 6% of the total premiums and 10% of the injury litigation claims).

From the \$33 billion expended for business expenses: \$11.3 billion was paid to agents and brokers for their commissions (about 14% of the total premiums and 33%

of the business expenses); \$5 billion was spent for "other selling expenses"; \$5.2 billion was expended for adjustment expenses; \$4.2 billion was incurred for overhead expenses; \$2.3 billion paid for state taxes; and \$5 billion paid to defense lawyers to protect the companies' interests (about 6% of the total premiums and 15% of business costs).

From 1959-1968, companies' profits were 10.5%—computed on "mean net worth" (the sum of capital stock, surplus, retained earnings and an adjustment to reflect equity in unearned premium reserves).

But insurance research authorities at the Arthur D. Little Co. said the industry's profit was only 3.7%—a rate substantially below that alleged by the Hart subcommittee staff. This was computed on a standard prescribed by 59 other major industry sectors. The measuring rod used by Arthur D. Little's staff members was "totality of income over totality of investable funds."

The above dispute brought acrimonious exchanges between the Arthur D. Little economists and staff counsel.

Staff figures showed that surplus fund's increased 79% during the decade. (The larger the surplus, the better the firm is doing financially.)

Surplus of Allstate Insurance Company, which received 81.6% of its total premium income from autos, increased 327%, that of Government Employees Insurance Co., which led the industry with 23.6% in earnings in ten years, increased by 260%, and State Farm Mutual's surplus jumped 254%.

Rating bureaus tend to encourage company concentration into auto insurance by charging uniform rates even for larger companies that have lower expenses than smaller companies.

The insurance industry maintained that rating bureaus provide a necessary balance and are vital to the industry. Rates are computed adequately and fairly and are supervised by state authorities, they said.

A plan to reduce rates was offered by Prof. John W. Hall of Georgia State College. His proposal: the establishment of a National Council of Automobile Insurance to create a compulsory reinsurance pool to reduce underwriting costs and cover all drivers.

On another insurance front, Henry S. Stone of Employers-Commercial Union Insurance Co. warned that conglomerates are draining surplus funds and preventing the increase of new insurance. He stated that, in the last 18 months, close to "1 billion of insurance-expansion capital has left the coffers of the insurance companies via the takeover or merger route."

MIDDLE AMERICA

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Joe Parham, Editor of the Macon Telegraph and News wrote a gem of an editorial about Middle America, sometimes called the silent majority.

It came to my attention rather indirectly. It was first copied in the Camilla, Ga., Enterprise and then forwarded to me through the thoughtfulness of Mrs. Joe Wingate of Meigs, Ga.

The following editorial of Editor Parham certainly expressed succinctly and brilliantly what Middle America feels:

[From the Camilla Enterprise, Jan. 16, 1970]

MAYBE THIS IS WHAT YOU NEED?

In this blue week when much seems to be going against all of us, the writings of Joe Parham, Editor of Macon Telegraph and News, well describes our problems and at

the same time seems to challenge us. The article was entitled "Middle America" and we invite your reading. It is first rate writing:

Call them what you like. Some term them the "silent majority." Others tag them the "middle Americans." The label doesn't matter. They are fed up. They are beginning to flex their muscles. And they may be overwhelming in their wrath.

What is a middle American or a member of the silent majority?

He is a guy not poor enough to need a government handout but not wealthy enough to be unconcerned about sizable unexpected expenses. He is patriotic. He prefers "America the Beautiful" to "Sock It to Me, Baby." He stands up and takes off his hat when a lady enters the room or a band plays the "Star Spangled Banner" and if he has a hangup it's on patriotism, not the futility of life.

Call him corny if you like but he thinks a cat is feline, pot is a vessel for cooking things in, and fix is a verb meaning to repair or mend. He is hit harder proportionately by taxes than anyone else but he has long borne this burden uncomplainingly. He holds the quaint notion that everyone who shares this wonderful country ought to pay according to his ability, but he doesn't worry too much if a bunch of weirdos shack up in a communal living experiment, so long as they don't bother their neighbors.

The sight of Old Glory puts a lump in his throat, a tear in his eye and steel in his spine. And fuzz is a fluffy lint, not officers of the law.

Sure, he goes for John Wayne more than Dustin Hoffman, for Burl Ives more than Jimi Hendrix and he'd rather see a good football game than have two tickets to "Hair" any day in the week.

He likes movies, food, housing accommodations and companions to be clean and he thinks the purpose of a university is to educate, not provide a forum for immature militants dedicated to destruction rather than improvement of a school.

Square he may be called but he regards grass as green ground-covered, put-on as something you do with a pair of pants and pop as what the weasel went. He makes the scene, all right, but it is at church, Sunday school, a civic meeting, a Little Leaguers banquet, a Boy Scout hike or the PTA. There's nothing psychedelic about him and the only swinging he ever did was in a front porch swing in his courting days.

Soul is something immortal to him, not a name for a type of food or kind of music. He gets a bigger kick out of landing astronauts on the moon than trying to burn down a town because the world owes him a living, and hasn't produced.

He prefers cook-outs to sit-ins, the pledge of allegiance to "black power" and a home with kids playing on the lawn to a pad with a year's supply of birth control pills. The beauty of America makes him want to shout with joy and the ugliness of the Black Panthers makes him want to regurgitate in disgust.

Everything seems to be squeezing him these days; inflation, high interest rates, screwball school bussing plans, shoddy workmanship, a Supreme Court which won't let his children pray in classrooms and a government which too often seems unresponsive to his needs. He's tired of the pressure and deafened by the shouting and beginning to stir in anger.

He's too young for Medicare and too old for rock and roll. He could be a service station attendant, a small business man, a teacher or a hard-working Negro farmer. He could wear a white collar or a blue collar. He could be anybody.

He's a big man, this middle American. Big in pride of country, big in love for America. He belongs to a big club.

Count me a member.

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY NEWSLETTER

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have recently sent the enclosed newsletter on environmental problems to many California citizens. I now include it in the RECORD:

TEXT OF NEWSLETTER

Thank you for your encouraging support in the continuing crucial battle for environmental quality. Over 500,000 concerned citizens like yourself already have responded to my efforts in this vital crusade. Your responses, your views soon will be made available to all California public officials and to the press. In addition, they will be transmitted to Members of the House Science and Astronautics Committee as our Congressional committee is now planning to hold hearings in California this spring dealing with environmental problems.

Although the Federal antitrust case against car makers was closed with acceptance of the consent decree last fall, the effects of our efforts still are potent. For example, the California Attorney General's office soon will initiate a new antitrust suit against the auto manufacturers in an attempt to collect damages caused by smog. I see this as an extremely positive sign, and it indicates what combined public action for a clean environment can accomplish.

CITIZEN'S ACTION COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

The unprecedented number of replies to my mailings show that Californians demand powerful efforts in the fight against pollution. Therefore, I have formed a Citizen's Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality. We aim to involve the greatest possible number of concerned persons in the Committee's operations and recommendations.

As a first step, some of the most knowledgeable scientists and conservationists in California have established a Scientific Advisory Panel. The panel will formulate the most practical and realistic approaches to environmental quality issues, and it will set priorities which can be translated into action NOW on all government levels.

NEW BILL REFLECTS INITIAL POLL RESULTS

Recently I asked many Californians their opinions on a series of environmental issues. One question asked if they favored banning pollution-causing vehicles which do not adhere to strict emission standards. While only a partial tally has been made of early returns, the support for such a ban is overwhelming—with nearly four out of every five respondents approving the restriction. Such support warrants action and so, on January 29, I introduced a new bill (H.R. 15613) in the House of Representatives; the bill proposes a ban on sale or delivery of internal combustion engines which do not meet tough emission standards by January 1, 1975.

I expect that more legislative actions will result from the outcome on other poll questions. Too many elected officials try to tell the people what should be right. I felt that I should ask the people and then act on their desires.

George Brown's environmental legislation includes:

Omnibus Environmental Quality Act (H.R. 13764), possibly the strongest single-package proposal ever introduced in the House of Representatives to establish government policies and programs to maintain the environment. The bill includes a declaration of national policy stating the right of every citizen to a quality environment, sets up a

permanent regulatory commission for environmental protection, creates a joint congressional committee on environmental quality, and forms a citizens advisory council on environmental quality.

An amendment to the National Emission Standards Act (H.R. 14579) proposes that motor vehicles exhaust standards be set at the lowest technically feasible level—without regard to economic costs.

An amendment to the Clean Air Act (H.R. 14867) provides for adoption of national standards for stationary sources of air pollution, and sets a series of penalties to be assessed against violators.

The Environmental Quality Education Act (H.R. 15289) would create educational programs to encourage understanding of policies and support of activities designed to enhance environmental quality and enhance ecological balance.

The Safe Pesticides Act (H.R. 14805) asks for a national pesticides study, transfers pesticides control enforcement into HEW, and bans the sale or shipment over a 5-year period of DDT and related chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides.

An amendment to the Outer Continental Shelf Development Act (H.R. 14644) requires public hearings to be held near sites of future drilling activity before leases can be granted, and proposes a moratorium on all future offshore leasing until stringent building codes and drilling regulations are set by the government.

Marine Sanctuaries (H.R. 5955, H.R. 5956) would authorize creation of sanctuaries—selected parts of the nation's natural tidelands, the outer continental shelf, seaward areas and lands and waters of the Great Lakes—and establish strong protective measures to insure balanced environmental utilization. One sanctuary would be in the Santa Barbara Channel.

Sonic Boom Damage Act (H.R. 4565) organizes a government program to provide adequate means for recovery of damages caused by sonic booms and encourages manufacturers to take steps to prevent these booms.

I pledge to continue to fight for environmental survival. You can do much to see that effective legislation is enacted.

You can: Join with your friends and neighbors, make your views known, discuss these issues, write your local polluters.

MEDICAL CARE: I

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, since the President spoke last year of a "massive crisis" in America's medical care system, we have seen little action. I greatly regret that the proposed Federal budget for 1971 offers no new initiatives in this area. Yet in no other domestic field is a strong Federal pressure for change so badly needed.

I include, as the first of several studies on this problem which I shall offer for consideration, an article from the January 17, 1970, New Republic called "Paying More, Getting Less," by Fred Anderson. This article describes the nature of the medical care problem which our country faces:

PAYING MORE, GETTING LESS

(By Fred Anderson)

Several months ago President Nixon, Secretary Finch and the Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, Dr. Roger Egeberg, gathered at the White House to tell the

nation that it is about to face a complete breakdown in the delivery of health services. Many think the breakdown has already occurred. Long waits for an appointment with a physician, poor service, and astronomical medical bills have gradually become the rule, rather than the exception. The public does not understand how this state of affairs came about, nor why physicians, hospitals and insurers have not done something about it. Particularly irritating is the federal government's failure, though it paid 29.6 percent of the \$53.1 billion spent on health in 1968. Long hours in the "waiting room," hurried and impersonal attention, difficulty in obtaining night and weekend care, reduction of services because staff is not available, high drug and treatment costs, loopholes in insurance coverage, and the like, tell only part of the story. The rest is told by statistics which smash any remaining confidence that we lead the world in health care. Fifteen other countries have longer average life expectancies. (Ten-year-old females have a longer life expectancy in twelve other countries, while the American male child of ten years is bested in 31 countries.) Infant mortality is less in 14 other nations. Five countries have better maternal mortality rates. Twelve have better records for ulcers, diabetes, cirrhosis, of the liver, hypertension without heart involvement. Twenty have less heart disease.

Whatever life expectancy a white American has, subtract seven years from the life of his nonwhite counterpart. Infant mortality rates are two times as great for nonwhites as for whites. Infant mortality rates for Negro children in Mississippi or a Northern city are comparable to Ecuador's; nationwide, to Costa Rica's nonwhite maternal mortality is four times as great as the white rate. (The disparity in maternal death rates has grown from twofold to fourfold since the end of World War II.) In the city slums there is three times as much heart disease, five times as much mental disease, four times as much high blood pressure, and four times as many deaths before age thirty-five than there is nationwide.

The National Advisory Commission on Health Manpower (1967) reviewed 15 representative studies of the quality of health care services in the United States. Here are the findings in three of the studies: (1) a survey of medical laboratories sponsored by the National Center for Communicable Diseases (US Public Health Service) found that 25 percent of reported laboratory results on known samples were erroneous; (2) an evaluation of all major female pelvic surgery performed during a six-month period in a community hospital revealed that 70 percent of the operations which resulted in castration or sterilization were unjustified in the opinion of expert consultants; (3) the medical records of a random sample of 430 patients admitted to 98 different hospitals in New York City during May 1962 were reviewed by expert clinicians. In their opinion only 57 percent of all patients, and only 31 percent of the general medical cases, received "optimal" care.

Organized medicine attributes deterioration in health care to our failure to produce enough physicians for the growing demands for services. That's correct, to a point. Over the decade 1955-1965 "physician-directed services" rose 81 percent and hospital services 65 percent, although the increased output of physicians (22 percent) barely exceeded population growth (17 percent). In fact, the increase in physicians who went into patient care (12 percent) was less than population growth. Thus the availability of direct, personal treatment of a physician has diminished at a time when demand for medical care is going up rapidly. Demand has been so great that the expected undersupply of physicians should have occurred years ago. What happened? Physicians learned to delegate many tasks to other medical pro-

fessionals, a practice which should be encouraged. Between 1955 and 1965, professional nurses increased by 44 percent, non-professional nurses 63 percent, x-ray technologists 56 percent, and clinical laboratory personnel 70 percent. Nevertheless, in the opinion of the National Advisory Commission on Health Manpower, the existing organization of medical care will soon require more physicians than the medical schools are capable of producing. "If additional personnel are employed in the present manner and within present patterns and 'systems' of care," said the Commission, "they will not avert, or even perhaps alleviate, the crisis." That seems to say that no number of additional physicians will be sufficient unless medical care is reorganized. But the Commission did not say how reorganization should be carried out.

What is so unsatisfactory about the organization of our present medical care system? It consists by and large of physicians in practice alone, or in small groups, on a fee-for-service basis. The model is the independent business entrepreneur, and a strong sense of nineteenth century individualism still guides professional conduct. (About 60 percent of physicians in direct care of patients are solo practitioners, even though less than two percent of current graduates go into general practice. Of physicians in office practice, about 72 percent still work on a fee-for-service basis.) The "nonsystem" of separate practitioners and few hospitals which grew up in the last century has somehow managed to underpin the vast array of interlocking referrals, specialties, clinics, hospital services and financial arrangements which exists today. That foundation is crumbling.

We cannot allow the further duplication of services, equipment and personnel, not only because of the high cost of redundancy, but because fee-for-service medicine is medically one-sided. It is adequate for episodic care for patients with a specific complaint. But such care, though good, is delivered in sporadic bursts. It is not the personalized, lifelong program of prevention, diagnosis, treatment and rehabilitation that it should be. Patients very rarely receive preventive screening or treatment. How could a fee-for-service bill be written for "diagnosing" and publicizing a dangerous playground? Who would be billed? The city? Parents? Fixing up several broken arms is a medical "service," with a going rate per arm. Getting embroiled with nonmedical "playground" issues is not, even though the expense of an ounce of prevention may be less than that for a pound of cure.

It is not quite fair to lay all the ills of the health care system at the feet of the practitioners who favor the fee-for-service system. The American Medical Association, as chief defender of fee-for-service, is almost a caricature of an Establishment, an easy target. But medicine has two Establishments, both of which contribute to our troubles. The second Establishment, hostile to the first, is based in urban hospitals. It is research and technology oriented, often salaried, and provides the world's best surgery and treatment for complex illnesses. The result is that though this is the best country in the world in which to have a serious illness, it is one of the worst countries in the world in which to have a non-serious illness. That part of medicine which most people encounter most often is mediocre. At the same time, we have outstanding open heart surgery, plastic surgery, surgical organ transplantation, and diagnostic skills. It is this paradox which makes it possible for a patient to read in the waiting room literature of America's latest triumph of medical technology, while failing to receive quick, effective and inexpensive treatment for a sore throat.

The strength of the new hospital-based

Establishment is in its domination of the medical schools. Dr. Charles E. Lewis of Harvard's Center for Community Medicine and Medical Care believes that the inertia of medical schools and their affiliated teaching hospitals is the health care delivery system's chief problem. The schools and their hospitals turn out excellent clinicians, scientifically imaginative researchers, who appear more concerned with a patient's interesting electrolytes than with his humdrum good health. A department chairman, selected perhaps, because he discovered subtle mechanisms of kidney function, makes the school's reputation (and much of its money) by his work and by the grants which he gets for research. No one can tell the collection of department chairmen who run a medical school, or their granting agencies, that the funds which they collect should go to teach students how to care for whole patients in the environment in which patients live.

The fee-for-service system has not adapted well to third-party payments, whether from insurance companies or from government. The public finds this awkward welter of insurance plans and complex federal programs confusing and vexing.

Picking one's way through the medical maze requires, in the words of Dr. Sidney Lee of Harvard Medical School, "the flexibility of a worm, the dexterity of a locksmith, and the hairsplitting ability of a Philadelphia lawyer." For instance, new employees at the Lawrence Radiation Laboratories in California are handed a chart which folds out like a roadmap into a description of eight programs and benefits for 21 selected services, in the 168 separate boxes of fine print are detailed the conditions of coverage and exclusions of each of the eight plans. Making sense of health insurance is a problem for all of us, even if we are not given "helpful" charts. With approximately 1800 separate plans in existence to choose from, what are we to do?

Perhaps it would be worth working through the maze if private insurance provided complete coverage. It does not. All third-party payments, including federal programs and philanthropy as well as private insurance, accounted for only half of personal health care expenditures for 1966. The private health insurers make quite a fuss over how extensive their coverages are. They point out that about three-fourths of the population has some kind of hospitalization or surgical coverage and that the number is growing. But the important point is not that the number of persons covered is going up; it is that the insured are not getting much for their money. The insured three-fourths of the population has about one-third of its medical bills paid through insurance. Large categories of medical expenses, such as drugs, dental care, and non-hospital "ambulatory" office visits, are excluded from most policies. These exclusions are critical at a time when consumers spend about 20 percent of their health dollars on drugs, about 10 percent on dental care, and, according to a recent MIT study, another 25 percent to 50 percent for ambulatory care.

Government, principally through Medicare and Medicaid, has ventured into paying some of the medical bills of those least able to pay—the elderly and the poor. Medicare includes two related programs for insuring persons over 65 against the costs of hospitalization, physicians' services and related health care. There is no means test. Part A, Hospital Insurance Benefits, covers practically all persons over age 65. It draws its money from a special hospital insurance trust fund, in the case of social security beneficiaries, and general revenues. In the case of those not currently covered by Social Security. Part B, medical insurance for some (but nothing like all) physicians' fees and related costs, is financed by voluntary

individual monthly payments, although the federal government also contributes from general revenues. Medicare functions quite smoothly, though hospitals complain of the paperwork and restrictions, and patients complain that in some hospitals they are discriminated against as Medicare patients. Lastly, and contrary to general belief, Medicare covers only about 35 percent of the total health bill of persons over 65.

Medicaid is more complicated. The primary recipients here are, in the bureaucratic phrase, the indigent "categorically needy": the aged, the blind, the disabled, and families with dependent children. Each participating state must submit a plan, and the categorically needy must be included. States are permitted, but not required, to include persons who are self-supporting but have no reserves to meet medical expenses. These are (again, their phrase) the "medically needy." States may also extend Medicaid to those whose only qualification is poverty. But the federal government will pay only the administrative costs of providing them with medical care. State Medicaid plans must offer five basic services: inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital care, other lab and x-ray services, nursing home services, and physicians' services. States may elect to provide five additional services for a comprehensive program.

We constantly hear that Medicaid was ill-conceived, that it slipped by Congress while its attention was on Medicare. It certainly was not ill-conceived. Medicaid is a ten-year plan designed to gently badger the states into providing comprehensive medical coverage for all medically and economically deprived persons by 1975. Inflation aside, one reason why Medicaid now gobbles up the dollars is because it is growing, exactly according to the plan set out in the original legislation. After four years of varying degrees of state acceptance, the plan does, however, seem to be a shambles: Medicaid currently serves limited categories of the poor and sick, through benefits of Byzantine complexity, which vary astonishingly from state to state (under Medicaid, New York averages \$57 per inhabitant for medical assistance; New Hampshire, \$5). The states abuse Medicaid, about a dozen of the states have rejected it altogether, and it is underadministered in Washington.

Skyrocketing costs under Medicaid have led to a well-publicized campaign to economize through administrative reforms. The Administration may actually believe that such tinkering with Medicaid, including November's frantic efforts of yet another Task Force, are the kind of "revolutionary change" which the President said he wanted when he drew attention to the crisis in health care. It would appear so, since the Administration's July report, billed as a major inter-agency study requiring five months to complete, spent most of its shot on administrative reforms. For instance, the government pins great hopes on the strict limits it recently set on fees of physicians participating in Medicaid. But physicians, angered by this effrontery, are likely to respond either by dropping out of Medicaid entirely, or raising their fees to the new legal maximum, causing costs to escalate further.

This sort of reform is worthless. All large institutional funds such as Medicaid, whether public or private in origin, are uncontrollably inflationary in the present entrepreneurial fee-for-service system. There is no effective way to police this vast undertaking. Through their right to determine "reasonable" fees, and behind the screen of the simple physician-patient contract for services, hospitals and practitioners are tempted to take what large third-party funds will allow. Proof is not hard to find. Medical costs were already increasing at twice the rate of increase in the Consumer Price Index when Medicaid and Medicare went into effect. But in that year physicians' fees shot

up at almost three times the rate of general prices, while hospital charges, incredibly, increased at five times the rate of general prices! Small wonder that the Senate Finance Committee felt obligated to inquire into possible fraudulent behavior among the 10,000 physicians who in 1968 "earned" \$25,000 or more apiece from Medicaid and Medicare.

Federal bureaucratic inefficiency is not particularly to blame, as a recent experience of a private insurer shows. Blue Cross of Kansas, a comparatively simple, modestly financed scheme, recently made \$250,000 available to its subscribers for walk-in care at the physician's office. Ten percent of the physicians participating used 50 percent of the fund, and \$50,000 was paid out by Blue Cross for simple hypodermic injections alone. Four physicians gave most of the injections, collecting remarkably "reasonable" fees. Patients did not need the injections any more than they did before Blue Cross acted, nor did they request injections. Nevertheless, their physicians prescribed them, and patients, because they were not paying or because they had no idea what an injection should cost, did not object to the artificially high prices charged back to Blue Cross.

It is not going to be easy to change all this, to modernize medical care. With \$2.5 million of campaign contributions, the AMA was able in 1968 to control the political forces which shape a health care system costing the public \$53.1 billion annually. The AMA pattern is clear: first a survey, a recommendation, a legislative proposal for change, supported by physicians and laymen alike, which speaks up for the public, attempting to head off health care crises like the one we're in. The retaliation of organized medicine is always swift and defensive, reaching an emotional crest on the editorial pages of the *Journal of the AMA*. So it was in 1948 when the recommendations of the President's National Health Assembly provoked a \$25 assessment on AMA members for a war chest to fight socialized medicine. So it was in 1951 when the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation was called "another flagrant proposal to play politics with the medical welfare of the American people." So it was, for eight years, with the battle for Medicare which ended in 1965.

A TRAGIC TRILOGY

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, for the RECORD, I include a tragic trilogy:

If the poor black man in this country could only see a national government where a President would speak up and see their plight and promise a national commitment to change it. If they could sense that hope, they would end the Black Panther Party and its present platform. (E. R. Gain, Chief of Police, Oakland, Calif.)

I of course was aware that Mrs. Shippen's dance class did exist, and as a native black Washingtonian . . . could have cared less. Unfortunately Mrs. Shippen's dance class became a factor in the life of my family, when invitations to join the class went out to the eighth grade class at St. Albans School for Boys and, according to an informal poll of the boys themselves, everybody in the eighth grade seemed to have been invited except the two black boys in the class . . . one happened to be my son.

It is very difficult for the black family, poor or affluent, to guide their youngsters . . . when they experience situations such as this,

when all that matters is their blackness, when they face these small insults day after day; when we cannot protect them and when they finally, as they say, "tune us out."

We will continue to educate our son and to work with him to become a contributing member of the American scene.

Our hope is that he will not have many experiences of this type. If he does, I am afraid you will see produced a family of black middle-classed militants. (Bette J. Catoe, M.D.)

Less than six months after the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in 1955 that municipal recreation facilities must be desegregated, the only golf course in Tallahassee, Fla., was turned over through two transactions to a private group that included among its founders G. Harrold Carswell, then U.S. Attorney and now a nominee to the Supreme Court. Negroes . . . were prevented from using it. (Washington Post, Jan. 27, 1970.)

If they could only sense that hope.

Mr. Speaker, if Judge Carswell has truly changed, then perhaps others, many others who need to change can do so and our country can be saved.

If Judge Carswell has not really changed, then the highly heralded change in our President might turn out to have been a change for the worse.

THE MIDDLE AMERICANS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the "middle Americans," the "silent majority," and so forth.

The editor in chief of the Hearst Newspapers, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., presented an interesting discussion of this subject in an article which appeared in the January 18 edition of the Hearst Newspapers, as follows:

THE MIDDLE AMERICANS

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

NEW YORK.—It is an almost ludicrous irony of these days that mainland America suddenly has been discovered by the literati, commentators, pundits and journalists of that parochial hot house known as the Eastern Establishment.

For years, judging by the information media such people dominate, a visitor from Mars might well think this nation is made up almost exclusively of militant minorities, hell-raising students, hippies, dumb-bell politicians and unhappy liberals and intellectuals.

There are plenty of these, for sure—but, it turns out that there are at least 150 million other adults in the country who make up by far the vast majority. The ensuing rush to explore this long-overlooked mass of humanity has been wondrous to behold.

With their usual snobbery, the Ivy-League types first agreed on a label for the discovery. What they had stumbled on, they decided, were "The Middle Americans"—a group whose members ever since have been having their brain waves measured, their temperature taken and their quaint folkways dissected, analyzed and classified.

FEATURED IN COVER STORIES

The results have been exhaustive cover stories in such magazines as Newsweek, U.S. News & World Report and Time, where Mr.

and Mrs. Middle America turned out to be "Man and Woman of the Year" for 1969. Columnists and TV commentators have focused similar clinical spotlights on the amorphous couple.

What was found, by and large, was that the Middle Americans are pretty upset about many of the drastic developments in their society, developments which they see as threatening their security and traditional values.

Henceforth, it was generally agreed, it might be a good idea to keep an eye on these people since it is just possible—but not likely—that they might do something drastic.

Nothing for an intellectual to become alarmed about, you understand.

After all, the tone of the findings suggested, Mr. and Mrs. Middle America are quite simple minded and hopelessly set in their ways.

The above, it is hoped, conveys my disgust with the typically patronizing attitude of a bunch of critics so blind they have been unable to see what is going on in our vast country because of the jungle of perpendicular buildings in which they work, live and through which they move at morn, noon and eve.

PEOPLE WHO REALLY RUN COUNTRY

Mr. and Mrs. Middle America, of course, have been around way out yonder all the time. They are the people who really run the country and hold it together. The liberals simply haven't been paying attention until now because they are interested in the nation's extremes, not its backbone.

Now that they have opened their eyes, taken a look and rendered their verdicts, it must be admitted that their findings are mostly correct—though not necessarily in the way they assume.

Take their discovery that the "Silent" Majority of Americans are distressed, bewildered and angry over such phenomena as soaring crime, rebellious youth, racial activities, heavy taxes and inflation.

How about that for a discovery!!! It could have been made long long ago if the instant analysts had deigned to climb down from their ivory towers and ask around.

It certainly came as no surprise to many, whose mail for years has been a deluge of protest against the permissiveness which has tolerated so much—from pornography to campus rioting.

President Nixon was a bit off in calling those who make up the strength of America "The Silent Majority."

SOUNDING OFF RIGHT ALONG

They have been sounding off all the time, in letters, in town meetings, in their churches and homes and—most effectively—at the polls.

It was they who elected Richard M. Nixon, the archetype of traditional values and the embodiment of all things viewed with disdain by the know-it-alls.

You can bet the Ivory tower boys are indeed well advised to keep an eye henceforth on Mr. and Mrs. Middle America.

Not because they are likely to do anything drastic.

Simply because, at the polls, in the peacefully proper democratic manner they respect, the voice of "The Silent Majority" will prove louder and more effective than all the others.

Where the analysts have been way off base is in their supercilious assumption that The Middle Americans are simple minded and unresponsive to needed change.

There is nothing simple minded in recognizing the proven importance of working hard to better one's life, taking pride in the country which makes it possible, being honest and helpful to one's neighbors and humble in the face of the ultimate mystery.

It is when those values are lost, or chal-

lenged by decadent and arrogant sophistry, that a great country such as ours gets itself in serious trouble.

For too long now we have been having such trouble, and we are going to have it so long as flaws and injustices in our social system exist to feed the sophists who—ignoring the genius of the architect, the decades of work, the artisans and laborers—would condemn a cathedral simply because it had dirty windows.

MIDDLE AMERICANS ARE AWARE

The fact is that Middle Americans ARE aware of the faults which need remedy in our society and have long been in the process of supplying it. Fundamentally, the nation's great majority wants to do the right thing but wants to do it properly and in an orderly manner.

It hasn't been happening fast enough to suit the firebrands and the intellectuals. But it HAS been happening. Thanks to the votes of the majority of our citizens, more corrective social legislation has been passed in the last 15 years than in the entire period since the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

So, in performance, Mr. and Mrs. Middle America are neither simple minded nor adverse to progressive change.

In at least one way they are a lot smarter than the Ivory tower double domes. The Middle Americans have a down-to-earth perspective which enables them to see clearly that American democracy—despite its admitted flaws—operates pretty darn well.

What really bugs them is that so many people who presume to teach their children and lecture to them on how they should think and behave—are themselves so stupid.

PAN AM EMPLOYEES BRING CHRISTMAS TO VIETNAM

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, on my recent trip to Vietnam I had the privilege to sit next to Rice E. McGuire of Miami on my airplane flight over. Rice is a machinist for Pan American Airways and he told me a project entitled "Project Santa Claus" that had been initiated by employees of Pan Am to make Christmas a little brighter for our U.S. servicemen in hospitals in South Vietnam. I would like to share with my colleagues a letter I received recently from Rice detailing the results of the project. He also points out the contributions made by Jim Straughn and Greg Swofford to make the Pan Am employee project a success. The letter is as follows:

MIAMI, FLA.,
January 26, 1970.

Congressman MONTGOMERY.

DEAR SIR: I don't know if you will remember me. I am the Santa's elf you met on the plane to Viet Nam. I thought you might be interested in the results of our "Project Santa Claus." We visited the hospitals in Saigon, Long Binh, Camranh Bay, and Da-Nang. There we distributed, hand to hand, over 4,000 presents to our boys. This was made possible by the money we collected from the Pan American employees. In eighteen days we raised over \$10,000. We packaged presents on our own time, after working hours. I am a machinist for Pan American, and Jim Straughn (Santa Claus) is a mechanic. We collected the money from

the employees, and purchased the items for our packages. I am very proud of my fellow workers for making this project the success that it was. In Long Binh we met a young boy in the psychiatric ward. He was strapped to his bed. When we gave him his present his face was blank. When he saw Santa Clause his eyes filled with recognition, and he took his present and smiled. As we were leaving the nurse explained to us that the boy had been there over a month. She went on to say that it was the first time he had shown any signs of improvement at all. She felt that this was wonderful.

To me this alone is worth all of the effort put into our project. I would like to thank Gregg Swofford for his wonderful cooperation in our project. He was with us at all times. Our day was 20 hours long. I feel that if someone in the government could write him and thank him for his interest it would mean much more than if I were to do so myself. If you could make this possible, it would be highly appreciated.

Gregg Swofford, Military Traffic Mgr., Pan Am APO 96307 San Francisco.

Sincerely,

RICE E. MCGUIRE.

APPEAL TO AMERICA'S SILENT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Sacramento Union of January 16 carried a column by the international correspondent of the Copley News Service, Dumitru Danielopol, which develops the thought of the now famous phrase of President Nixon, "The Silent Majority."

The column which follows contains a very clear and timely message:

APPEAL TO AMERICA'S SILENT

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—"America where are you? Are you being heard now in the vocal chords of a minority, or are you silent? Cease your silence—I believe you owe our Vietnam wounded at least that."

This poignant appeal appeared in a letter written by an Air Force nurse, Capt. Leona Gartside.

Every American should make his voice heard, she says, by writing to his elected officials.

After three years overseas duty including two years of escorting casualties from Vietnam to hospitals in the Pacific and the United States, nurse Gartside is now a student at the University of Pennsylvania.

"Words are inadequate to express my admiration and respect for the courage of our injured men," she writes. "I have often asked myself if we, as a nation, are deserving of their sacrifices?"

A good question.

She is appalled and disgusted with the atmosphere on her campus.

"The American Flag is flown upside down at half-mast," she said. "Classes are closed for the war memorials because 10 per cent want to attend."

She has to listen to lectures in an attic with bad acoustics while a good room in a newer building is reserved for "political" meetings.

She is shocked and dismayed that Far Left ideologists are allowed to teach their own philosophy as if it were the only plausible, moral or rational solution.

"It is a deliberate seduction of young minds and manipulation of youth's idealism," she writes. "When I am told that the present government is immoral, that the war in Vietnam is immoral and that President Nixon should resign, my ire becomes complete."

Capt. Gartside's ire is understandable. We send our boys to risk their lives in Vietnam in order to prevent this type of ideology from spreading throughout Asia, yet we permit young minds at home to be fed the same philosophy.

"I am frightened," she writes, "I care not if you are pro or con on the war in Vietnam. That is not the issue . . . The issue is the stability and continuance of our present governmental structure and national ideals."

Nurse Gartside adds a word of warning for those who President Nixon labeled "the silent majority."

"It is your apathy, disinterest and neglect that amplifies the sound of a few . . . If you don't speak, there is a very well-organized minority that will speak for you."

THE SHOE PROBLEM IN AMERICA

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the shoe problem in America continues to grow. I take leave to include the following article that appeared in last Sunday's edition of the New York Times:

NEW ENGLAND SHOE TOWN WORRIED,
DOWN AT HEEL

(By Leonard Sloane)

HAVERHILL, MASS.—In the heart of the area known as "shoetown" here, a billboard contains this no-nonsense message: "Support American Labor. Buy American Shoes. Help Your Neighbor And Yourself."

Whether consumers are buying domestic-made shoes in Haverhill—and there are indications that even in this city where footwear accounts for 70 per cent of the industrial base, imports are being sold—they are buying the imported variety in increasing numbers throughout the United States.

INDUSTRY BEING HURT

At the same time, the New England footwear industry, once the largest and most important in the nation, and now containing less than 78,000 workers is being decimated. In places like Haverhill, or Brockton, another Massachusetts shoe city, or Manchester, across the state line in New Hampshire, factories are closing, workers are laid off, small businesses are feeling the pinch and everyone in town knows that the local footwear companies are having problems.

Shoe manufacturers in these parts and elsewhere insist that imports are responsible for their plight and demand some type of quota arrangement to protect them from the rising flow of overseas merchandise. So far Congress and the White House has been impervious to their pleas, but the shouts are getting louder and more desperate every day.

"It's an economic problem—we just can't compete against countries where labor is anywhere from one-tenth to one-quarter of ours," says Warren M. Weltzman, treasurer of Seymour Shoes, Inc., of this city. "We don't want anything different from what the Europeans are doing for their shoe industries."

Mr. Weltzman adds that while there were 23 footwear plants in Haverhill a decade ago, only seven are left, "and two of these are

going out of business in the next 30 to 60 days. It's become a ghost town—I've got nobody to talk to anymore."

"My basic nature is a free trader," notes William E. Tarlow, vice president of Brockton Footwear, Inc., of Brockton, known once as the country's shoe capital. "But when you're involved in an industry that you see disintegrating before your eyes overnight, you begin to question that."

"You know, as shoe manufacturers go out of business, there's also a direct effect on suppliers of insoles, outsoles and other component parts. And all of this makes it more difficult to hire labor because people look to learn marketable skills elsewhere."

The comments of these and other footwear producers reached during a recent fact-finding trip to the shoe country of New England are, as might be expected, charged with emotion. But they and their national trade group, the American Footwear Manufacturers Association, marshal plenty of statistics to support their views.

Item: 27 of the 221 footwear manufacturing units in New England—where shoes represent the largest employer in the non-durable field—with 6,795 men and women discontinued operations last year. One of these plants, operated by the Victory Shoe Company in Avon, Mass., was opened only a couple of years ago as a modern, one-story, airconditioned facility.

Item: United States production of leather and vinyl shoes declined to 592 million pairs in 1969 from a record of 646 million pairs in 1968, while imports, primarily of women's footwear, rose to 200 million pairs from 175 million pairs. In 1955, imports totaled just 8 million pairs.

Item: The average wage rate, which accounts for 30 to 40 per cent of the cost of shoes in the domestic industry of \$2.62 an hour, is substantially above that of other footwear manufacturing countries. For example, in Italy the hourly rate is \$1.04, in Japan, 58 cents, and in Spain, 56 cents. Taiwan and Portugal have even lower rates.

NEED FOR QUOTAS SEEN

"I feel that the shoe industry has to have some time," says William Shesky, president of Commonwealth Shoe and Leather Company, Inc., of Whitman, Mass., and chairman of the A.F.M.A.'s National Affairs Committee. "But to ask for permanent quotas, you're considered a protectionist."

Interviewed the other day on the eve of a strategy trip to other major shoe manufacturing centers in St. Louis, Milwaukee and Harrisburg, Mr. Shesky outlined his plans: "I'm going to recommend that we ask for temporary quotas for three years in which we would share whatever market growth there is with imports. After three years, we could look at the facts again because I feel the industry has to earn the right to any type of help it gets."

Importers and many retailers attracted by the higher-profit margin of imported footwear claim that these shoes have better styling and cost the customer less money. They believe that a large percentage of these imports, moreover, are made by subsidiaries of American manufacturers, who are plagued in the United States by obsolete facilities and an aging work force.

Whatever the reason for the decline in New England shoe making—and there are some around here who place part of the blame on poor management and the failure of the companies to invest in new plant and equipment during the more profitable times 10 to 20 years ago—the scene in many places is bleak. Just as many corporations in the textile industry left this area in the nineteenth-thirties and nineteenth-forties, so is the shoe manufacturing segment of the economy here facing up to the fact that companies are

going out of business, moving away or operating on short work weeks and reduced schedules.

Take a look at Haverhill, a city with a population of about 43,000 in northeastern Massachusetts 33 miles from Boston. Shoe manufacturing started here, at least on a primitive basis, in 1646, just six years after the place was settled, and two centuries later there were 90 manufacturers within its borders.

"FIRST SHOE CITY"

In 1882, a fire destroyed most of the shoe district and caused \$2-million worth of damage. But 27 years later, when the First World's Shoe and Leather Fair was held in Boston, the area had been rebuilt with brick loft buildings and Haverhill was calling itself "The First Shoe City of the World."

Today the city has no such pretensions. As Mayor James F. Waldron puts it, "We have lost more shoe production in Haverhill in the last seven years than we presently produce with the factories remaining. We lost 675 shoe workers jobs, or 39 per cent of the industry's labor force, not including the allied industries."

To P. Joseph McCarthy, manager-treasurer of Joint Board 31 of the United Shoe Workers of America, the problem is seen in human terms.

"When a factory goes out, the women in the stitching rooms and packing rooms are easy to absorb but the men find it a little more difficult to be placed. Ten years ago we had 3,500 members working and now its around 2,000."

VACANT STORES NOTED

A walk along Merrimack Street, Haverhill's downtown shopping area, shows that a half dozen or so of the stores are vacant. And business at the other stores has been better.

"The politicians have to do something, it's affecting our volume," says Irving P. Karellis of Karellis Jewelers. "What's happening in the shoe business is dragging the economy down. With so many families affected, it could become a distress area."

Nicholas C. Gerros of Gerros Men's Shop adds, "Business has been bad and I can see no future in this city."

What's happening in Haverhill is happening in many New England communities. Not only are the owners and workers affected but retailers, restaurants and others are also being hit by the shoe slowdown. As Milton Goldberg, president of Johnson Shoes, Inc., of Manchester observes, "Those factories fortunate enough to remain open certainly haven't been putting 52 weeks of pay in the employees' envelopes."

Whether the decline in footwear manufacturing here can be reversed is anybody's guess. Right now, though the industry is fighting to stay alive until a new horizon beckons it back to the happy profit days of yore.

DRUGS AND DRUG ABUSE

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, my own interest in the matters of drugs and drug abuse has been of a longstanding nature. As former chairman of a Joint Legislative Committee on Penal Institutions in the New York State Legislature, I became familiar with the despair experienced by some of the addicts committed to such institutions. On occasion, the addict left with no hope took his own life.

Several years ago, the average citizen reacted to such incidents with some shake of the head—but there was little real identification and even less understanding of the problem. Too many middle and upper class citizens in the tone of their comments indicated that they felt "it could not happen here." In other words, their community was protected by some invisible barrier of middle class respectability from the threat of an invasion of drugs and drug users.

No thoughts could have been further from present reality. Like an epidemic whose symptoms remained unrecognized until hundreds and thousands were infected, drug abuse and the problems that go with such abuse have infected almost every community in the United States.

I represent an urban district known for its relatively high standard of living and the number of students who enter college and pursue professional careers. Yet, each time I have returned to my district, the reports of the problems and concerns with drugs have grown to the extent that I can safely say that drugs are the No. 1 issue in the minds of my constituents. This district, I might add, is not an aberration. It is the rule rather than the exception. More and more people have come to realize that no family is immune from the dangers of drugs. There is not a child of school age who does not know at least one individual who uses drugs. We see how far we have come when the child accepts these occurrences as a matter of course. Last session, the House passed a Drug Abuse Education Act. This was the first step, but it covered very little distance when one surveys the size of the problem we are going to have to cope with.

I believe that there is a definite relationship of the knowledge of the effects of drugs and ultimately some cure for the problem of drug abuse. Everyone knows that preventive medicine eliminates many problems before they have a chance to worsen. If cigarettes cause cancer then the first step to prevent the spread of cancer is to persuade people to refrain from smoking in the first place. Yet, we must in such cases establish cause and effect so that the relationship is "beyond a reasonable doubt." Otherwise, they will not listen. Even then, we always face the problem of a few nonbelievers.

In the area of drugs and drug abuse, our educating function has not been performed as effectively as it might have been. Here we are dealing with human psychology and human thought patterns—a complicated and tortuous process even for experts. Here we may be working under a false assumption—that if people know the effects of drugs, they will refrain from taking them. We must determine whether this is a correct assumption as well as what the effects of drugs are.

At the same time, the number of potential cures for the problem are increasing. Suggestions range from the immediate and unremitting "cold turkey" to free heroin. New drugs such as

methadone appear as an effective method of treatment for some addicts. The possibilities and alternatives are then growing more and more varied. For the clinician, this poses the ultimate challenge. Yet, it is obvious that not enough research has been done to determine which types of treatment are most effective on which types of individuals. Most drug treatment continues on a hit-or-miss basis. What about operating with knowledge on your side? This knowledge can be gained only through further research.

Should an individual be given methadone if he can be treated as an abstainer? Should he be put through repeated "cold turkeys" and civil commitment if he is capable of losing his habit? Are there any new drugs that can be used for treatment?

What I am then saying is that we must have more knowledge about how addicts differ and how effects of drugs differ. How does the individual on speed or amphetamines vary from those on heroin? Can we set up a program where a doctor is able to determine what type of treatment an individual can successfully undergo; or if success is too optimistic a word, is there a type of treatment where an individual has a chance of living as a productive member of society?

As I have said earlier, no community is immune from a drug invasion. Through scientific research, some of the questions that I have raised may be answered. If so, we will have come a long way toward coping with this vital issue.

CRIME REPORT

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include, at the conclusion of these remarks, the crime index for December 1969, recently released by Chief of Police Jerry V. Wilson of the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department.

The release of the December crime index permits a year-to-year comparison of the crime statistics of 1968 with those of 1969. In all of 1969 there were 62,575 crimes reported as against 49,273 in 1968, or a percentage increase of 27 percent. Moreover, by November and December, the rate of offenses was averaging about 6,000 a month which would project a yearly rate for 1970 of over 72,000 reported offenses. An average offense rate of over 72,000 would work out to about one for every 10 persons living in the District of Columbia.

What it comes down to in my view is that the residents, tourists, and suburban visitors to the District are on notice that they have about one chance in 10 of being the victim of crime while in the District in 1970.

Alarming though this statistic is, there is more. The "spillover" of the criminal element from the District to the Mary-

land suburbs is increasing at an alarming rate. Prince Georges County reports over 50 percent of the crimes committed there are committed by persons with District addresses.

Into this background of startlingly high crime statistics there will soon be introduced by the House District Committee an Omnibus Crime Bill for the District of Columbia. It will be a good bill; a bill designed to fight crime in the District on many fronts. It will reorganize the local courts to permit swift justice in the way of speedy trials. It will give to the courts, prosecutors, and the police several of the tools needed to deal with crime in the District.

When this bill reaches the floor, I ask my colleagues to support it and give it speedy passage. Let us promptly pass this anticrime measure and help pull back the cloak of fear that now seems to shroud this Nation's Capital.

CRIME INDEX FOR DECEMBER 1969

On January 19, 1970, the Office of the Chief of Police released the reported Crime Index Statistics for the month of December 1969. The total number of offenses reported for this month was 5,808. The total number for last month was 6,071. The cumulative total Crime Index Offenses for the twelve-month period ending with December 1969 was 62,575 and the number for the corresponding period in 1968 was 49,273, an increase of 27.0%.

In the categories of Homicide, Rape and Aggravated Assault, 31, 17, and 325 offenses were reported for December. In comparing the twelve-month total ending with December 1964 with the same period in 1968, an increase of 95 (+49.0%) was reported in Homicide, 76 (+29.2%) in Rape, and 519 (+16.7%) in Aggravated Assault.

Although reported Robberies for the twelve-month period ending with December 1969 were 12,423, a 44.1% increase over the same time span in 1968 (8,622 reported Robberies), this is the first time in 12 years that there was a decrease in Robberies in the

month of December over November. Traditionally, December shows substantial increases over November. While 1,256 Robberies were reported for November, 1,163 (a decrease of 7.2%) were reported for this month.

This month 2,246 Burglaries and 1,028 Larcenies were reported. These two categories represent 38.7% and 17.7% of the total offenses reported for the month, thus Burglary and Larceny total over 1/2 of all the crimes reported. During the twelve-month period ending in December 1969, 22,992 Burglaries and 11,548 Larcenies were reported, an increase of 28.7% and 46.6%, respectively, over the corresponding period in 1968.

Auto theft, with 998 offenses represents 17.2% of total offenses reported for December. A total of 11,366 offenses were reported for the twelve-month period ending with December 1969, an increase of 0.1% over the same period of the previous year. While all the other categories of crime cited above showed increases during the past twelve months, ranging from 16.7% to 49.0%, Auto Theft has never had so small an annual increase.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT—CRIME INDEX OFFENSES, DECEMBER 1969

| Classification | December | | Change | | Cumulative through December | | Percent change | 12 months end December 1968 | 12 months end December 1969 | Percent change |
|--------------------------|----------|-------|--------|---------|-----------------------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|
| | 1968 | 1969 | Amount | Percent | fiscal year 1969 | fiscal year 1970 | | | | |
| Criminal homicide..... | 22 | 31 | +9 | (1) | 107 | 163 | +52.34 | 194 | 289 | +48.97 |
| Rape..... | 18 | 17 | -1 | (1) | 160 | 186 | +16.25 | 260 | 336 | +29.23 |
| Robbery..... | 1,076 | 1,163 | +87 | +8.09 | 5,131 | 7,327 | +42.80 | 8,622 | 12,423 | +44.08 |
| Aggravated assault..... | 254 | 325 | +71 | +27.95 | 1,613 | 1,896 | +17.54 | 3,102 | 3,621 | +16.73 |
| Burglary..... | 1,617 | 2,246 | +629 | +38.90 | 9,122 | 12,885 | +41.25 | 17,865 | 22,992 | +28.70 |
| Larceny (\$50/over)..... | 815 | 1,028 | +213 | +26.13 | 4,738 | 6,594 | +39.17 | 7,876 | 11,548 | +46.62 |
| Auto theft..... | 1,048 | 998 | -50 | -4.77 | 6,476 | 6,691 | +3.32 | 11,354 | 11,366 | +0.11 |
| Total..... | 4,850 | 5,808 | +958 | +19.75 | 27,347 | 35,742 | +30.70 | 49,273 | 62,575 | +27.00 |

¹ Base too small to compute percent change.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT, DECEMBER 1969
CRIME INDEX OFFENSES RELATED TO PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL

| | Number | Percent |
|------------------------------------|--------|---------|
| Homicide..... | 31 | 0.53 |
| Rape..... | 17 | .29 |
| Robbery..... | 1,163 | 20.02 |
| Aggravated assault..... | 325 | 5.60 |
| Total, crimes against persons..... | 1,536 | 26.44 |
| Burglary..... | 2,246 | 38.68 |
| Larceny \$50/over..... | 1,028 | 17.70 |
| Motor vehicle theft..... | 998 | 17.18 |
| Total, property crimes..... | 4,272 | 73.56 |
| Total, reported crimes..... | 5,808 | 100.00 |

A FIRSTHAND REPORT ON VIETNAM

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, since we hear so much about conditions in Southeast Asia from the instant experts who have no firsthand knowledge of conditions and attitudes, it was refreshing to read a letter from Capt. Donald G. Wilson, a U.S. Army chaplain, published in the Thursday, January 29, issue of the Clarksville Times and Mecklenburg County Records.

I insert Captain Wilson's letter in the RECORD in order that my colleagues may

have an opportunity to read this firsthand report:

LOCAL MAN, NOW A CHAPLAIN IN VIETNAM, WRITES A MOVING LETTER

(NOTE.—We are proud to print below a very moving and informative letter written by a young man, a member of Union Chapel Baptist Church, who is now a Chaplain in Vietnam. Be sure to read his letter below.)

JANUARY 17, 1970.

EDITOR, The Clarksville Times, Clarksville, Va.

DEAR SIR: I grew up at Buffalo Junction and my parents, Mr. and Mrs. Horace G. Wilson, still live there. I now am serving in Vietnam as a Chaplain; I am located in the North near the Laotian border, and serve two battalions, the 3/21 and the 4/31 of the 196th Infantry Brigade. I receive the "Clarksville Times" here as a gift from my home church, Union Chapel Baptist Church. I enjoy reading it and compliment you on always producing informative editions. I thought I might share a few reflections of Vietnam to you, and maybe the people there would be interested.

I have found my ministry here very challenging, demanding, and yet very rewarding. I arrived here in August and a major offensive was underway and our area of operations has been and is an active one. Having seen and been involved in many operations here, I have been tremendously impressed with the fact that every precaution is taken to preserve one's life. This I am sure in part is conducive to the high morale prevalent among our men having to fight a very complicated war. When a man is wounded the "Dust-off Pilots" as they are called, fly in through any type of combat situation or weather and take the wounded man as quickly as possible, which is just a matter of

minutes, to a hospital. It is rare indeed that they are unable to accomplish their missions; I have never heard of one failing to get a man out of our area of operations. The men know this and if they do become wounded they know help is on the way.

We have some of America's finest young men over here in Vietnam; of this I am sure, for I live with them and see them endure terrible weather, at times hard enemy situations, physical fatigue, and yet through it all, when it is over, still be able to extend a smile.

Where I am located the only means of transportation, other than foot, is the helicopter. My services are usually held out in the field on company level wherever they have stopped during the day. The services usually are well attended; over here there are the believers and the non-believers; there are none fluctuating between the two. The men love to sing as it is a great release for their fears, one has only to experience it! I hold an average of from eight to twelve services per week. Throughout the world we hear of ecumenical efforts aimed at making us one in our Christian life; over here we have a very practical ecumenicity; we are all one out in the field—we believe in God and truly depend upon Him!

The men on a whole have responded quite well toward spiritual inclinations. Many have made spiritual decisions since I have been here, and two have made decisions, while here, to enter the ministry. I have met several boys who plan to enter the Ministry upon return to the states, and this is very encouraging concerning the moral and spiritual fibre of our young men as they are now confronted by such a perplexed "sitzen leben" or life situation.

We have "Kit Carson Scouts" which are former VC or NVA soldiers who have come over to the South Vietnamese side; these,

later on after reformation, fight with our companies. In one of our battalions there was one very outstanding Kit Carson; he had fought with our battalion for 18 months. Everyone in the Company in which he served loved him. His name was Nguyen Van Ly, but everyone called him "Twenty" for he was 20 years old when he entered the battalion. "Twenty" was very small of stature but a truly great young man; he saved many lives of our boys with his knowledge of the country and enemy tactics. But on the 10th of December we suffered an immense loss, for "Twenty" was killed. I happened to be in the aid station when they brought him in; the Colonel himself jumped out of the helicopter crying, for "Twenty" was gone. I told my assistant, who was very close to him, that "Twenty" had been killed and he cried as if he had been his own brother; such was the close personal attachment of this young man to us!

The men of his Company asked me to hold a Memorial Service for "Twenty". I had never held one for a Vietnamese, but somehow I could not refuse, even though he was of a different religion; for, he was a close personal friend to me too. Our little chapel will only seat 40-50 people, but that day over 100 jammed into it, and almost every eye was wet with grief. Each had come to pay his last respects to "Twenty," their friend. I asked one of the boys to say something about "Twenty," and he was so moved that he could only lead us in praying the Lord's Prayer, but it was enough! I asked the Colonel also to speak and he reviewed many of Twenty's accomplishments and value to the battalion and closed with these words:

"Men, I know you loved him, but "Twenty" found his reward before he died when you accepted him as one of you. "Twenty" has died, but remember there are many more just like him in this country whom you have not met."

We closed by singing "My Country 'Tis of Thee" in recognition of "Twenty's" country—Vietnam!

His life has done more than anything else to show me why I am here in Vietnam. He loved his country and was dedicated to saving it! I am so happy I came and got to meet him—his life has enriched mine immensely. I am proud to be an American and proud to serve here in "Twenty's" Vietnam!

I too am proud of Clarksville and its surrounding communities. It is an example of the "silent majority" that is still loyal to America and God.

Sincerely,

DONALD G. WILSON,
Chaplain, Captain, USA.

TOM CUITE OF THE NEW YORK CITY COUNCIL

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as any teenaged student of civics knows, running New York City is a job of nightmarish proportions requiring the dedication of many thousands of hard working, loyal and honest persons. Such a man is the Honorable Thomas J. Cuite, vice chairman and majority leader of the New York City Council. I have known Tom Cuite since he was a boy. I represent on a Federal level the same areas that he represents so well in the city council. On January 29 a newspaper took recognition of some of Tom's

finer attributes—attributes, I might add, which have been known to us for many a year. Under permission heretofore unanimously granted to me I include the article at this point in the RECORD:

CUITE: CITY HALL'S QUIET MAN

For City Hall's "invisible man," Thomas J. Cuite, who uses the power levers ever so quietly, today's mood is one of "here we go again."

As vice chairman and majority leader of the City Council, Mr. Cuite (pronounced cute) will announce committee chairmen as the Council holds its first complete legislative session of its new four-year term.

For weeks, Mr. Cuite, a 10-year veteran of the Council, has been getting ready for today, supervising reorganization of the Council into new committee setups and laying the groundwork for new legislation.

He predicts another four years of legislative rough and tumble, as busy as the last four, and with consumer protection, pollution control and accelerated construction of public projects getting much of the attention.

A life-long Brooklyn resident, Irish Catholic and regular organization Democrat, the lean, mild-spoken, bespectacled Mr. Cuite shows little interest in the glare of publicity or television.

He is the opposite of the stereotype of the old-time Irish politician—the bluff, red-faced, back-slapping, loud, "let's have another round" kind of politician.

In his 20th Councilmanic bailiwick (South Brooklyn, Red Hook, Gowanus, parts of Borough Park and Park Slope) his method is to be in almost constant touch with community groups, Parent-Teacher Associations, block associations, school boards and planning boards—and, as he says, "to attend nearly all their meetings."

On a citywide level he exerts leadership in the Council through a nearly nonstop round of private meetings with Councilmen, officials of city agencies and other politicians. Or, as an aide says, "lots of invisible work."

An associate with a mild case of exasperation adds, "This guy is the best organized politician I've ever seen. He starts off the day maybe with a 'breakfast meeting'. He'll convert a lunch hour into three stops—you know, a fruit cup at this place, soup somewhere else, and then a sandwich at his desk, and meeting somebody different at each stop. Then he goes to four or five meetings every night."

He will be 57 years old in March, but he remains in such good physical condition that it was no surprise for members of a youth center to see him join in for a few minutes of basketball on a visit the other night. Although 5 feet 8 in height, he was a basketball regular in his days at Brooklyn's St. Francis College in the nineteen-thirties.

"I've made it a practice to know people," Mr. Cuite says, and aides add, "Amen." He knows bootblacks, policemen, clerks, and small-office holders by the hundreds, and thousands of Brooklynites have come to know him as a regular visitor.

Mr. Cuite uses his acquaintances with a wide range of city officials and his good relationship with Mayor Lindsay to accomplish a vast amount of preparation on bills and budgets in the earliest stages.

Until he was first elected majority leader a year ago, succeeding David Ross, who had been "a one-man show," Mr. Cuite was for a number of years chairman of the Finance Committee. While head of that committee he made it a regular policy to examine departmental budget requests months before the final budget evolved.

In doing so, he became increasingly irked at the delays in starting construction on new schools. At his insistence, the Board of Education had to submit monthly construction

status reports and to send its top construction officials to make verbal reports every three months. One result of the system was to speed up projects.

Now he plans to create a number of finance subcommittees responsible for working with all city agencies that are involved with construction. He contends that "several hundred million dollars" can be saved in the next 10 years by eliminating delays and red tape in these projects.

In the last Council term there were only three serious attempts by the Council to override a Lindsay veto. One of those times, the Council forced through a methadone program for drug addicts in city prisons, despite the Mayor's veto, but, has been unable to implement the idea so far.

In cooperating with the Mayor, Mr. Cuite held up action for months on creation of several new superagencies until both decided it was the right time.

But on a bill to get at rent gouging, Mr. Cuite got a better deal for tenants than the Mayor had suggested. He talked with builders and building unions to find out what the industry "could live with," resisted the landlords' lobby and pushed through a bill holding rent increases to 10 per cent on two-year leases and 15 per cent on leases of three years.

While he is credited with lots of hard work, opponents chafe at his rigid control over bringing bills out of committee. One disenchanted politician said, "Sure, the name's easy to remember—Cute by name and cute by method."

Yet an attempt by Theodore S. Weiss, a Reform Democrat Councilman, to unseat Mr. Cuite as majority leader and as vice chairman failed dismally at the Council's reorganization meeting early this month.

That meeting, required by the Charter, was to set the new Council in motion in preparation for what might be called the first real business session today. While the Rules Committee will be making the committee assignments, Mr. Cuite's preferences will certainly be highly influential.

Typically he was busy in conferences at City Hall last night, conferring both on committee selections and on the men to be named by the Council to the new corporation that will run city hospitals.

In the coming meetings he will be pressing for more consumer protection bills—to license television and automobile mechanics, for instance—and for greater control of narcotics.

"I was born into politics," he said in his office the other day. "At 8 or 9 I was running around to the polling places with coffee and sandwiches around the Navy Yard section where I lived." His father, Thomas F. Cuite, was for many years local district captain, then a confidential stenographer to three borough presidents, a clerk to the Council majority leader and secretary to Supreme Court justices.

The son joined the father in a real estate business that still goes on at 16 Court Street. The younger Cuite attended parochial schools in Brooklyn before graduating from St. Francis in 1935.

MYLAI IN INDIANA?

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, one after another, in individual letters to my office, in news articles which come to my attention, in reports and documentaries, the tales of mistreatment behind prison

bars come to my attention. The abhorrent, decadent, and inhuman conditions, and practices within the prisons of this Nation cannot be tolerated. The white supremacist attitude found to dominate the atmosphere behind prison walls is reprehensible.

Prison is a convenient arena for the hatreds which cannot legally be aired in the outer society. Too many incidents of racial mistreatment in prisons have been leaked to the public. It is false security and pure hypocrisy for this society to think it can ignore what happens behind bars.

What happens behind bars does and must concern us—for the majority of these human beings will be released to try again for successful induction into society. They cannot learn the lessons they will need through cruel and inhuman treatment. When this is all they get out of prison, it is no wonder that they come out with a vengeance toward society which leaves no room for respect of the laws of that society.

A violation of prison rights motivated by racial prejudices carries consequences for this society as severe as the violation of civil rights motivated by racial prejudice. If black men can be murdered behind bars with no repercussion from the law—then certain elements within this society will work to put more black men behind bars. And when it becomes obvious that these incidents are common to imprisonment for blacks, there cannot be expected any respect for law or for order.

I am greatly distressed by the most recent story of murder in the Indiana Reformatory at Pendleton, Ind. I call to the attention of my colleagues these news comments, an editorial from the December 30, 1969, *St. Louis Post Dispatch*, and a news item from the *New York Post* of December 29, 1969.

The items follow:

[From the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*,
Dec. 30, 1969]

MYLAI IN INDIANA?

On the morning of Sept. 26, a dozen white prison guards at the Indiana State Reformatory at Pendleton opened fire on a crowd of young black inmates who were lying on their abdomens in the belief that the officers would not shoot them in the back. One was killed and 46 were wounded. The details of this shocking incident, which appear to have been suppressed, have been pieced together by the *Los Angeles Times*. That newspaper's account, if accurate, constitutes a terrible indictment of brutality and callousness carried out by prison authorities and condoned by a number of state officials including Governor Edgar D. Whitcomb.

According to a dispatch from a *Times* correspondent, Bryce Nelson, the shooting occurred after the blacks had demonstrated in behalf of a list of demands calling for the right to wear Afro hair styles and to read "black literature" and for the release of four Negro prisoners who were being held in isolation. When the blacks were ordered to disperse from a recreation area, they lay down; whereupon, Mr. Nelson reported, the guards, who were standing beyond a chain link fence, fired volley after volley from their shotguns.

Mr. Nelson's efforts to visit the reformatory, which is the largest in the country, were unsuccessful. He was told by the state corrections commissioner that "we want to keep out people who only do negative re-

porting." A county grand jury, which received evidence that as many as 90 shots were fired, concluded "there is insufficient evidence to place criminal responsibility" on any prison officers. Even before the grand jury investigation, Governor Whitcomb said that no reformatory employe would be suspended or dismissed for his part in the incident.

Reading Mr. Nelson's account, we found ourselves thinking of the massacre at My Lai, where Americans also allegedly shot down helpless people in cold blood. But there is no war in Indiana, except insofar as that state shares with the general population our dreadful and devious internal conflict. Despite the admonition that unspeakable things always happen in war, we were incredulous when we learned about My Lai. And we were incredulous when we read about Pendleton; the long official secrecy that surrounded both incidents (and the public indifference to the Indiana episode) speak of a people's humanity that no longer seems operative.

Pendleton, of course, shares with most of our penal institutions conditions that so easily lead to violence: overcrowding, increasingly militant inmates, untrained and underpaid prison personnel. The shooting ought to compel Indiana legislators to address themselves to these problems. But more importantly, the *Times* report of the shooting cries out for a thorough impartial and public investigation of what appears to be a shameful incident.

[From the *New York Times*, Dec. 29, 1969]
A PRISONER IS SHOT DEAD—THEN SILENCE
(By Bryce Nelson)

PENDLETON, IND.—On a warm, idyllic autumn day near this sleepy rural town, 12 white men fired repeated volleys of buckshot through a fence at young black men who were lying on their stomachs. They killed one and wounded 46. Very few people around the country seemed to notice.

The unarmed inmates, the great majority of whom are 15 to 30 years old, had been demonstrating against discrimination at the Indiana State Reformatory. They had lain down in the belief that the guards would not shoot them in the back.

Pendleton, which is about 30 miles north-east of Indianapolis, is the nation's largest "reformatory." In the opinion of several experts, it is also one of the country's poorer penal institutions. Nevertheless, the conditions which helped produce the shooting here—overcrowding, increasingly militant black inmates and untrained, underpaid, callous prison personnel—are representative of the problem faced by prisons in many other states.

Indiana corrections commissioner, Robert P. Heyne, twice has refused permission to talk to reformatory officials.

On the day of the shooting, Sept. 26, several hundred inmates congregated in a fenced-in recreation area. They had several demands, including the right to read black literature and to wear their hair in the "Afro" style. Their most important demand was the release of four black inmates who had been isolated for unclear reasons. In discussions the previous day, the black inmates had thought they had received assurances that their fellows would be released.

THEY FELT BETRAYED

However, on the morning of Sept. 26, they saw two of the four inmates being hustled out of the prison for transfer to the Indiana State Prison at Michigan City. Many of the black inmates felt betrayed and were in a defiant mood.

At one point in the morning's hectic activities, inmates started fires in a furniture factory in the reformatory, but these were soon extinguished, probably by inmates. The

fire equipment had left before the shooting took place.

The guards told inmates in the recreation area to leave the vicinity. Many, including all the white inmates, did so. The black inmates asked to present their grievances to Supt. George Phend who was not at the scene of the confrontation either that day or on the preceding day. Although he is said to have been in the reformatory, Phend refused to talk to the inmates.

On the other side of a chainlink fence were 11 white guards and at least one vocational teacher, dressed in riot helmets and carrying loaded shotguns. The confrontation continued for about 10 to 15 minutes. No attempt was made to disperse the crowd with tear gas, smoke bombs or nearby fire equipment.

The inmates reasoned that if they lay down, they would force the guards to shoot them in the back if they shot at all.

The guards fired warning shots. Then, at the command of the captain of the guard, Jason Huceby, the guards began firing through the fence either at or around the inmates. The county grand jury which investigated the shooting reported they had received varying estimates of the number of shots fired from 15 to 90.

One witness said that some of the men were trying to rise from the ground raising their hands in a gesture of surrender but were told by the guards, "You've had your chance," and were shot down. After the shooting, the men were told to leave the blood-spattered court, which they did, carrying the wounded. Two men were left lying on the pavement. One of the two, James E. Durr, 21, of Gary, was dead with a piece of buckshot in his head. Of the 46 wounded, estimates of those seriously injured run from eight to 20.

The inmates were clearly disobeying the orders of the guards to leave the area, but some observers believe the group would have dispersed after serious consultations with prison leaders or use of nonlethal force.

In the 12 weeks since the shooting there has been no public reprimand. From the Governor of Indiana on down, the attitude of officials has been to support the shooting as necessary.

One of the official explanations seems to be that the shots were fired to prevent the disturbance from developing into a riot. One contention is that the guards only fired around the inmates and that the prisoners were hit by ricochets. This statement is disputed by witnesses and by those who have talked to the inmates who were shot.

Although more than a third of the reformatory's inmates are black, the guards, about 90 per cent of whom are white, are drawn mainly from this white rural area.

"It was murder, plain murder," says Retha Bliss of Gary, whose son is an inmate at Pendleton, "some of them were shot six and seven times."

CALIFORNIA WINE IS NOW EXPORTED TO EUROPE—CAN THE CAFÉS OF PARIS BE FAR BEHIND?

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the wines of California have grown in reputation on a steady basis and are now known throughout the world as some of the very best. I am particularly proud of my own congressional district, which produces some of the finest wines in the world.

calculated using a "maximum likelihood" technique.

The five parts of the tabulation representing "All Cars—All Speed Limits, All Front Seats" are offered on the following pages as an illustration.

HIGHLIGHT RESULTS

At this time the discussion of the study results will be confined, in main, to the principal objective. These results are summarized in the following tables. The full set of tabulations is available for review from the Foundation. Where differences in probabilities are not significant according to chi-square no ratios are provided. Some general observa-

tions not included in the summary tables now follow.

For the entire 12797 vehicle occupants observed in the study, 8372 or about 65% had some type of seat restraint available. Of the 12797 occupants, 2624 or about 20% were using some type of restraint. Of those 8372 occupants that had restraints available, about 81% were using some restraint.

For the 11463 passenger car occupants observed, 7813 or about 68% had some type of seat restraint available. Of these 11463 occupants, 2461 or about 21% were using some type of restraint. Of the 7813 occupants that had restraints available, about 32% were using some restraint. Of the 1420 occupants

that had a shoulder belt available, 59 or about 4% were wearing it.

A passenger's decision to use his seat belt was shown to be significantly influenced by the driver's use of his seat belt. Approximately 26% of all right front seat passengers having belts used them. However, when the driver was using his seat belt, 66% of right front seat occupants having seat belts available also used them. The driver's use of his seat belt had a lesser but significant effect on center front and rear seat passengers. Of these occupants having seat belts available, 45% followed the driver's example in using them.

ALL CARS, ALL SPEED LIMITS—FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PHYSICAL INJURY EXTENT AGAINST RESTRAINT USE FOR ALL FRONT SEATS

| Restraint usage | Physical injury extent | | | | | Total |
|------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------|----------------|------------|------------|-------|
| | None (O) | Complaint (C) | Noticeable (B) | Severe (A) | Killed (K) | |
| Restraints not available | 1,853 | 264 | 348 | 87 | 20 | 2,572 |
| Lap belt only available, not used | 2,556 | 425 | 463 | 108 | 30 | 3,582 |
| Shoulder and lap belts available, none used | 661 | 89 | 102 | 18 | 2 | 872 |
| Subtotal, no restraints used | 5,070 | 778 | 913 | 213 | 52 | 7,026 |
| Lap belt only available, used | 1,319 | 186 | 156 | 29 | 2 | 1,692 |
| Shoulder and lap belts available, lap only used | 421 | 29 | 36 | 4 | 1 | 482 |
| Subtotal, lap belt only used | 1,731 | 215 | 192 | 33 | 3 | 2,174 |
| Shoulder and lap belts available, shoulder only used | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Shoulder and lap belts available, both used | 44 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 59 |
| Subtotal, some restraint used | 1,781 | 220 | 201 | 34 | 4 | 2,240 |
| Total, all occupants | 6,851 | 998 | 1,114 | 247 | 56 | 9,266 |

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF PHYSICAL INJURY EXTENT AGAINST RESTRAINT USE FOR ALL FRONT SEATS

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|
| Restraints not available | 72.0 | 10.3 | 13.5 | 3.4 | 0.8 | 100 |
| Lap belt only available, not used | 71.4 | 11.9 | 12.9 | 3.0 | .8 | 100 |
| Shoulder and lap belts available, none used | 75.8 | 10.2 | 11.7 | 2.1 | .2 | 100 |
| Subtotal, no restraints used | 72.2 | 11.1 | 13.0 | 3.0 | .7 | 100 |
| Lap belt only available, used | 78.0 | 11.0 | 9.2 | 1.7 | .1 | 100 |
| Shoulder and lap belts available, lap only used | 85.5 | 6.0 | 7.5 | .8 | .2 | 100 |
| Subtotal, lap belt only used | 79.6 | 9.9 | 8.8 | 1.5 | .1 | 100 |
| Shoulder and lap belts available, shoulder only used | 85.7 | 0 | 14.3 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Shoulder and lap belts available, both used | 74.6 | 8.5 | 13.6 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 100 |
| Subtotal, some restraint used | 79.5 | 9.8 | 9.0 | 1.5 | .2 | 100 |
| Total, all occupants | 73.9 | 10.8 | 12.0 | 2.7 | .6 | 100 |

ALL CARS, ALL SPEED LIMITS—STATISTICS FOR INDIVIDUAL PHYSICAL INJURY OUTCOMES FOR ALL FRONT SEATS

| Statistic | Physical injury extent | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|-------|-------|---------------|-------|-------|----------------|-------|-------|------------|-------|-------|------------|-------|-------|
| | None (O) | | | Complaint (C) | | | Noticeable (B) | | | Severe (A) | | | Killed (K) | | |
| | Low | Est. | High | Low | Est. | High | Low | Est. | High | Low | Est. | High | Low | Est. | High |
| P (Unrestrained) | 0.711 | 0.722 | 0.732 | 0.103 | 0.111 | 0.118 | 0.122 | 0.130 | 0.138 | 0.026 | 0.030 | 0.034 | 0.005 | 0.007 | 0.009 |
| P (Lap belt only) | .779 | .796 | .813 | .086 | .099 | .111 | .076 | .088 | .100 | .010 | .015 | .020 | -.000 | .001 | .003 |
| P (Both belts used) | .635 | .746 | .857 | .014 | .085 | .156 | .048 | .136 | .223 | -.016 | .017 | .050 | -.016 | .017 | .050 |
| P (Any restraint used) | .778 | .795 | .812 | .086 | .098 | .111 | .078 | .090 | .102 | .010 | .015 | .020 | .000 | .002 | .004 |
| C (Unrestrained—lap belt only) | | 47.58 | | | 2.29 | | | 26.83 | | 14.04 | | | | 9.14 | |
| C (Unrestrained—both belts used) | | 0.07 | | | 0.18 | | | 0 | | .05 | | | | 0.01 | |
| C (Unrestrained—any restraint used) | | 47.21 | | | 2.64 | | | 25.59 | | 14.42 | | | | 8.01 | |
| C (Lap belt only—both belts used) | | .61 | | | .02 | | | 1.05 | | .18 | | | | 1.51 | |
| R (Unrestrained—lap belt only) | .87 | .91 | .94 | .93 | 1.12 | 1.37 | 1.22 | 1.47 | 1.80 | 1.29 | 2.00 | 3.42 | 1.84 | 5.36 | (1) |
| R (Unrestrained—both belts used) | .89 | | .93 | .98 | | 1.25 | 1.29 | | 1.65 | 1.39 | | 2.61 | .11 | | 10.61 |
| R (Unrestrained—any restraint used) | .83 | .97 | 1.15 | .66 | 1.31 | 8.63 | .55 | .96 | 2.86 | .53 | 1.79 | -2.15 | .11 | .44 | -.59 |
| R (Lap belt only—both belts used) | .85 | | 1.09 | .38 | | 2.23 | .44 | | 1.48 | -1.14 | | 4.72 | -.28 | | 1.16 |
| R (Any restraint used) | .88 | .91 | .94 | .94 | 1.13 | 1.37 | 1.20 | 1.45 | 1.77 | 1.30 | 2.00 | 3.39 | 1.53 | 4.14 | (1) |
| R (Lap belt only—both belts used) | .89 | | .93 | .99 | | 1.26 | 1.27 | | 1.63 | 1.39 | | 2.60 | .60 | | 7.69 |
| | .91 | 1.07 | 1.28 | .55 | 1.17 | 8.15 | .34 | .65 | 2.08 | .20 | .90 | -1.27 | -.00 | .08 | -.18 |
| | .93 | | 1.20 | .33 | | 2.00 | .29 | | 1.01 | -.59 | | 2.38 | -.07 | | .24 |

Note: Negative probability confidence limits result from computations on a normal distribution. ¹ Indicates a ratio of 100.0 or greater. Negative ratios result from negative lower probability confidence limits.

ALL CARS—ALL SPEED LIMITS—STATISTICS FOR CUMULATIVE ASCENDING PHYSICAL INJURY OUTCOMES FOR ALL FRONT SEATS

| Statistic | Physical injury extent | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|-------|-------|---------|-------|-------|---------------|-------|-------|---------------------|-------|-------|
| | O | | | O and C | | | O and C and B | | | O and C and B and A | | |
| | Low | Est. | High | Low | Est. | High | Low | Est. | High | Low | Est. | High |
| P (unrestrained) | 0.711 | 0.722 | 0.732 | 0.824 | 0.832 | 0.841 | 0.958 | 0.962 | 0.967 | 0.991 | 0.993 | 0.995 |
| P (lap belt only) | .779 | .796 | .813 | .882 | .895 | .908 | .978 | .983 | .989 | .997 | .999 | 1.000 |
| P (both belts used) | .635 | .746 | .857 | .735 | .831 | .926 | .920 | .966 | 1.012 | .950 | .983 | 1.016 |
| P (any restraint used) | .778 | .795 | .812 | .881 | .893 | .906 | .978 | .983 | .988 | .996 | .998 | 1.000 |

| Statistic | Physical injury extent | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------|-------|------|---------|-------|------|---------------|-------|------|---------------------|------|------|
| | O | | | O and C | | | O and C and B | | | O and C and B and A | | |
| | Low | Est. | High | Low | Est. | High | Low | Est. | High | Low | Est. | High |
| C (unrestrained—lap belt only) | | 47.58 | | | 50.07 | | | 22.82 | | | 9.14 | |
| C (unrestrained—both belts used) | | .07 | | | .02 | | | .04 | | | .01 | |
| C (unrestrained—any restraint used) | | 47.21 | | | 48.27 | | | 22.47 | | | 8.01 | |
| C (lap belt only—both belts used) | | .61 | | | 1.89 | | | .26 | | | 1.51 | |
| R (unrestrained/lap belt only) | 0.87 | .91 | 0.94 | 0.91 | .93 | 0.95 | 0.97 | .98 | 0.99 | 0.99 | .99 | 1.00 |
| R (unrestrained/both belts used) | .89 | | .93 | .92 | | .94 | .97 | | .98 | .99 | | 1.00 |
| R (unrestrained/any restraint used) | .83 | .97 | 1.15 | .89 | 1.00 | 1.14 | .95 | 1.00 | 1.05 | .98 | 1.01 | 1.05 |
| R (lap belt only/both belts used) | .85 | | 1.09 | .90 | | 1.10 | .96 | | 1.04 | .98 | | 1.04 |
| R (lap belt only/any restraint used) | .88 | .91 | .94 | .91 | .93 | .96 | .97 | .98 | .99 | .99 | .99 | 1.00 |
| R (lap belt only/both belts used) | .89 | | .93 | .92 | | .95 | .97 | | .98 | .99 | | 1.00 |
| R (lap belt only/any restraint used) | .91 | 1.07 | 1.28 | .95 | 1.08 | 1.24 | .97 | 1.02 | 1.07 | .98 | 1.02 | 1.05 |
| R (lap belt only/both belts used) | .93 | | 1.20 | .97 | | 1.18 | .98 | | 1.06 | .99 | | 1.04 |

Note: 1. Probability confidence limits exceeding 1.000 result from computations on a normal distribution.

ALL CARS, ALL SPEED LIMITS—STATISTICS FOR CUMULATIVE DESCENDING PHYSICAL INJURY OUTCOMES FOR ALL FRONT SEATS

| Statistic | Physical injury extent (percent) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----------|-------|-------|---------------|-------|-------|
| | K | | | K & A | | | K & A & B | | | K & A & B & C | | |
| | Low | Est. | High | Low | Est. | High | Low | Est. | High | Low | Est. | High |
| P (unrestrained) | 0.005 | 0.007 | 0.009 | 0.003 | 0.038 | 0.042 | 0.159 | 0.168 | 0.176 | 0.268 | 0.278 | 0.289 |
| P (lap belt only) | -.000 | .001 | .003 | .011 | .017 | .022 | .092 | .105 | .118 | .187 | .204 | .221 |
| P (both belts used) | -.016 | .017 | .050 | -.012 | .034 | .080 | .074 | .169 | .265 | .143 | .254 | .365 |
| P (any restraint used) | .000 | .002 | .004 | .012 | .017 | .022 | .094 | .107 | .119 | .188 | 2.05 | .222 |
| C (unrestrained, lap belt only) | | 9.14 | | | 22.82 | | | 50.07 | | | 47.58 | |
| C (unrestrained, both belts used) | | .01 | | | .04 | | | .02 | | | .07 | |
| C (unrestrained, any restraint used) | | 8.01 | | | 22.47 | | | 48.27 | | | 47.21 | |
| C (lap belt only, both belts used) | | 1.51 | | | .26 | | | 1.89 | | | .61 | |
| R (unrestrained, lap belt only) | 1.84 | 5.36 | ***** | 1.52 | 2.28 | 3.77 | 1.35 | 1.60 | 1.92 | 1.21 | 1.37 | 1.55 |
| R (unrestrained, both belts used) | .11 | | 10.61 | 1.62 | | 2.94 | 1.42 | | 1.78 | 1.26 | | 1.47 |
| R (unrestrained, any restraint used) | .11 | .44 | -.59 | .42 | 1.11 | -3.43 | .60 | .99 | 2.39 | .73 | 1.10 | 2.02 |
| R (lap belt only, both belts used) | -.28 | | 1.16 | -.17 | | 2.39 | .52 | | 1.46 | .69 | | 1.50 |
| R (lap belt only, any restraint used) | 1.53 | 4.14 | ***** | 1.49 | 2.22 | 3.63 | 1.33 | 1.57 | 1.88 | 1.21 | 1.36 | 1.53 |
| R (lap belt only, both belts used) | .60 | | 7.69 | 1.59 | | 2.85 | 1.40 | | 1.74 | 1.26 | | 1.46 |
| R (lap belt only, any restraint used) | -.00 | .08 | -.18 | .14 | .49 | -1.79 | .35 | .62 | 1.60 | .51 | .80 | 1.54 |
| R (lap belt only, both belts used) | -.07 | | .24 | -.09 | | 1.06 | .32 | | .92 | .50 | | 1.10 |

Notes: 1—Negative probability confidence limits result from computations on a normal distribution. 2—Negative ratios result from negative lower probability confidence limits 3—Asterisks indicate a ratio of 100.0 or greater.

Because so few occupants were observed wearing both lap and shoulder belts there is little that can be concluded about their combined use. The confidence intervals for probabilities associated with the use of both belts are too large to draw meaningful conclusions. Furthermore, the chi-square tests between those using both belts and those either using just seat belts or no belts at all are not satisfactory to establish significant differences. Thus, the remainder of this discussion will be confined to comparisons between unrestrained occupants and those using lap belts only.

In the summary tables included in this discussion, probabilities and ratios of probabilities are included for the fatal outcome and for the combined outcome of being either killed or severely injured. The full set of tabulations present the statistics as-

sociated with all individual outcomes as well as with both cumulative ascending and descending injury levels. The probability values are shown to the nearest thousandth, however the ratios were computed before rounding off the probabilities. In the summary tables just the estimates are offered for the probabilities. For the ratios, both the estimate and lower boundary limit are presented. As indicated previously, there is only a 5% chance that the true ratio is less than the lower boundary limit.

As no commercial occupants using seat belts were observed to incur either fatal or serious injuries, the associated probabilities were all zero. Rather than enter zeroes in the table, dashes have been used to discourage their erroneous use.

Examining all vehicle occupants included

in the study, the estimate of the ratio of being killed (all ratios cited are for unrestrained occupants to those wearing seat or lap belts) is 4.15 with a lower boundary limit of 1.59. Thus for those occupants included in this study, unrestrained occupants were more than 4 times as likely to be killed as those wearing lap belts. The lower limit indicates that if the study were repeated there is 95% certainty that ratio would be at least 1.59. The ratio of the probabilities of being either killed or severely injured is 1.99 with a lower boundary of 1.37. That the ratio is lower for the combined outcome than for the singular outcome of being killed is somewhat logical but will not be pursued to any greater extent in this study as only opinion rather than specific observations could be offered.

ALL SPEED LIMITS

| Vehicle type | Seat position | Killed | | | | Killed or severely injured | | | | Sample size | Number killed |
|----------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|------------------|----------|----------------------------|-----------|------------------|----------|-------------|---------------|
| | | Probability | | Ratio—None/belts | | Probability | | Ratio—None/belts | | | |
| | | No belt | Seat belt | Lower | Estimate | No belt | Seat belt | Lower | Estimate | | |
| All vehicles | Driver | 0.007 | 0.001 | 1.65 | 5.89 | 0.035 | 0.014 | 1.52 | 2.46 | 6,960 | 38 |
| | Right front | .008 | .002 | | | .038 | .020 | .97 | 1.93 | 2,964 | 19 |
| | All front | .007 | .001 | 1.89 | 5.43 | .035 | .015 | 1.54 | 2.29 | 10,575 | 61 |
| | All rear | .004 | .005 | | | .021 | .027 | | | 2,222 | 10 |
| | All seats | .006 | .002 | 1.59 | 4.15 | .033 | .016 | 1.37 | 1.99 | 12,797 | 71 |
| Full-size cars | Driver | .007 | .001 | 1.51 | 7.80 | .036 | .014 | 1.40 | 2.51 | 4,427 | 22 |
| | Right front | .004 | .002 | | | .035 | .015 | 1.00 | 2.39 | 2,081 | 8 |
| | All front | .006 | .001 | 1.29 | 4.72 | .035 | .014 | 1.51 | 2.46 | 7,014 | 33 |
| | All rear | .003 | .005 | | | .016 | .021 | | | 1,769 | 5 |
| | All seats | .005 | .002 | .96 | 3.07 | .031 | .015 | 1.30 | 2.07 | 8,783 | 38 |
| Small cars | Driver | .008 | .002 | | | .044 | .019 | .99 | 2.32 | 1,533 | 11 |
| | Right front | .021 | | | | .054 | .041 | | | 645 | 11 |
| | All front | .013 | .002 | 1.32 | 6.81 | .047 | .024 | 1.01 | 1.97 | 2,252 | 23 |
| | All rear | .013 | | | | .043 | .069 | | | 428 | 5 |
| | All seats | .013 | .002 | 1.50 | 7.18 | .046 | .026 | .95 | 1.77 | 2,680 | 28 |
| All cars | Driver | .007 | .001 | 1.52 | 5.63 | .038 | .016 | 1.50 | 2.45 | 5,960 | 33 |
| | Right front | .008 | .002 | | | .039 | .021 | .96 | 1.91 | 2,726 | 19 |
| | All front | .007 | .001 | 1.84 | 5.63 | .038 | .017 | 1.52 | 2.28 | 9,266 | 56 |
| | All rear | .005 | .005 | | | .022 | .027 | | | 2,197 | 10 |
| | All seats | .007 | .002 | 1.54 | 4.06 | .034 | .018 | 1.34 | 1.95 | 11,463 | 66 |

| | | All speed limits | | | | | | | | Sample size | Number killed |
|------------------|---------------|------------------|-----------|------------------|----------|----------------------------|-----------|------------------|----------|-------------|---------------|
| | | Killed | | | | Killed or severely injured | | | | | |
| Vehicle type | Seat position | Probability | | Ratio—None/belts | | Probability | | Ratio—None/belts | | | |
| | | No belt | Seat belt | Lower | Estimate | No belt | Seat belt | Lower | Estimate | | |
| Small trucks | Driver | 0.003 | | | | 0.014 | | | | 360 | 1 |
| | Right front | | | | | .031 | | | | 115 | 0 |
| | All front | .002 | | | | .016 | | | | 526 | 1 |
| Big trucks | Driver | .013 | | | | .035 | | | | 363 | 4 |
| | Right front | | | | | .012 | | | | 97 | 0 |
| | All front | .010 | | | | .029 | | | | 478 | 4 |
| Tractor trailers | Driver | | | | | .017 | | | | 248 | 0 |
| | Right front | | | | | | | | | 20 | 0 |
| | All front | | | | | .016 | | | | 268 | 0 |
| All trucks | Driver | .006 | | | | .023 | | | | 971 | 5 |
| | Right front | | | | | .020 | | | | 232 | 0 |
| | All front | .005 | | | | .021 | | | | 1,272 | 5 |

ALL SEAT POSITIONS

| Speed limit range | Vehicle type | Killed | | | | Killed or severely injured | | | | Sample size | Number killed |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|----------------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|---------------|
| | | Probability | | Ratio (none/belts) | | Probability | | Ratio (none/belts) | | | |
| | | No belt | Seat belt | Lower | Estimate | No belt | Seat belt | Lower | Estimate | | |
| 20 m.p.h. or less | Cars: | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Full size | | | | | | | | | 65 | 0 |
| | Small | | | | | | | | | 21 | 0 |
| | All | | | | | | | | | 86 | 0 |
| | Trucks: | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 |
| | Small | | | | | | | | | 2 | 0 |
| | Big | | | | | | | | | 2 | 0 |
| | Tractor-trailers | | | | | | | | | 4 | 0 |
| | All | | | | | | | | | 90 | 0 |
| | All vehicles | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 to 30 m.p.h. | Cars: | | | | | 0.008 | | | | 155 | 0 |
| | Full size | | | | | | | | | 65 | 0 |
| | Small | | | | | | | | | 220 | 0 |
| | All | | | | | .006 | | | | | |
| | Trucks: | | | | | | | | | 12 | 0 |
| | Small | | | | | | | | | 10 | 0 |
| | Big | | | | | | | | | 5 | 0 |
| | Tractor-trailers | | | | | | | | | 27 | 0 |
| | All | | | | | | | | | 247 | 0 |
| | All vehicles | | | | | .005 | | | | | |
| 31 to 40 m.p.h. | Cars: | | | | | | | | | 736 | 0 |
| | Full size | | | | | .012 | | | | 238 | 0 |
| | Small | | | | | .020 | | | | 974 | 0 |
| | All | | | | | .014 | | | | | |
| | Trucks: | | | | | | | | | 30 | 0 |
| | Small | | | | | | | | | 27 | 0 |
| | Big | | | | | | | | | 13 | 0 |
| | Tractor-trailers | | | | | | | | | 70 | 0 |
| | All | | | | | | | | | 1,044 | 0 |
| | All vehicles | | | | | .013 | | | | | |
| 21 to 40 m.p.h. | Cars: | | | | | | | | | 891 | 0 |
| | Full size | | | | | .011 | | | | 303 | 0 |
| | Small | | | | | .016 | | | | 1,194 | 0 |
| | All | | | | | .012 | | | | | |
| | Trucks: | | | | | | | | | 42 | 0 |
| | Small | | | | | | | | | 37 | 0 |
| | Big | | | | | | | | | 18 | 0 |
| | Tractor-trailers | | | | | | | | | 97 | 0 |
| | All | | | | | | | | | 1,291 | 0 |
| | All vehicles | | | | | .011 | | | | | |
| 41 to 50 m.p.h. | Cars: | | | | | | | | | 2,192 | 7 |
| | Full size | 0.004 | | | | .038 | 0.008 | 1.78 | 4.94 | 787 | 10 |
| | Small | .017 | | | | .066 | .017 | 1.28 | 3.89 | 2,979 | 17 |
| | All | .007 | | | | .045 | .011 | 1.94 | 4.27 | | |
| | Trucks: | | | | | | | | | 126 | 1 |
| | Small | .010 | | | | .029 | | | | 237 | 2 |
| | Big | .009 | | | | .024 | | | | 149 | 0 |
| | Tractor-trailers | | | | | .007 | | | | 512 | 3 |
| | All | .007 | | | | .020 | | | | 3,491 | 20 |
| | All vehicles | .007 | | | | .041 | .010 | 1.96 | 4.38 | | |
| 51 to 60 m.p.h. | Cars: | | | | | | | | | 4,489 | 26 |
| | Full size | .007 | .002 | | | .032 | .018 | 1.01 | 1.82 | 1,271 | 18 |
| | Small | .016 | .004 | | | .048 | .026 | | | 5,760 | 44 |
| | All | .009 | .003 | 1.11 | 3.43 | .036 | .020 | 1.10 | 1.82 | | |
| | Trucks: | | | | | | | | | 329 | 0 |
| | Small | | | | | .014 | | | | 170 | 2 |
| | Big | .013 | | | | .046 | | | | 98 | 0 |
| | Tractor-trailers | | | | | .021 | | | | 597 | 2 |
| | All | .004 | | | | .025 | | | | 6,357 | 46 |
| | All vehicles | .008 | 0.002 | 1.12 | 3.41 | .035 | .019 | 1.13 | 1.86 | | |
| 61 to 70 m.p.h. | Cars: | | | | | | | | | 965 | 2 |
| | Full size | .002 | .003 | | | .026 | .027 | | | 251 | 0 |
| | Small | | | | | .028 | .079 | | | 1,216 | 2 |
| | All | .001 | .003 | | | .037 | .055 | | | | |
| | Trucks: | | | | | | | | | 27 | 0 |
| | Small | | | | | | | | | 30 | 0 |
| | Big | | | | | .333 | | | | 3 | 0 |
| | Tractor-trailers | | | | | .022 | | | | 60 | 0 |
| | All | | | | | .026 | .034 | | | 1,276 | 2 |
| | All vehicles | .001 | .003 | | | | | | | | |
| 71 to 70 m.p.h. | Cars: | | | | | | | | | 7,646 | 35 |
| | Full size | .005 | .002 | .87 | 2.83 | .033 | .017 | 1.24 | 1.97 | 2,309 | 28 |
| | Small | .015 | .002 | 1.57 | 7.51 | .052 | .029 | .95 | 1.77 | 9,955 | 63 |
| | All | .007 | .002 | 1.47 | 3.92 | .037 | .020 | 1.29 | 1.88 | | |
| | Trucks: | | | | | | | | | 482 | 1 |
| | Small | .002 | | | | .017 | | | | 437 | 4 |
| | Big | .010 | | | | .031 | | | | 250 | 0 |
| | Tractor-trailers | | | | | .017 | | | | 1,169 | 5 |
| | All | .005 | | | | .022 | | | | 11,124 | 68 |
| | All vehicles | .007 | .002 | 1.53 | 4.01 | .036 | .109 | 1.31 | 1.91 | | |

Separate data are offered for full size cars and those less than full size. However, as the range of smaller cars, from imported compact to those just under full size sedans, is large, the discussion will be limited to the data for all cars inclusive.

For front seat car occupants the ratio of the probabilities of being killed is 5.36 with a lower boundary limit of 1.84. For the combined outcomes of being either killed or severely injured the ratio is 2.28 with a lower boundary limit of 1.52.

The ratios associated with rear seat car occupants present a different picture. For both sets of ratios the chi-square test does not indicate a significant difference between the outcomes for restrained and unrestrained rear seat occupants.

As indicated in the summary table showing the probabilities and ratios as a function of speed limit, no fatalities were recorded for the 1291 occupants traveling on routes with speed limits between 21 and 40 mph.

In the 41-50 mph speed limit range all 20 persons killed of the 3491 observed were not wearing seat belts. For passenger car occupants the ratio of the probabilities of the combined outcomes of being either killed or severely injured is 4.27 with a lower boundary limit of 1.94.

In the 51-60 mph speed limit range for passenger car occupants the ratio of the probabilities of being killed is 3.43 with a lower boundary limit of 1.11. For the combined outcome the ratio is 1.82 with a lower boundary limit of 1.10.

No ratios can be offered in the 61-70 mph speed limit range as the statistical tests did not indicate any significant differences.

Interestingly, seat belts appear to be of greater value in the lower speed range, 41-50 mph.

CONCLUSIONS

The study has achieved its principal objective with respect to passenger car occupants. The relative risk of death has been computed as 4.06 times as great for passenger car occupants not wearing seat belts as for those using seat belts; the relative risk of sustaining either a fatal or severe injury 1.95 times as great. The advantages of seat belt use in preventing serious or fatal injury for front seat occupants has been shown far greater than for rear seat occupants. The advantages of seat belts have been shown for routes having speed limits in the 41-60 mph range.

The study has also shown that only 21% of passenger car occupants are using some type of seat restraint. Furthermore, when seat restraints are available, only 32% of occupants having a choice elected to use them. Only 4% of the occupants having a shoulder belt available used same.

The results of this study can be more fully appreciated when they are applied to the national totals of 55,200 deaths and 2,000,000 disabling injuries resulting from traffic accidents in 1968.

Of the national total of 55,200 traffic fatalities reported in 1968, approximately 42,700 were motor vehicle occupants; the other 12,500 were pedestrians, bicyclists and motorcyclists. Using the vehicle type involvement and seat position distributions observed in this study, 33,750 traffic fatalities were front seat passenger car occupants. Furthermore, it is estimated that 1,222,000 disabling injuries were incurred by front seat passenger car occupants.

According to the distribution observed in this study, 7% of front seat passenger car fatalities occurred with the use of seat belts. This leaves approximately 31,400 front seat passenger car occupants who were killed and not wearing seat belts.

If these 31,400 front seat passenger car occupants had all been wearing seat belts, the estimate derived from this study is that but 5,860 would have been killed indicating

a savings of 25,540 lives. This estimate is based on the calculated relative risk of death of 5.36 to 1 between unrestrained and belted front seat passenger car occupants. If a relative risk of 1.84, the lower limit on the 90% confidence interval, is used, 17,065 would have been killed resulting in a savings of 14,335 lives.

Of the 1,222,000 disabling injuries that were incurred by front seat passenger car occupants in 1968, it is estimated that 13.7% took place while seat belts were in use. This leaves approximately 1,024,590 disabling injuries which occurred without the use of seat belts.

Employing the calculated relative risk of incurring serious injury of 2.00 to 1 between unrestrained and belted front seat passenger car occupants, it appears that 512,295 disabling injuries could have been prevented through universal seat belt use. Using a relative risk of 1.29, the lower limit on the 90% confidence interval, universal seat belt use could have produced a savings of 230,335 disabling injuries.

In summary, in 1968 the universal use of seat belts by front seat passenger car occupants could have resulted in a savings of between 14,335 and 25,540 lives and a reduction of between 230,335 and 512,295 serious injuries. As the number of accidents continue to rise, possible savings in future years are even greater.

The study illustrates a broad inconsistency between mandatory seat belt installation in new vehicles, thus far approaching a total expenditure of \$1,000,000,000, and the relatively small advantage that is taken of this investment. This situation should be resolved by state legislatures.

The consequences of mandatory seat belt use, at least in the front seats of passenger cars must be weighed; the number of fatal and severe injuries to be prevented vs. the infringement upon individual choice as well as the cost of seat belt installation for cars presently not so equipped.

Admittedly, mandatory seat belt usage creates problems in enforcement be it by police or indirectly by reduced insurance company benefits in case of an involvement when not restrained. However, it is believed that mandatory seat belt usage legislation would be sufficient in itself for most people to react accordingly.

The Highway Safety Foundation endorses such legislation and contends that the state legislatures must at least address themselves to this issue.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Data processing facilities employed in this study were made available through the generosity of the Nationwide Insurance Company.

RESUME OF "A STUDY OF SEAT RESTRAINT USE AND EFFECTIVENESS IN TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS"

(By the Highway Safety Foundation with the cooperation of the Ohio State Highway Patrol and Mansfield, Ohio, Police Department, Feb. 3, 1970)

MOTIVATION FOR THE STUDY

In recent years there has been much publicity and emphasis on the life saving value of motor vehicle occupant seat restraints, namely seat belts. To date, this has resulted in required seat restraints on all new passenger cars. Such installation represents an annual cost to the motoring public estimated in excess of \$250,000,000 in the purchase of new cars. The total investment that has been made for seat restraints since they became available approaches \$1,000,000,000. An accompanying observation has been that most vehicle occupants who have the opportunity to use seat belts do not. It was believed that this study could indicate the assumed advantages of using seat restraints and serve as an instrument to achieve a much greater use of a safety device for which great capital investment has already been dedicated.

METHOD OF STUDY

The data used in the study were obtained from 4571 accidents investigated by the Ohio State Highway Patrol and the Mansfield, Ohio Police Department during the month of August, 1969. These accidents involved 12,797 vehicle occupants. In each investigation, special data were gathered for each vehicle occupant including the availability and use of seat restraints and the level of injury incurred.

HIGHLIGHT STUDY RESULTS

1. 20% of all vehicle occupants were using seat restraints.
2. 65% of all vehicle occupants had some type of seat restraint available.
3. Of those occupants having seat restraints available, 31% used some.
4. When the driver used his seat belt 66% of right front seat passengers also used them.
5. Shoulder belts are used by only 4% of those vehicle occupants having them available.
6. The chance of being killed was observed to be 4.06 as great for unrestrained passenger car occupants as compared to those wearing seatbelts.
7. The chance of being killed was observed to be 5.36 as great for unrestrained front seat passenger car occupants as compared to those wearing seat belts.
8. The use of seat belts did not significantly affect the chance that a rear seat passenger car occupant would be killed.
9. The chance of being severely injured was observed to be twice as great for unrestrained front seat passenger car occupants as compared to those wearing seat belts.

IMPLICATION OF STUDY RESULTS

The results of this study can be more fully appreciated when they are applied to the national totals of 55,200 deaths and 2,000,000 disabling injuries resulting from traffic accidents in 1968. From national data sources and observations made in this study it is estimated that 31,400 deaths and 1,024,590 disabling injuries were incurred by front seat passenger car occupants who were not wearing seat belts.

If, in 1968, all front seat passenger car occupants had been wearing seat belts, the study indicates that 25,540 lives could have been saved. This estimate is based on the observed relative risk of death of 5.36 to 1 between unrestrained and belted front seat passenger car occupants. Using a relative risk of death of but 1.84 to 1, a very conservative statistical estimate of the true relative risk, 14,335 lives would have been saved had all front seat passenger car occupants worn seat belts. By a similar means of analysis, between 230,335 and 512,295 disabling injuries could have been prevented had all front seat passenger car occupants worn seat belts.

In summary, in 1968 the universal use of seat belts by front seat passenger car occupants could have resulted in a savings of between 14,335 and 25,540 lives and a reduction of between 230,335 and 512,295 serious injuries. As the number of accidents continues to rise, possible savings in future years are even greater.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study has illustrated a broad inconsistency between mandatory seat belt installation in new vehicles, thus far approaching a total public expenditure of \$1,000,000,000, and the relatively small advantage that is taken of this investment. This situation should be resolved by state legislatures.

The consequences of mandatory seat belt use, at least in the front seats of passenger cars, must be weighed; the number of fatal and severe injuries to be prevented vs. the infringement upon individual choice as well as the cost of seat belt installation for cars presently not so equipped.

Admittedly, mandatory seat belt use would create problems in enforcement by police or indirectly by reduced insurance benefits in case of an involvement when not restrained. However, it is believed that mandatory seat belt usage legislation would be sufficient in itself for most people to react accordingly.

The Highway Safety Foundation endorses such legislation and contends that the state legislatures must at least address themselves to this issue.

SOME NOTES ABOUT THE HIGHWAY SAFETY FOUNDATION

The Highway Safety Foundation is a nonprofit, tax-exempt organization registered in the state of Ohio that is supported by concerned individuals and industries. As its name implies, the Foundation's main function is to engage in activities that can help improve safety on the highway and simultaneously afford a higher quality transportation system.

From its beginning in 1960 until the present time the Foundation has been active in assistance to law enforcement agencies through production and distribution of recruiting films and through paying the cost of advanced, formal education for upper-chelon enforcement officers; also in public education, through production and distribution of motion pictures portraying what actually happens in crashes and potential crash situations. Foundation films have been seen by millions of students as a part of driver education programs.

Since 1967 the Foundation has concentrated its effort in the area of onsite, multidisciplinary accident investigation. In this program the Foundation has continuously fielded a team of specialists who perform their detailed investigations at the actual accident scene. Through this effort it is believed that insight can be developed toward safety countermeasures within and/or modifications to the entire highway transportation process that are compatible with social and economic objectives. In addition to fielding its own team of specialists, the Foundation has either helped or is working in cooperation with the states of Ohio, Pennsylvania, Maryland and South Carolina in conducting similar programs.

Foundation personnel, both resident and consultant, represent a wide and varied experience in many fields. These include the disciplines of psychology, vehicle mechanics, medicine, traffic and highway engineering, police technology, photography, statistics, communications and data processing.

The Foundation has begun to undertake a series of special studies of which its work concerning the value of seat belts represents the first. The seat belt study has shown that great reductions in the number of persons killed and seriously injured on the highway can be achieved and has illustrated the foundation's aggressive program by recommending that, in the absence of success from mass education activities, legislation be passed to require seat belt use.

HIGHWAY SAFETY FOUNDATION TRUSTEES

The Honorable James A. Rhodes, Governor of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.

John D. Bolesky, President, Therm-O-Disc, Inc., Mansfield, Ohio.

Ralph E. Boyd, Chairman of the Board, Allison Iron Works Manufacturing Co., Allison, Ohio.

R. Donald Campbell, M.D., Mansfield, Ohio.

George S. Case, Jr., President, The Lamson & Sessions Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

Col. R. M. Chiaramonte, Superintendent, Ohio State Highway Patrol, Columbus, Ohio.

Ansion B. Cook, Executive Director, Ohio Peace Officer Training Council, Columbus, Ohio.

Paul Cooper, President, Cleveland Twist Drill Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

James C. Gorman, President, Gorman-Rupp Co., Mansfield, Ohio.

George J. Grabner, President, Weatherhead Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

Avery C. Hand, Jr., President, First National Bank, Mansfield, Ohio.

Charles Hand, President, T. & A. Saweway Markets, Mansfield, Ohio.

J. D. Harnett, Vice President, The Standard Oil Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

John Hart, Vice President, B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio.

Wilson Hirschfeld, State Editor, The Plain Dealer, Cleveland, Ohio.

W. C. Killgallon, Vice President, The Ohio Art Co., Bryan, Ohio.

Henry D. Lester, Treasurer and Vice President, The Sherwin-Williams Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

B. H. Little, Treasurer, Ohio Brass Co., Mansfield, Ohio.

M. J. Ludwig, Vice President, Basic, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio.

Hugh D. Luke, President, Reliance Electric & Engineering Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

P. E. Masheter, Director, Ohio Department of Highways, Columbus, Ohio.

Roy B. Miner, President, Cook Coffee Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

Charles Nail, President The Lumbermens Mutual Ins. Co., Mansfield, Ohio.

Warren C. Nelson, Director, Ohio Department of Highway Safety, Columbus, Ohio.

James Pedler, Jr., Attorney, Akron, Ohio.

W. R. Tappan, President, The Tappan Co., Mansfield, Ohio.

John A. Saunders, President, General Fireproofing Co., Youngstown, Ohio.

Allan K. Shaw, Senior Vice President, Cleveland Trust Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

Richard Stewart, Partner, Jones, Day, Cockley & Reavis, Cleveland, Ohio.

Tinkham Veale II, Chairman and President, Alco Standard Corp., Philadelphia, Pa.

R. D. Wayman, Partner, Ernst & Ernst, Cleveland, Ohio.

Col. Scott B. Radcliffe, Director of Research, Retired Superintendent, Ohio State Highway Patrol.

KEYNOTE REMARKS BY HON. FRANK M. CLARK, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE HIGHWAY SAFETY FOUNDATION LUNCHEON, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 3, 1970

Today we are being presented with a concrete recommendation for greatly reducing the number of deaths and serious injuries that occur each year on our nation's highways. In an age when 55,200 people lose their lives and over 2,000,000 more suffer disabling injuries in a single year, we cannot afford to ignore any possible course of action which promises to significantly reduce this carnage.

The Highway Safety Foundation's study of seat restraint use and effectiveness suggests a specific course of action, based on an examination of facts and this is of great value. Too many studies brought to public attention thoroughly analyze a problem but fail to set forth the steps required to solve it. As a legislator, I too, must use the tools of research and professional studies to suggest solutions in order that I and my associates may select the best course to follow.

For the benefit of those not well acquainted with the Highway Safety Foundation, this private organization specializes in conducting on-site investigations of traffic accidents using a multidisciplinary team approach. Whereas many of us read reports of traffic accidents and related studies, the men of the highway safety foundation are confronted with the results of the accident at the scene. They see and often assist the injured parties. They also come face-to-face with the traffic fatality. Only too often they encounter a traffic death that could have been prevented had a seat belt been worn. The Foundation study, undertaken at its own expense, represents an effort to obtain a more conclusive answer or substantiation of

what appears to be the fact: That seat belt use significantly reduces the chance of death and serious injury in a traffic accident.

1. Between 15,000 and 25,000 lives and 230,000 to 512,000 serious injuries could be saved in a single year if all front seat passenger car occupants wore seat belts.

2. Unfortunately only 31% of vehicle occupants having seat belts available are using them when involved in an accident; shoulder harness use is almost nonexistent.

3. To date approximately one billion dollars has been invested in providing occupant seat restraints in new vehicles.

The Foundation's recommendation that seat belt use be mandatory for front seat passenger car occupants is logical. We have already mandated that seat belts be installed in all new cars. We have also observed that advertising and public education campaigns have been unsuccessful in getting the majority of people to voluntarily wear seat belts.

While work goes on to develop more crash-worthy vehicles, energy absorbing systems that do not rely on the driver or his passengers, and the prevention of accidents in the first place, we must look to interim measures until the desired goals can be reached.

The Highway Safety Foundation has issued a challenge to the state legislatures. In projecting and presenting the benefits to be gained from compulsory seat belt use, a specific course of action has been offered. What is now needed is a governmental acceptance of the recommendation.

I personally concur with the Foundation's recommendation. I believe that the benefits to be achieved will far outweigh the discomforts.

We cannot let the momentum of this study end with this conference. The Foundation has undertaken its study and presented its results. The next step is ours.

NEWS RELEASE BY HIGHWAY SAFETY FOUNDATION, MANSFIELD, OHIO, FEBRUARY 3, 1970

With the aid of the Ohio State Highway Patrol and the Mansfield, Ohio Police Department, the Highway Safety Foundation recently found some interesting results in a study on the use and effectiveness of seat restraints in automobiles.

The Highway Safety Foundation observed that although over one billion dollars has already been invested in the installation of seat belts, most occupants who have the opportunity to use the belts do not.

Of the 4,571 automobile accidents investigated in the study, it was found that the chances of an unrestrained person being killed was 4.06 as great as occupants wearing belts. For the front seat passenger, chances of death were 5.36 as great.

The results of the study show that the universal use of seat belts by front seat occupants could have saved as many as 25,000 lives per year and possibly reduced over 512,000 serious injuries.

The study concluded that the inconsistency between mandatory seat belt installation, approaching a public expenditure of one billion dollars, and the relatively small advantage of this investment should be resolved by the various state legislatures.

HSF feels that consequences of mandatory seat belt use must be weighted in terms of fatal and severe injuries prevention versus the infringement upon individual choice as well as cost of installation of this vital safety device. HSF endorses legislation at the State level making seat belt use mandatory and contends that state legislatures must address themselves to this issue.

Supported by concerned individuals and industries, the Highway Safety Foundation, a nonprofit, tax-exempt organization, has as its main function to engage in activities that can help improve safety on the highway and simultaneously afford a higher quality transportation system.

GOVERNMENT PLANNING THREATENS HOME BUYERS FREEDOM

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, my attention has just been directed to a very effective and timely editorial in the December 31 issue of the Oak Lawn, Ill., News, commenting on the threat to individual homeownership which develops from Federal Government paternalism.

The editorial is an extremely effective summary of the situation and merits thoughtful review by officials in the HUD bureaucracy as well as Members of Congress. It follows:

GOVERNMENT PLANNING THREATENS HOME BUYERS FREEDOM

It is conceivable that in the not too distant future, middle income American families will be dependent on the federal government for their housing. The public has already accepted the idea that local and federal government provide public housing for low income families and if present government policies and economic conditions continue, middle income families not only will not be able to afford a home of their own, but housing will not be available for them.

It is ironic that the federal government will find it necessary to solve the critical housing shortage in the United States when it was the federal government which created the problem in the first place. Through years of deficit financing brought about by an idea that the American people had an endless supply of money and also the idea that the United States could solve all the world and social problems by spending more money, the federal government has now found itself in a position of having to pay historically high interest rates in order to finance its various programs and the Viet Nam war.

This has created a situation whereby capital has moved away from savings and loan associations, the institutions which supply the major portion of the nations home mortgage money. Today, rates on government securities have risen to an historical high of about 8% while obligations of agencies of the United States Government are currently paying in excess of 8%. Savings and loan associations, which traditionally have been the major source of mortgage credit, are restricted by government regulations to paying 5 1/4% on pass-book accounts and up to 6% on certificate accounts and find themselves unable to compete with the rate of return on government securities.

Preston Martin, chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, which advances mortgage funds to savings and loans, has stated that the rate that the S & L's will have to pay to borrow money from the Federal Home Loan Bank will be increased up to 8% some time in 1970. This will further tighten an already non-existent supply of mortgage funds to the home buyer and home builder. In the Chicago metropolitan area in the month of November, permits for homes and apartments declined for the seventh consecutive month compared to a year ago. Home building permits dropped 42% to the lowest November level since 1946, while permits for new apartments dropped 61%, the lowest since 1962.

George Romney, secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, in a recent speech said that our country, to meet its housing needs, should be producing 2,400,000 new housing units a year, and that we are only building at a rate of 1,200,000 units.

Not only has the high interest rates dried up the source of mortgage credit, but inflation has pushed the cost of homes so high that the average American is being priced out of the home buying market. Today, people are paying 30 and 40 thousand dollars for homes when ten years ago the same people would have paid 20 to 25 thousand dollars for a comparable home. So we find ourselves in a situation where the government has made it impossible for private enterprise to freely operate to meet the housing needs of the country, and the government will now take upon itself to solve the problem for us.

Already Romney is conducting negotiations with giant companies to initiate "Operation Breakthru", the government's plan to provide more housing, homes which will be planned by the government and which will be factory built, and built on land aggregated by state and local officials. Romney has already announced that the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which has been in existence for four years, is now to be really organized for the first time. In the department there will be four assistant secretaries, one of these being Mr. Eugene Gulledge who will have the title of assistant secretary of Housing Production and Mortgage Credit. It will be his responsibility to supervise all housing production and rehabilitation activities and initiate construction and financial settlement for public housing.

Therefore, we see that if the present trend continues, there is a distinct possibility that many of us will be living in a home planned and developed or subsidized by the federal government and we will have lost our freedom of choice of purchasing our own home.

It is paradoxical, that in America, the country in which private home ownership has meant so much and that has been protected so diligently by the government over the years, that the same government through its present policies may well destroy this cherished heritage.

INVITATION TO CHAOS

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the January 30, 1970, issue of Life magazine by Mr. Theodore H. White in which he deals with the election reform legislation approved by the House of Representatives last September.

In one of the most lucid, reasoned arguments yet put to print, Mr. White says the action by the House was "a triumph of noble purpose over common-sense," and "an invitation to national chaos."

I invite Members of the House and Senate, as well as members of the State legislatures who eventually will be confronted with this issue, to ponder well the warnings laid down by Mr. White.

The article follows:

DIRECT ELECTIONS: AN INVITATION TO NATIONAL CHAOS

(By Theodore H. White)

Last September, in a triumph of noble purpose over common sense, the House passed and has sent to the Senate a proposal to abolish the Federal System.

It is not called that, of course. Put forth as an amendment to the Constitution, the new scheme offers a supposedly better way of electing Presidents. Advanced with the delusive rhetoric of *vox populi, vox Dei*, it not only wipes out the obsolete Electoral College but abolishes the sovereign States as voting units. In the name of The People, it proposes that a giant plebiscite pour all 70,000,000 American votes into a single pool whose winner—whether by 5,000 or 5,000,000—is hailed as National Chief.

American elections are a naked transaction in power—a cruel, brawling year-long adventure swept by profound passion and prejudice. Quite naturally, therefore, Constitution and tradition have tried to limit the sweep of passions, packaging the raw votes within each state, weighting each state's electoral vote proportionately to population, letting each make its own rules and police its own polls.

The new theory holds that an instantaneous direct cascade of votes offers citizens a more responsible choice of leadership—and it is only when one tests high-minded theory against reality that it becomes nightmare.

Since the essence of the proposal is change in the way votes are counted, the first test must be a hard look at vote-counting as it actually operates. Over most of the United States votes are cast and counted honestly. No one anymore can steal an election that is not close to begin with, and the past generation vote fraud has diminished dramatically.

Still, anyone who trusts the precise count in Gary, Ind.; Cook County, Ill.; Duval County, Texas; Suffolk County, Mass.; or in half a dozen border and Southern states is out of touch with political reality. Under the present electoral system, however, crooks in such areas are limited to toying with the electoral vote of one state only; and there only when margins are exceptionally tight. Even then, when the dial riggers, ballot stuffers, late counters and recounters are stimulated to play election-night poker with the results, their art is balanced by crooks of the other party playing the same game.

John F. Kennedy won in 1960 by the thinnest margin of 118,550—less than 1/2 of one percent of the national total—in an election stained with outright fraud in at least three states. No one challenged his victory, however, because the big national decision had been made by electoral votes of honest-count states, sealed off from contamination by fraud elsewhere—and because scandal could as well be charged to Republicans as to Democrats. But if, henceforth, all the raw votes from Hawaii to Maine are funneled into one vast pool, and popular results are as close as 1960 and 1968, the pressure to cheat or call recounts must penetrate everywhere—for any vote stolen anywhere in the Union pressures politicians thousands of miles away to balance or protest it. Twice in the past decade, the new proposal would have brought America to chaos.

To enforce honest vote-counting in all the nation's 170,000 precincts, national policing becomes necessary. So, too, do uniform federal laws on voter qualifications. New laws, for example, will have to forbid any state from increasing its share of the total by enfranchising youngsters of 18 (as Kentucky and Georgia do now) while most others limit voting to those over 21. Rest

dence requirements, too, must be made uniform in all states. The centralization required breaches all American tradition.

Reality forces candidates today to plan campaigns on many levels, choosing groups and regions to which they must appeal, importantly educating themselves on local issues in states they seek to carry.

But if states are abolished as voting units, TV becomes absolutely dominant. Campaign strategy changes from delicately assembling a winning coalition of states and becomes a media effort to capture the largest share of the national "vote market." Instead of courting regional party leaders by compromise, candidates will rely on media masters. Issues will be shaped in national TV studios, and the heaviest swat will go to the candidate who raises the most money to buy the best time and most "creative" TV talent.

The most ominous domestic reality today is race confrontation. Black votes count today because blacks vote chiefly in big-city states where they make the margin of difference. No candidate seeking New York's 43 electoral votes, Pennsylvania's 29, Illinois' 26 can avoid courting the black vote that may swing those states. If states are abolished as voting units, the chief political leverage of Negroes is also abolished. Whenever a race issue has been settled by plebiscite—from California's Proposition 14 (on Open Housing) in 1964 to New York's Police Review Board in 1966—the plebiscite vote has put the blacks down. Yet a paradox of the new rhetoric is that Southern conservatives, who have most to gain by the new proposal, oppose it, while Northern liberals, who have most to lose, support it because it is hallowed in the name of The People.

What is wrong in the old system is not state-by-state voting. What is wrong is the anachronistic Electoral College and the mischievous anonymous "electors" can perpetrate in the wake of a close election. Even more dangerous is the provision that lets the House, if no candidate has an electoral majority, choose the President by the undemocratic unit rule—one state, one vote. These dangers can be eliminated simply by an amendment which abolishes the Electoral College but retains the electoral vote by each state and which, next, provides that in an election where there is no electoral majority, senators and congressmen, individually voting in joint session and hearing the voices of the people in their districts, will elect a President.

What is right about the old system is the sense of identity it gives Americans. As they march to the polls, Bay Staters should feel Massachusetts is speaking; Hoosiers should feel Indiana is speaking; blacks and other minorities should feel their votes count; so, too, should Southerners from Tidewater to the Gulf. The Federal System has worked superbly for almost two centuries. It can and should be speedily improved. But to reduce Americans to faceless digits on an enormous tote board, in a plebiscite swept by demagoguery, manipulated by TV, at the mercy of crooked counters—this is an absurdity for which goodwill and noble theory are no justification.

GILBERT OPPOSES VETO OF HEALTH AND EDUCATION FUNDS

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I voted to override the President's veto of the

Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill, and I regret the House of Representatives did not have the two-thirds necessary to nullify the President's irresponsible act.

President Nixon declared that he vetoed this vital measure because it appropriated \$1 billion more than he wanted for educational programs. He said this \$1 billion would be inflationary. In a total Federal budget of almost \$200 billion, this sum represents barely one-half of 1 percent. That one-half of 1 percent does not represent the inflationary edge. But, Mr. Speaker, I do believe it will deny education opportunities to many American schoolchildren.

I am more opposed to inflation than President Nixon—because I represent men and women who pay for it out of meager weekly paychecks. But I understand the difference, in building a sound economy, between investment and waste. I think the President should use other methods available to him to combat inflation. As I have often advocated, he should take a more critical look at exorbitant military spending instead of jeopardizing education. I propose to invest in the young men and women of this country, on whose schooling every American depends for economic growth and stability.

Mr. Speaker, the President has vetoed the appropriation bill which provides funds for many of our major domestic programs: education, health, and anti-poverty. New York City will lose \$36 million in education funds. This will mean the curtailment in New York City of programs for remedial courses, special facilities and student loans to aid the low-income student with college potential. The bilingual education program, which I was instrumental in getting through Congress, will be cut back by \$1 million.

Some 450,000 youngsters may have to be dropped from title I programs next fall. Another 250,000 will be deprived of summer programs; library funds will be cut back by \$1.3 million, vocational programs will be curtailed, and handicapped pupils will suffer the loss of \$500,000.

In many cases, school districts have borrowed to meet the commitments in anticipation of Federal funding. In other cases, locally derived funds budgeted for the end of the school year have already been spent in anticipation of the forthcoming Health, Education, and Welfare funds.

Funds will be reduced for mental health services, medical research, consumer protection, and environmental health services—all programs which I strongly supported and have witnessed as they have made tremendous contributions to the health and well-being of our citizens. Several thousand potential medical students will lose opportunities for loans, and research for cures for major crippling and killing diseases, such as cancer and heart ailments, will be set back needlessly.

The New York City Board of Education has a deficit of over \$750 million at the present time. The veto of this bill is going to mean a greater deficit. The city's plans call for the beginning of construction of 24 urgently needed

schools this year, and yet we are able to begin only 15 because of increases in building costs. Education costs in New York State rose from \$1.6 billion a decade ago to \$4.1 billion this year.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for the increased appropriation for HEW when it first came before the House in July 1969. No one is more concerned about the health and education needs of our country than I am, and I shall continue to support governmental cooperation and assistance among all levels of government to provide the best possible quality of education and medical care for Americans. Education should be our Nation's No. 1 priority. It is a weapon against crime in the streets, it is a sound investment in the youth of our country, a strong force against unemployment and poverty.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that President Nixon's veto will halt the forces of inflation. But I do believe it will deny education opportunities to American schoolchildren.

WASHINGTON REPORT

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I periodically make a report to the people of the Second Congressional District of Nebraska, whom I have the honor to represent in the U.S. House of Representatives.

This is my fifth report for the 91st Congress:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM)

January, 1970.

PLATTE RIVER DAM PROJECT LOSES IN POLL

DEAR FRIENDS: Near the close of the first session of the 91st Congress I sent to each household in the Second Congressional District a questionnaire seeking your views on important issues facing the District and nation.

You were wonderful. The return was overwhelming and I am the envy of my fellow members in the House of Representatives who seldom receive such a response.

As you might expect, the closest margin on any direct question was on the proposed construction of the Platte River Dam and Reservoir, which I have opposed from the outset.

Of those returning the questionnaires, 40.5 percent were opposed to the project, compared to 36.2 percent in favor of the \$500 million undertaking. The remaining 23.3 percent expressed no opinion.

The majority of those returning questionnaires in four of the five counties in the Second District—Burt, Cass, Douglas and Washington—were opposed to the dam. In Sarpy County, the tally was 40.8 percent for the project, 31.6 percent opposed and 27.6 percent registering no opinion.

As I have stated on a number of occasions, the area of greatest potential growth in Nebraska is the corridor between Omaha and Lincoln.

I am certain this, coupled with the inundation of 126,000 acres of choice farm land and a growing skepticism as to its recreational value, prompted the negative response to my questionnaire.

SUMMARY—91ST CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------|
| Days in Session..... | 186 |
| Total Bills Introduced..... | 19,950 |
| Cunningham Bills Introduced..... | 84 |
| Reported out of Committee..... | 1,451 |
| Measures Passed..... | 1,140 |
| Public Laws..... | 190 |

PAPPIO RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSURED

Many have overlooked the recreational potential offered by the Pappio Watershed Project, which I have long fostered.

With money now available for planning and property acquisition, construction funds will soon follow for the 21 dams.

Chairman Milt Fricke of Papillion and his Pappio Watershed Board have been busy and the results are gratifying. The State Game, Forestation and Parks Commission has signed a letter of intent to be responsible for recreation development around all 21 of the dams. Douglas County and Omaha have indicated interest in incorporating several of the dam sites into their park system. Both Sarpy and Washington Counties indicate a willingness to participate in the program.

POSTAL CORPORATION HAS BIG EDGE

President Nixon's proposal to replace the present Post Office Department with a wholly government-owned corporation received overwhelming approval in my Opinion Poll.

Almost 60 percent of those returning questionnaires favored the corporation concept. Twenty-two percent were opposed and 18.7 percent did not express an opinion.

As you might expect, the largest number of replies came from Douglas County, which also produced the largest margin for the corporation, 38.9 percent.

The original bill lost in committee on a 13-13 tie vote. However, after months of work and consultation with the Administration, I recently introduced another measure (H.R. 15430) to set up a Postal Authority.

STRONG SUPPORT FOR LOTTERY

There was also strong support for President Nixon's revision of the Draft based upon a lottery system. Of course, this is now law.

Just over two-thirds of those responding favored the lottery while only 12.1 percent suggested that the draft be abolished.

In the area of campus disturbances, 58.6 percent favored giving college and civil authorities greater power to act while a number of others suggested withdrawing federal aid to those involved. The complete results, showing the overall totals and a county-by-county tabulation, follow this report.

GREGORY CRAIG OF OMAHA WEST POINT NOMINEE

I have selected Gregory Craig as principal nominee to West Point. The son of Mr. and Mrs. Bryant Craig, 3711 N. 18 St., Omaha, Gregory is a student at the Military Academy Prep School, Ft. Belvoir, Va.

CENSUS BEGINS APRIL 1

The Decennial Census will begin on April 1 and I want to point out to you just how important it is to respond to the questionnaire when it arrives.

As you know, the Census provides the statistics which are the basis for your elected representation and for hundreds of Government programs which benefit you directly.

Billions of dollars in funds, goods and services from the Federal Government are allotted on the basis of Census information as is the number of local, state and Federal representatives you will have. You must be counted if you want to count!

SUPREME COURT HEARS ARGUMENTS ON CUNNINGHAM LAW

The Supreme Court has heard arguments on the constitutionality of the "Cunningham Law," which gives parents the means to halt the flow of unsolicited smut to the family mail box. A decision is expected in the near future.

This is the last stop for those people who would poison the minds of our young as they become wealthy through the sale of pornography. A three-judge California Court last year upheld the law which I authored in the 90th Congress.

More than 400,000 persons have requested their names to be removed from the smut peddlers' mailing lists since this measure became effective in April 1968. That number grows daily as more people learn they can secure from their local Post Office a form (POD Publication 123) with instructions on how to have their names removed.

Just last week I received a letter from a man whose 13-year-old son had received some of the most vile material you can imagine. This is quite a shock to a parent and until we tighten our laws even more, this filth will find its way to the young.

APOLLO FILM STILL AVAILABLE

A 30-minute color documentary film on the historic voyage of Apollo 11 to the moon still is available through my Omaha office. A number of organizations and schools have already availed themselves of the opportunity to see this film. Reservations may be made by calling the Omaha office at 221-4631. I regret that we will not be able to project the film for you, but I am hopeful your group will either have or have available a 16mm sound projector.

NEW FTC CHAIRMAN IS SWORN IN

I was invited by President Nixon to attend the swearing-in of new Federal Trade Commission Chairman Caspar W. Weinberger, who formerly served as Director of Finance for the State of California. In addition to the President, Chairman and Mrs. Weinberger, others attending were Judge Austin Fickling of the D.C. Court of Appeals and Rep. Dan Kuykendall (R-Tenn.)

PAMPHLET ON DRUGS NOW AVAILABLE

The problem of drug abuse continues to grow throughout the nation. And just recently a cache of marijuana, possibly worth \$100,000, was found in the basement of an eastern Sarpy County house.

Here in the nation's capital the crime rate continues to climb. Many of the robberies and muggings are committed by persons—many of them teenagers—who are on drugs. They must have the money for another fix.

One of the methods used to combat the growing menace is wide dissemination of available information on drug abuse. I have been fortunate to obtain in quantity an excellent pamphlet, "The Crutch That Cripples: Drug Dependence," compiled by the American Medical Association's Committee on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence. I will be glad to furnish them on request to parents, teachers, church leaders and others.

RESULTS OF 1969 SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OPINION POLL TAKEN BY REPRESENTATIVE GLENN CUNNINGHAM

| | Tabulation by percentage | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|------|------------|-------|------|------------|------------|------|------------|
| | Overall total | | | SARPY | | | Washington | | |
| | Yes | No | No opinion | Yes | No | No opinion | Yes | No | No opinion |
| 1. Do you support the proposal to replace the present Post Office Department with a wholly Government-owned corporation operating on a self-supporting basis? | 59.2 | 22.1 | 18.7 | 58.1 | 22.2 | 19.7 | 45.6 | 28.6 | 25.8 |
| 2. Would you favor an amendment which would permit Congress to override decisions of the Supreme Court by two-thirds vote in each House? | 53.9 | 34.6 | 11.5 | 52.8 | 35.5 | 11.7 | 62.6 | 20.4 | 17.0 |
| 3. Should the Federal Government attempt to slow present migration from rural to city areas through programs of economic incentives to attract industry and jobs to rural areas? | 58.2 | 26.0 | 15.8 | 61.7 | 25.4 | 12.9 | 61.9 | 16.3 | 21.8 |
| 4. Do you favor my proposals to permit increased outside earnings and automatic cost-of-living adjustments for social security recipients? | 82.2 | 6.9 | 10.9 | 81.6 | 7.7 | 10.7 | 78.1 | 5.5 | 16.4 |
| 5. Do you believe the Federal Government should guarantee heads of families a minimum annual income? | 11.7 | 78.6 | 9.7 | 9.6 | 80.5 | 9.9 | 7.5 | 81.0 | 11.5 |
| 6. Should adults on welfare be required to accept training and suitable employment if they are capable of working? | 94.0 | 1.9 | 4.1 | 94.3 | 0.7 | 5.0 | 91.2 | 2.0 | 6.8 |
| 7. In the Middle East, should the United States— | | | | | | | | | |
| (a) Support Israel..... | | 17.2 | | | 20.2 | | | 16.7 | |
| (b) Support the Arab nations..... | | 2.2 | | | 1.7 | | | 2.1 | |
| (c) Work for mediation..... | | 74.7 | | | 71.3 | | | 70.1 | |
| (d) No opinion..... | | 5.9 | | | 6.8 | | | 11.1 | |
| 8. Should the activities carried on by the Office of Economic Opportunity be— | | | | | | | | | |
| (a) Increased..... | | 17.9 | | | 19.7 | | | 15.0 | |
| (b) Decreased..... | | 18.4 | | | 18.0 | | | 15.0 | |
| (c) Abolished..... | | 49.0 | | | 49.9 | | | 49.0 | |
| (d) No opinion..... | | 14.7 | | | 12.4 | | | 21.0 | |
| 9. Do you favor construction of the proposed Platte River Dam and Reservoir? | 36.2 | 40.5 | 23.3 | 40.8 | 31.6 | 27.6 | 12.3 | 69.2 | 18.5 |
| 0. Which of the following Federal actions do you favor in dealing with campus disturbances? | | | | | | | | | |
| (a) Keep hands off..... | | 10.3 | | | 8.7 | | | 4.0 | |
| (b) Act against students receiving Federal aid for their schooling..... | | 26.8 | | | 30.8 | | | 24.8 | |
| (c) Give college and civil authorities greater power to act..... | | 58.6 | | | 55.3 | | | 64.0 | |
| (d) No opinion..... | | 4.3 | | | 5.2 | | | 7.2 | |
| 11. What is needed to combat crime? | | | | | | | | | |
| (a) More Federal laws..... | | 2.1 | | | .8 | | | .7 | |
| (b) More police..... | | 3.9 | | | 3.0 | | | 2.2 | |
| (c) Better living conditions..... | | 9.6 | | | 8.7 | | | 5.9 | |
| (d) More respect and support for law enforcement officers..... | | 79.6 | | | 80.2 | | | 83.7 | |
| (e) No opinion..... | | 4.8 | | | 7.3 | | | 7.5 | |
| 12. Do you think our current draft system should be— | | | | | | | | | |
| (a) Retained as is..... | | 14.1 | | | 16.5 | | | 15.1 | |
| (b) Abolished..... | | 12.1 | | | 11.9 | | | 15.1 | |
| (c) Based on lottery system called for by President Nixon..... | | 66.9 | | | 64.9 | | | 51.4 | |
| (d) No opinion..... | | 6.9 | | | 6.7 | | | 18.4 | |

| | Tabulation by percentage | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|------|------------|------|------|------------|------|------|------------|
| | Douglas | | | Cass | | | Burt | | |
| | Yes | No | No opinion | Yes | No | No opinion | Yes | No | No opinion |
| 1. Do you support the proposal to replace the present Post Office Department with a wholly Government owned corporation operating on a self-supporting basis? | 60.4 | 21.5 | 18.1 | 49.5 | 28.3 | 22.2 | 42.0 | 31.3 | 26.7 |
| 2. Would you favor an amendment which would permit Congress to override decisions of the Supreme Court by two-thirds vote in each House? | 53.6 | 35.3 | 11.1 | 57.3 | 29.1 | 13.6 | 58.8 | 21.4 | 19.8 |
| 3. Should the Federal Government attempt to slow present migration from rural to city areas through programs of economic incentives to attract industry and jobs to rural areas? | 57.2 | 26.9 | 15.9 | 65.6 | 17.5 | 16.9 | 71.8 | 9.2 | 19.0 |
| 4. Do you favor my proposals to permit increased outside earnings and automatic cost-of-living adjustments for social security recipients? | 82.6 | 6.9 | 10.5 | 83.6 | 5.2 | 11.2 | 70.0 | 6.2 | 23.8 |
| 5. Do you believe the Federal Government should guarantee heads of families a minimum annual income? | 12.3 | 78.1 | 9.6 | 6.1 | 87.8 | 6.1 | 7.6 | 73.3 | 19.1 |
| 6. Should adults on welfare be required to accept training and suitable employment if they are capable of working? | 94.0 | 2.1 | 3.9 | 97.2 | .5 | 2.3 | 89.2 | .8 | 10.0 |
| 7. In the Middle East, should the United States— | | | | | | | | | |
| (a) Support Israel | | 17.1 | | | 18.1 | | | 10.2 | |
| (b) Support the Arab nations | | 2.3 | | | 1.0 | | | 1.6 | |
| (c) Work for mediation | | 75.0 | | | 76.7 | | | 75.8 | |
| (d) No opinion | | 5.6 | | | 4.2 | | | 12.4 | |
| 8. Should the activities carried on by the Office of Economic Opportunity be— | | | | | | | | | |
| (a) Increased | | 17.7 | | | 17.4 | | | 19.8 | |
| (b) Decreased | | 18.7 | | | 15.5 | | | 15.3 | |
| (c) Abolished | | 49.1 | | | 50.2 | | | 41.2 | |
| (d) No opinion | | 14.5 | | | 16.9 | | | 23.7 | |
| 9. Do you favor construction of the proposed Platte River Dam and Reservoir? | 37.0 | 39.7 | 23.3 | 28.2 | 54.9 | 16.9 | 19.8 | 58.8 | 21.4 |
| 10. Which of the following Federal actions do you favor in dealing with campus disturbances? | | | | | | | | | |
| (a) Keep hands off | | 10.8 | | | 6.1 | | | 8.3 | |
| (b) Act against students receiving Federal aid for their schooling | | 26.8 | | | 22.1 | | | 20.4 | |
| (c) Give college and civil authorities greater power to act | | 58.5 | | | 69.1 | | | 58.3 | |
| (d) No opinion | | 3.9 | | | 2.7 | | | 13.0 | |
| 11. What is needed to combat crime? | | | | | | | | | |
| (a) More Federal laws | | 2.4 | | | 1.1 | | | 0.0 | |
| (b) More police | | 4.1 | | | 3.2 | | | 5.0 | |
| (c) Better living conditions | | 10.1 | | | 4.7 | | | 4.1 | |
| (d) More respect and support for law enforcement officers | | 79.1 | | | 87.4 | | | 79.3 | |
| (e) No opinion | | 4.3 | | | 3.6 | | | 11.6 | |
| 12. Do you think our current draft system should be— | | | | | | | | | |
| (a) Retained as is | | 13.8 | | | 16.0 | | | 11.5 | |
| (b) Abolished | | 12.0 | | | 14.1 | | | 10.7 | |
| (c) Based on lottery system called for by President Nixon | | 67.9 | | | 61.5 | | | 60.3 | |
| (d) No opinion | | 6.3 | | | 8.4 | | | 17.5 | |

SALUTE TO AN AMERICAN

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that in times of war, the contributions of many of our citizens on the homefront remain unknown and oftentimes unrewarded. For indeed, the suffering of these patriots may be as great as those who serve in the Armed Forces. Such has been the case with Mr. Walter Hampson, an English-born naturalized American, and, I am proud to say, a constituent of the 12th Massachusetts Congressional District.

Mr. Hampson and the Clinton Silk Mill—Holyoke, Mass.—of which he was the proprietor, produced silk material for use by the Navy during the years of World War II. This material was employed as insulation for armature coils of motors and generators in the various vessels used by the Department. The mill also turned out silk flare chutes of the finest quality.

With both of his sons inducted into active service, Mr. Hampson had to supervise the running of the mill alone—with the result that he permanently impaired his health. Throughout the war, he sacrificed personal gain in order to aid his adopted country by turning out the finest products that could be made.

It is too late for Mr. Hampson to receive formal commendation for his outstanding service. The Navy reports that war records are no longer available to them. Yet the recognition which he so

much deserves should not be denied him.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members of the 91st Congress to join me in saluting Mr. Hampson and those Americans like him who have so unselfishly served their country in war and peace. They, too, contribute to our Nation's economic strength—thereby enabling us to pursue our war effort more effectively.

GSA ANNUAL REPORT

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, recently, General Services Administrator Robert L. Kunzig, submitted the GSA Annual Report to the Congress. I am happy to learn of the many constructive changes which Administrator Kunzig has made at GSA. I am particularly pleased with the efforts which have been taken to hire those persons who are handicapped. At this point in the RECORD, I would like to enter a section of the report which dealt with Hiring the Handicapped at GSA:

It's good business to hire the handicapped. That's a fact, not just a slogan.

Without a doubt, society is best served when a family becomes self-sufficient through the gainful employment of a mentally retarded or physically handicapped member.

The extra pride of accomplishment is a significant incentive for the handicapped to perform better—sometimes even better than non-handicapped.

Two examples of outstanding achievement

by the handicapped the past year within General Services Administration are the cases of an industrially blind carpenter who is especially adept at training non-handicapped men, and a multiple-amputee dispatcher who refuses to let his injuries deter his career.

Working closely with State and local vocational rehabilitation organizations, GSA has maintained a position of leadership among Federal agencies in employing the handicapped. The past year, 203 or 2.26 percent of its new employees were physically handicapped, a record surpassed by only one of 24 agencies of Government.

GSA employed 104 mental retardates during the year, more than any other Federal agency of comparable size.

FRANK B. CURLEY HONORED

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, National Commander John W. Lay of the American Ex-Prisoners of War, Inc., has conferred upon Frank B. Curley, past service officer of the DAV, an honorary lifetime membership for his outstanding service to veterans of all wars, especially ex-prisoners. I would like to include as part of these remarks a copy of the letter of notification sent to Mr. Curley advising him of this action.

It has been my privilege to know Frank Curley for many years, and I often wonder where Frank—himself a disabled veteran—gets the power and push to carry on in behalf of servicemen less fortunate than he is.

The letter follows:

Mr. FRANK B. CURLEY,
Past Service Officer, DAV,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR FRIEND: The Golden State Chapter of the American Ex-Prisoners of War, Inc. are having their yearly Social at the Concord Inn, February 7, 1970 at 7:30 p.m. You are to be an "Honored Guest" of the Chapter and your host will be National Commander John W. Lay. You also have been chosen, by the National Commander, to be awarded an Honorary Lifetime Membership.

This award is for your outstanding services to veterans of all wars, especially ex-prisoners, and also acknowledging your help and concern for survivors of Bataan and Corregidor and their dependents.

You have been a great help and inspiration to me throughout the years which I appreciate very much.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. LAY,
National Commander.

**GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY FOR
RESPONSIBLE HEW BILL**

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, now that the apocalyptic vote has been taken and President Nixon's veto of the Labor-HEW bill sustained, I would hope we have learned our lesson and that we move quickly to adopt a substitute measure which will be a responsible reflection of our duty to maintain fiscal integrity in Government spending.

I need not mention that the vetoed bill carried appropriations for the fiscal year which began last July. Here we are into the second month of a new year and this most important matter is still unsettled. I was among those who voted to uphold the President's veto. My concern is for the Nation's education and its economy. I think both will benefit if we all work now for a compromise measure that will give politically untainted priorities to the most necessary programs.

I realize there were some cogent reasons offered by those who sought to override the Presidential veto, and I understand their concern, but I feel their fears are groundless. This was not a measure aimed at shutting the doors of our classrooms. In fact, President Nixon's \$19.6 billion proposal was \$1.4 billion more than that allocated by the last administration for 1969.

Education and health care rank very high on our list of domestic priorities, along with the need for halting skyrocketing costs throughout the country. President Nixon has declared that no schoolchild will be deprived of education and he has promised to provide substantial increases in aid in the new bill.

It is our duty to see that the taxpayers' diminishing dollar in these inflationary times is used in the most productive way possible. I do not think it was under the vetoed bill. We have a golden opportunity now to produce legislation which will provide for our most urgently needed programs and at the same time maintain

the kind of fiscal integrity that will insure the trust of the people.

Unless we curb inflation we could well price our children right out of the classroom. For more than 7 months, I fear, there has been political procrastination on the issue. I earnestly plead with this House that we act quickly now and adopt a bill which will redirect our resources in the most constructive way possible for education and health.

**WOULD A DISEASE-AMPUTATED
CHICKEN CARCASS BE LABELED
GRADE A?—LETTER TO SECRETARY
HARDIN ON PROPOSED
CHANGE IN POULTRY INSPECTION
RULES**

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, consumers around the country are aroused and shocked—as they might well be—by a proposal made to Secretary of Agriculture Hardin by an advisory panel of veterinarians to change poultry inspection regulations so that chickens bearing tumors from a certain cancer-like disease be accepted as "wholesome" and sold for human food after the tumorous parts are cut away and discarded.

Under present regulations of the Department of Agriculture under the Poultry Products Inspection Act of 1957, the entire bird must be rejected for human food if lesions or tumors obviously show the presence of leukosis.

While it is apparently true that there is no scientific proof at present that this particular virus is dangerous to humans in cooked poultry, there apparently is also no scientific proof that it is not harmful. Under the circumstances, it would be a shameful abuse of the USDA inspection label, on which public acceptance of poultry is now so firmly based, to pass this stuff off on the consumer as "wholesome."

Once the Associated Press' G. David Wallace revealed the existence of an official report to Secretary Hardin calling for the change in regulations applying to leukosis-infected chickens, numerous consumers informed me that if this policy is adopted they will just stop buying and using chicken. This would be disastrous for the very people the change in the regulations presumably is supposed to benefit—the economically depressed poultry raisers. As a member of the National Commission on Food Marketing which studied this industry and other segments of the agricultural marketing field in depth between 1964 and 1966, I do not see how the poultry raiser will be helped by destroying public confidence in his product. Actually, only a little more than 1 percent of inspected poultry is rejected for leukosis.

COOKED GARBAGE?

As the original sponsor of the legislation which became the Poultry Products Inspection Act of 1957, requiring Federal

inspection of all poultry sold in interstate commerce, and as the initiator of the Johnson administration study which led to my introduction and the passage of the Johnson administration Wholesome Poultry Act of 1968, dealing with poultry sold in intrastate commerce, I strongly oppose any proposal for reducing the effectiveness of the consumer protections of those laws by allowing the sale of obviously diseased birds. Hence, I wrote to Secretary Hardin last week and asked him to review this issue not merely from the narrow standpoint of the possible medical safety of eating obviously diseased poultry but rather of the "wholesomeness" of the product. Is it to be the equivalent of cooked garbage—medically safe to eat perhaps, but hardly "wholesome?" This was a point I made 14 years ago in first introducing the bill which became the 1957 Poultry Inspection Act.

In my letter, I inquired particularly how the Secretary would label chickens from which diseased portions had been surgically removed. In addition to being labeled "wholesome" would they also be eligible for grade A designations? How much confidence could the public have in such a label if that were done? They should be labeled "probably wholesome parts of a diseased bird."

MEAT CUTTERS UNION OBJECTS ALSO

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important factors in bringing to my attention many years ago the need for compulsory inspection of poultry, and also in dramatizing the issue nationally and providing the main lobbying effort in getting my bill enacted, was the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen union. Its members were literally being killed by the unsanitary conditions and the diseased products, in poultry-processing plants. Without the help of that union, I never would have had any hope of getting the 1957 law enacted.

President T. J. Lloyd and Secretary-Treasurer Patrick E. Gorman of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters have placed their union strongly on record with Secretary of Agriculture Hardin against the proposed change in Federal poultry inspection regulations dealing with leukosis-infected chickens.

Mr. Speaker, having received permission, I submit herewith my letter to Secretary Hardin of January 30; the release by the Meat Cutters union of January 28 containing the text of a Lloyd-Gorman telegram to the Secretary; the Associated Press article by G. David Wallace which appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on January 26th; and a subsequent article that afternoon in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch clarifying several points of the original article.

The material referred to follows:

LETTER TO SECRETARY HARDIN

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., January 30, 1970.

HON. CLIFFORD M. HARDIN,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY HARDIN: As the original sponsor of the legislation which became the Poultry Products Inspection Act of 1957 and also of the Wholesome Poultry Act of 1968, I am deeply disturbed by the implications of the proposal made by a Department advisory

panel of veterinarians to permit the sale as wholesome poultry of birds from which diseased portions containing leukosis tumors have been removed. I am glad that you have referred this matter to the Surgeon General for his comments, but I think much more is involved here than the question of whether it is *probably safe* for humans to eat such poultry.

According to information I have received, no one can flatly state with any scientific assurance that leukosis virus is safe for humans—apparently the only information available so far is that there is no *proof* that it is dangerous. Certainly no one would pretend that this virus is *good* for people!

But in view of the inconclusiveness of present scientific data on the possible safety of this virus in food intended for human consumption, the larger issue, it seems to me, is the degree of confidence of the public in the poultry inspection process in assuring the acceptability of a product bearing the official stamp of the Government of the United States that it has been inspected and found to be "wholesome." Since the articles appeared in the newspapers indicating that the Department intended to change its policy on leukosis, a number of my constituents have indicated they will just stop buying and using poultry entirely, particularly in view of the fact that the virus has been likened to a cancer virus.

I believe the rejection rate on poultry bearing evidence of leukosis tumors is slightly more than 1% of inspected poultry. To jeopardize public acceptance (and export acceptance) of all of our inspected poultry in order to make possible the commercial marketing as human food of such a tiny fraction of the poultry produced could well be an economic disaster for an industry which already has many problems. As a Member of the National Commission on Food Marketing which studied this industry, along with others in the food field, I would hate to see the serious economic problems of the poultry raisers compounded by a loss of public acceptance for the product merely in order to try to squeeze an extra 1.14% of the product past Federal inspection.

Under the proposal made by your advisory panel, would those presumably wholesome parts of a chicken from which diseased parts had been removed be eligible for the U.S.D.A. Grade A label? If not, how would the product be labeled? Would the consumer have any way of knowing that the chicken or the chicken parts he is buying came originally from a bird from which diseased portions had to be removed?

What are the comparable provisions of the present regulations dealing with meat inspection?

Is it not true that many chickens are now rejected during Federal inspection not because of known danger to the consumer but because the Department cannot, for one or another reason, certify them as "wholesome"? I would appreciate more information on this point, for it relates to a point which was made when I first introduced a poultry inspection bill years ago that "As for the hazards to the consumer, while it is true that most of the disease organisms are killed by thorough cooking, to allow diseased birds to be sold is somewhat like condoning the cooking of garbage for human consumption—edible from a medical standpoint but certainly not desirable." The leukosis issue would fall into this category in the absence of proof that it is either safe or dangerous for humans.

In July 27, 1954, when I first began the drive which resulted in the enactment of the Poultry Products Inspection Act of 1957, I called to the attention of the Congress the traffic in diseased poultry which had destroyed public confidence in the safety and wholesomeness of this product. Throughout

the long and often bitter battle over the legislation, the poultry industry sought to place in the bill every conceivable loophole for watering down its effectiveness. The biggest issue was over the question of ante-mortem inspection—the right of the inspector to see the chicken before slaughter, in order to weed out obviously sick birds which might look all right in carcass form. This new approach toward weakening poultry inspection derives from the same desire to pass off as healthy and wholesome a product which is obviously diseased, by permitting in-plant surgery on the diseased portions of the bird. I sincerely hope this issue will be given the careful consideration it deserves, not from the standpoint of what can be slipped past the consumer, but from the standpoint of the "wholesomeness" of inspected poultry.

Sincerely yours,

LEONOR K. (MRS. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress, Third District,
Missouri.

[News release of Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America, (AFL-CIO), Jan. 28, 1970]

MEAT CUTTERS UNION BLASTS RECOMMENDATIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE PANEL TO PERMIT SALE OF CANCEROUS CHICKENS

WASHINGTON.—The Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen, AFL-CIO, today made public a message to Sec. of Agriculture Clifford Hardin in which the union said it was "shocked and alarmed" by a proposal from a government advisory panel that cancerous chickens could be sold to unsuspecting consumers.

The 500,000-member food union, which includes poultry processing workers, called on Sec. Hardin to "reject" the panel's recommendations and to retain "existing inspection regulations and instructions (to federal inspectors) requiring condemnation of poultry which carries cancer virus."

The statement was signed by Pres. T. J. Lloyd and Sec.-Treas. Patrick E. Gorman of the union, which in the 1950's initiated the campaign for the first mandatory poultry inspection legislation and was a major factor in the 1968 effort to improve that law. The union is currently urging Congress to adopt similar legislation for better inspection of fish and fish products.

The proposals of the government panel were reported in an Associated Press dispatch earlier this week. It noted that inspectors presently condemn any bird carcass showing lesions or tumors, which are held to reveal the presence of leukosis or viruses of Marek's disease. Under the proposals, inspectors would reject not the whole carcass of an infected bird but only the visually damaged parts.

The AMC statement noted that there is still "much to be learned" about the transmissibility of leukosis from poultry to humans, and that experts are in considerable disagreement on the subject.

The Lloyd-Gorman telegram voiced opinion that present law does not permit adoption of the panel's recommendation, and it added:

"Poultry inspection exists to protect the consumer—not simply to get obviously repugnant parts out of sight."

Text of the message by Pres. Lloyd and Sec.-Treas. Gorman to Sec. of Agriculture Hardin follows:

"The Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen, AFL-CIO, is shocked and alarmed by the Agriculture Department advisory panel's recommendations concerning poultry suffering from cancer virus or leukosis. It is hard to believe that the panel would permit cancerous birds to pass poultry inspection. Under the recommendations,

inspectors could condemn use of leukosis-suffering birds for human food only when consumers might become aware of the cancer; then, inspectors could reject only those parts obviously damaged, according to the published reports of panel recommendations.

"There is still much to be learned about possible transmissibility of leukosis from poultry to humans. Experts disagree about the degree of danger. In fact, we understand a recent reorganization of the advisory group which made recommendations eliminated some panel members who opposed changing existing policy on leukosis condemnations. Reports persist that even the reorganized panel did not vote unanimously, but split.

"Leukosis policy was a major issue during Congressional consideration of poultry inspection in 1968. Senate defeated so-called Talmadge Amendment after it had been okayed by the Agriculture Committee to permit inspection approval of cancerous birds. In our opinion, the language which the Senate substituted for the Talmadge Amendment forbids carrying out the panel's recommendations. Poultry inspection exists to protect the consumer—not simply to get obviously repugnant parts out of sight.

"Our union therefore strongly urges retention of existing inspection regulations and instructions requiring condemnation of poultry which carries cancer virus. We hope you will reject the panel's recommendations."

[From the St. Louis Globe Democrat, Jan. 26, 1970]

SALE OF CHICKENS WITH CANCER VIRUS URGED

(By G. David Wallace)

WASHINGTON.—A government panel of scientists has recommended that chickens bearing cancer virus be allowed on the market as long as the birds don't look too repugnant.

The basis for the recommended change in inspection standards, according to Agriculture Department officials, is scientific evidence disputing any link between cancer virus in chickens and disease in humans.

Federal chicken inspectors presently condemn all of any bird carcass showing lesions or tumors, which have traditionally been accepted as a visual sign of presence of avian leukosis of Marek's disease viruses.

The two diseases, lumped together as leukosis in department records, are the largest single cause for rejection of frying chickens. Of the 176 million fryers slaughtered under federal inspection in November 1969, inspectors condemned 2 million for leukosis.

The disease has a much smaller effect on older chickens and turkeys.

Specialists say virtually all chickens harbor the viruses in varying degrees in their bodies. When the virus gets out of control, the chicken's body fights back, and lesions and tumors develop although the disease usually passes.

But Agriculture specialists say tests have shown that the presence of tumors, or their numbers, bear no relation to the amount of virus in the birds' systems.

The finding reported by a panel of eight veterinarians and animal-disease specialists would not stop the condemnation of birds whose internal organs show active signs of the disease.

But chickens showing only slight signs of the virus which causes the disease would be declared no threat to human health. The panel recommended that condemnation of such birds be "only on an aesthetic basis," according to Richard E. Lyng, assistant secretary for marketing and consumer services at the agriculture department.

Thus, officials said, if tumors are detected on the wing of a bird, the wing could be cut off and used in a product like hot dogs and

the rest of the bird be sold as cut-up chicken—all without posing a threat to human health.

Under present practices, the whole chicken in such a case would be condemned.

The panel's report has not been made public, but officials discussed it freely in interviews.

The recommendation now is under consideration by the surgeon general's office, which is expected to report back to the Agriculture Department within a week. Any change in inspection standards would be up to Secretary of Agriculture Clifford M. Hardin.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Jan. 26, 1970]

PANEL FOR MARKETING OF DISEASED CHICKENS

WASHINGTON, January 26.—Parts of some chickens showing evidence of a virus disease should be cleared for sale, a panel of veterinarians has recommended in the Department of Agriculture.

The report involved two viruses—avian leukosis and Marek's disease. Both cause nonmalignant lesions and tumors in birds that survive the disease. Some birds die.

Traditionally, federal inspectors have condemned birds for sale if a lesion or tumor is found in the meat.

DESTROY DISEASED PARTS

Dr. Caro E. Luhrs of the Department of Agriculture said the veterinarians have proposed that if a bird showed one lesion in an organ that could be removed, such as a wing, then only that organ would be condemned. Two or more lesions in the bird would result in condemnation of the whole carcass.

Dr. Luhrs worked closely with the veterinary team that recommended the changes. He offered the following example under the proposed regulations:

If a tumor was found in the liver of a chicken, the whole liver would be removed and destroyed. Unaffected parts of the chicken could be sold. If a lesion was discovered in the liver and on a leg, however the whole chicken would be destroyed.

"We of course are concerned about human health implications," said Dr. Caro. "We have sent the proposals to the surgeon general for his recommendations and he should have a report on the proposals within about two weeks."

NO DANGER TO HUMANS

The basis for the recommendations, said Dr. Caro, is that there is no evidence that the viruses concerned represent any danger to human beings.

Dr. J. Spencer Munroe, a New York University researcher, injected an artificial leukosis virus into monkeys in 1963 and found that the animals developed tumors.

Dr. Luhrs said that an artificial leukosis virus was used in Dr. Munroe's experiments and that later research had not confirmed his findings. Dr. Ben R. Burmester of the Department of Agriculture has done similar research. He suggests that unspecified elements in an artificial virus may be the cause for the tumors found by Dr. Munroe.

Earlier reports on the recommendations from the veterinarians called the viruses cancer viruses.

NOT MALIGNANT

"Cancer is not a good word to use," commented Dr. Leo Eldridge of the Poultry Veterinary Service Group of Ralston Purina Co. in St. Louis. "We're not dealing with a malignant tumor here. These tumors do not show the bizarre cells you see in cancer."

Those earlier reports also said that a chicken part with a lesion could be used in products such as hot dogs.

"That simply is incorrect," said Dr. Luhrs. "The part with a tumor would be destroyed. It would be inconceivable to use it."

IOWA: AN AMERICAN MODEL FOR THE SEVENTIES

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the Des Moines Register recently published an assessment of Iowa's remarkable progress through the decade of the sixties, and its potential for even greater success in the seventies.

As the Register noted, the sixties brought in Iowa "the emergence of a town-country-city kind of community that is more fun to live in than megalopolis but no less rewarding to work in."

It was a decade marked by unprecedented economic and industrial expansion which placed three Iowa metropolitan areas—Des Moines, Cedar Rapids, and Waterloo—among the top 15 in the Nation in per capita income. Per capita income for the State as a whole rose at a more rapid rate than the national average in the sixties.

At the same time, Iowa retained its preeminence in agriculture, and although Iowa farmers have suffered from the same cost-price squeeze which has seriously affected agriculture in general, they continue to be among the top earners from agriculture in the country.

Finally, the State has taken significant steps in the sixties to develop its vast potential for recreation and tourism. And as the decade drew to an end, the development of this third dimension reached a new highpoint with the discovery of a vast underground cave in northeast Iowa.

The sense of adventure, energy, and courage which resulted in the discovery of that cave are the same qualities which have characterized Iowans for more than two centuries, which have made possible the achievements of the sixties, and which will assure even greater accomplishments in the seventies.

This decade is one which must necessarily be marked by a new concern about the environment in which every American lives, and a development of a national growth policy which will maximize all of the vast resources and capabilities which this country possesses.

In that context, Iowa can offer fulfillment, not only to her own citizens, but to men and women and families throughout the Nation who are seeking a better and fuller way of life.

I commend the Des Moines Register article to my colleagues in the House of Representatives, and include it at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Des Moines Register, Jan. 11, 1970]

FOR IOWA'S ECONOMY, THE 1970'S COULD BE "DECADE OF WONDERS"

Two Iowa geology students presented stunning color photos of a magnificent Northeast Iowa cave to the State Conservation Commission last month. The young spelunkers, convinced by evidence about them that such a grand cavern should exist in Iowa, had just kept looking until they found it.

They urged the commission to heed the lesson learned from caves ravaged by exploitation elsewhere by preserving this new wonder of Iowa's in a way that would share it, not spoil it.

Commission development may open this underground wonder to the public in the 1970's.

Iowans, in the same decade, should produce an aboveground wonder of their own to rival it. The economic evidence of the Surprising Sixties points to it as clearly as the geologic evidence which encouraged the young cavern-seekers.

One surprise of the Sixties for Iowa was an unexpected surge of industrial growth which assured a better balance between agriculture, manufacturing, trade and services in the state's economy. This burst of economic vigor confirmed the emergence of a town-country-city kind of community that is more fun to live in than megalopolis but no less rewarding to work in.

It gave Iowans a surer sense that what economists had told them could be, would be.

MORE JOBS IN INDUSTRY

The end-of-the-decade payoff on the adventurous probing of the students for their dream cave provides an apt symbol for Iowa's passage to the Seventies.

Iowans already have transformed some of the uncertainties the state faced 10 years ago into sure signals to "push ahead."

In the economy, in 1960, there remained a question as to just how well Iowa would continue to weather the broad-scale agricultural revolution which was creating fewer but bigger farms, employing fewer people and more machines.

Iowa has, since the early Fifties, been adjusting by exporting labor to other states with more urban job opportunities. In the Sixties, however, more jobs began coming into Iowa to help take up labor freed from farming.

Manufacturing employment, static through the Fifties, rose yearly through the Sixties as record numbers of new plants opened and expanded.

Agriculture, long the No. 1 Iowa employer, was pushed to second by manufacturing in 1967, to third by trade in 1968. But farm income—per farm and per person—pushed up strongly during the decade and was anything but sickly. Iowa farm people continued to be among the top earners from agriculture in the nation.

The number of employed persons rose each year as new workers found jobs in Iowa—good-paying jobs. Three Iowa metropolitan areas (Des Moines, Cedar Rapids, Waterloo) were among the first 15 in the nation in per capita income by 1966. And per capita income for the state as a whole rose faster than the national average in the Sixties.

The uncertainty facing Iowa government in 1960 was whether Iowa people—traditionally reluctant to change—were ready to re gear for a more urban and complex society.

They were.

Iowans voted for more constitutional amendments in the Sixties than in any decade in state history. Among these were amendments which brought appointment of judges, annual sessions of the Legislature, a smaller Legislature with assurance of regular reapportionment and city home rule.

Legislators broke an encrusted tradition of board administration of state agencies and reorganized several agencies under single administrators.

They also faced up to the old bugaboo of over-reliance on property taxes by shifting more school financing to state income and sales taxes.

Though these steps were only a start, it was a running one.

THE BOOM IN EDUCATION

In education, 10 years ago Iowa was moving uncertainly, despite substantial school district reorganization, toward assuring all students access to large enough high schools for comprehensive education opportunities. And technical and vocational education beyond high school barely existed.

School district reorganization unfortunately wasn't carried much further in the Sixties. It ground to a halt when the State Supreme Court voided the state school standards law. But now, higher standards are being enforced once more at the start of the Seventies.

But post-high-school education simply outstripped all expectations for the decade and signalled Iowa's new direction.

Public two-year colleges enrolled only about 2,600 students, few in vocational or technical programs, as the decade began. Expanded as area community colleges, these schools were reaching almost 19,000 full-time students (almost half in vocational-technical programs) as the decade ended, along with another 19,000 part-time students and more than 60,000 adults in evening programs.

Iowans were committed to range and variety, as well as growth, in higher education. State university enrollments more than doubled in the decade. Private colleges grew by 60 per cent. The state began providing Iowans at these colleges tuition grants to help assure a strong role for these colleges in the future.

WE'RE WORKING ON PROBLEMS

But even as steps like this quickened Iowa progress toward its new potential, unexpected barriers sprouted across that path.

In 1960, Iowans could scan open, fertile fields and conclude they were free from pollution problems. They could view a black population of less than 1 per cent and conclude there were no racial conflicts.

And they were wrong.

Pollution—not only from new plants and growing cities but from the very chemicals that made those fields so fertile—demand priority attention as we start the Seventies.

So does the accumulation of racial injustices—discrimination in homes and jobs, the school segregation that discrimination produces, a host of other inequalities.

Iowa made a start on the first problem by setting up air and water pollution control commissions in the Sixties. It acted on the other with state civil rights and open housing laws, city ordinances and school board action against racial separation.

But much still has to be done. Continuing either of these conditions—dirty streams or inequality—would contradict the kind of good life which Iowans should realize in the Seventies.

TOWN AND COUNTRY: A HAPPY MIXTURE

Some Iowans, proud as they were of their state, were surprised in 1968 when a mid-west research firm ran all the statistical indicators of what might be called the "good life" through a computer, and Iowa popped up in the first 10 states. Most of those statistics were pre-1966. Some major Iowa advancements—in technological education, income and government—came later. Iowa could well rank above tenth today.

But beyond statistical indicators, Iowa is developing an intangible quality of city-town-country living which offers a heady and healthful variety of life to its people.

The United States achieved the "impossible" in the Sixties. Men went to the moon in the Sixties—twice. Communications equipment from the giant Collins Radio complex in Cedar Rapids helped make it possible. And many workers in that plant live in quiet little towns nearby—comfortable towns that continue to flourish even in Space Age Iowa.

This style of area living means larger-than-imagined labor pools for new industries. And

these new plants, in turn, have meant new vitality for the towns and cities around them. Plants, urban or rural, function in a broad city-town-country community.

It's a happy mixture. And Iowans have had the chance to learn from lessons of metropolitan sprawl elsewhere in time to preserve their living-and-working style.

PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT CALLS TO MIND RECENT HISTORY

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. Speaker, preparation of the Economic Report of the President to Congress must have been a challenging assignment, after a year which has brought us record high interest rates, the highest cost of living in history, repeated price increases, and a declining stock market which has cost investors over \$120 billion in losses.

The report cites as a cardinal principle:

Government must say what it means and mean what it says. Economic credibility is the basis for confidence, and confidence in turn is the basis for ongoing prosperity.

Viewed in the light of administration's own statements on the economy, this principle needs to be practiced more often by the administration itself.

For instance, Mr. Nixon said just last week that the administration policies are working to bring inflation under control. That same week, steel prices were raised again, although demand for steel was down and acres of unsold automobiles were shown in news pictures with stories announcing cutbacks in production.

Those with memories will also recall the statement of Mr. Arthur Burns, one of the President's chief economic advisers and today the new Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, who said in April, reflecting the administration view, that the expected rate of inflation by the end of 1969 would be down to 3 percent or lower. It actually was over 6 percent for the year.

And in December, the President told businessmen that the administration policies were working against inflation and the businessmen who bet against it would lose. Prices that month also went up sharply, and, the businessmen who may have postponed borrowing found interest rates even higher a month and 2 months later when they went to the bank for operating capital.

In October, the President went on nationwide radio to calm the growing clamor of housewives who were deeply concerned by the soaring prices of food and household services. Administration policy, he told them, was stopping the price spiral. Prices continued to climb, that month, the next month, in December and wholesale food prices went up 2 percent in January alone.

The same line was heard all year from the administration spokesmen—economists and the press secretary representing the President. The policies were work-

ing, they said, inflation was being whipped. The official line was repeated in April, in June, in August, in September, and again in December.

While the public statements did not reflect it, sometime last fall the administration insiders finally recognized that tight money and high interest rates were not checking inflation, which was becoming a political albatross. So, the decision was made to attempt to place the blame elsewhere, and the President's melodramatic veto of the HEW appropriation bill then followed. This, despite cuts by Congress in the Nixon budget which far exceeded the HEW increase.

Placing the blame on his predecessor may have sounded plausible in April and June, and maybe even last fall, but it is being worn thin. Surely the credibility of the administration on this issue is nearing the breaking point by now. Businessmen, housewives, and wage earners are beginning to understand that 1970 inflation is Nixon's own inflation—not John Kennedy's inflation and not Lyndon Johnson's inflation as Mr. Nixon would have them believe.

The principle as stated is true: "Government should say what it means, and mean what it says"—but this administration is rapidly losing its credibility on the economic front, and it needs to stop searching for a scapegoat and get down to fighting inflation.

The same technique of substituting rhetoric for responsible action is much too prevalent throughout the administration. Until there is recognition of past mistakes, and confession that the old policies are not working, the American people cannot be expected to believe that inflation is going away just because the administration says so. It has said so too often in the past.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH NEEDS

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. LUJAN, Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a most excellent and far-reaching address on "Environmental Health Needs of the Public" delivered by our distinguished colleague, Congressman LARRY HOGAN of Maryland, at the Tri-State Educational Conference in Silver Spring, Md., on January 15.

Congressman HOGAN's remarks are directed at the overwhelming problems of air and water pollution and are particularly appropriate in view of President Nixon's strong emphasis on this subject in his state of the Union address last week.

The Tri-State Educational Conference was sponsored by the National Capital Association of Sanitarians, the Maryland Association of Sanitarians, and the Virginia Association of Public Health Sanitarians. Thus, Congressman HOGAN was speaking to the people most directly involved in the problems—and the solu-

tions—of air and water pollution. Mr. HOGAN's address follows:

Various kinds of pollution pose serious health hazards—automobiles, open burning dumps and industrial plants spew pollutants into our air; sewage, garbage, chemical wastes and silt choke our rivers and streams; litter and junk despoil the beauty of our landscape; poisonous pesticides and fertilizers are being washed into our waterways and contaminate our fish, constituting a danger to those who eat the fish; noise vibrates our nerves intensifying the pressures of life in an urbanized society; workers in many industries absorb injurious particles into their bodies.

All of these problems cry out for immediate response.

Several years ago, U.S. Surgeon General, Luther Terry, used the word "Eutrophication" to describe our modern society.

I am sure this word is part of your technical jargon, but I must admit it sent me scurrying to the dictionary. I discovered that it very aptly describes the paradox of technology vs. a livable environment. To a poet, "eutrophication" is almost an onomatopoeic term because it sounds like what it means—over-enrichment, but my mind keeps linking it with putrefaction.

Unfortunately, for us and our poets, the azure skies, the glistening streams, the prairie grasslands, which have traditionally inspired beautiful poems, are daily being distorted by the pollutants of technological progress and waste.

Our fellow Marylander, H. L. Mencken, coined a phrase to describe the deterioration of our surroundings when he said that the American "libido for uglification" is an all too prevalent disease.

Eutrophication, or the excessive nourishment that eventually chokes life, is a natural process. Unfortunately, we have speeded the process by several million years. We've overexerted our brainpower to further mankind's progress while neglecting the application of that same brainpower to the ill effects of that progress. We have to face a fact of life: the more active and industrialized and affluent we become, the more waste we're going to produce. It's one of the prices we must pay for progress.

For example, in 1964 a team of Public Health Service scientists found and charted an area of 2,600 square miles at the bottom of Lake Erie which was totally devoid of oxygen. Now, even if man had not settled and built and manufactured around the edge of the Lake, this process would still have gone on, but it would have taken hundreds of thousands of years to make this tremendous source of fresh water useless. Over eons of time, the water levels in the lake would go down, more and more soil would wash from the fields to fill the Lake, algae would proliferate, then, gradually and imperceptibly the Lake would become a swamp and finally a bog.

This process which should take hundreds of thousands of years has been so expedited that it is happening now.

And, therefore, now is the time to re-direct our concerted efforts to achieve technological excellence. In fact, now is almost too late. We should have begun years ago. To win this race against time will take vast outlays of money, far more than we are now spending, and it will take tougher restrictions on communities, individuals, and our industry. In short, we need to assign to this problem the same kind of national priority we assigned ten years ago to landing a man on the moon, and we must make up our minds that we're going to focus the money, talent and concerted effort that is necessary to solve this problem.

This issue, in a word, is survival, and that's not something we can compromise with.

First, action must be taken against the

most serious existing problems, and secondly, an environmental protection system must be created that offers a means to identify emerging environmental hazards so we can prevent them from getting out of hand. In other words, we must find a means to eradicate the harm of the past and provide a preventive program for the future.

President Nixon remarked the other day that the 1970's will be now-or-never years for reclaiming our living environment. This deadline was no exaggeration and, while we have made some efforts in this field since as long ago as the 1940's, it is clear that every individual citizen and organized group of citizens must pick up the yoke of responsibility and respond.

This year the federal government will spend about \$800 million for grants to local communities to help them construct sewage treatment facilities. An additional \$400 million is being spent for research and development on the problems of air and water pollution. But this is nowhere near enough. To do the job which needs to be done will take billions of dollars. Some among us will say, "We can't afford to spend that much money." I say, "We can't afford not to."

If someone came to you and said all human life will be eradicated from earth within six months, could there be any price too dear to pay to forestall this calamity? Perhaps I am being overly dramatic. We all know we're not going to be eradicated within six months. But the problems are so serious that we need to approach them in terms of survival or non-survival.

In 1969, the Congress laid the groundwork for a unified effort by introducing legislation which, in each case, responded to the overriding need for a watchdog, central entity for environmental response. On every level of government—federal, state and local—it is necessary to centralize efforts.

Some signs of this trend are now evident. For example, the President recently signed the legislation setting up the three member Council on Environmental Quality.

Close to your field of responsibility and mine is the Potomac River Compact.

With further reference to this idea of centralization and coordination, I joined with 58 of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to sponsor a resolution to establish a Standing Committee on the Environment. With the creation of such a committee, the Congress could look to one central committee for leadership in this area and to which new ideas could be directed. At the present time, legislation to resolve the pressing problems of the environment is scattered throughout a number of different committees. This, too, is the case with the federal bureaucracy—pollution problems, even those in one particular area, such as air pollution, are scattered throughout several agencies. The result frequently is the right arm not knowing what the left arm is doing.

There must be coordination. For example, when I voted for the \$1 billion funding for the Clean Waters Restoration Act, it occurred to me that perhaps this money could serve a double purpose if the blueprint for the use of that money could be applied to air pollution.

I spoke earlier of the involvement of this endeavor. You, as individual sanitarians and as members of organized groups of sanitarians, are in an ideal position to effect a tremendous amount of good. The health official needs to bring his expertise and influence to bear on the community more than ever before. Your voice may be only one among many; but because of your training and experience, it can and should be a loud voice.

Allow me to be very blunt—you are—and must be—the leaders in this arena.

People are finally becoming aware of the

danger to their own survival and they are looking for leadership. Our young people are particularly ready to join in this crusade. We must assign them a role. This generation is disturbed by their deteriorating surroundings. I am convinced that they will join readily in the fight to protect and improve man's health and to restore the balance in man's relationship to other species. They have a valuable contribution to make and we must assign them a piece of the action.

In the words of a San Francisco State graduate student:

"We don't want merely to survive; we want to live. There is only one place in which to live and that is on this planet and we must live here together."

If we must live here together, then we can work here together to make this planet livable. We must accept this responsibility and assume it as a sacred trust.

CONVERSION TO METRIC SYSTEM

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the world is turning more and more to the metric system of measurements. The British began a conversion to the metric system in 1965 and will convert to decimal currency in 1972. The Australian currency became decimalized in 1966, and on January 19 of this year Prime Minister John Gorton, of Australia, issued a statement concerning the conversion of Australia to the metric system. That statement follows:

CONVERSION TO METRIC SYSTEM

(Statement by the Prime Minister, Mr. John Gorton)

Following detailed consideration of the recommendations made by the Senate Select Committee on the adoption of the Metric System of Weights and Measures, the Government has decided that Australia should convert to the Metric System as soon as possible.

The Commonwealth has notified the States of this decision and has suggested that arrangements be made for a conference with them to discuss co-operation in those areas where co-operation may be required.

The Government believes that the lasting benefits which will result from this decision will greatly outweigh the not inconsiderable transitional difficulties involved.

The Government's aim is to complete the changeover during a period of ten years although conversion will be completed much sooner than this in some sectors.

It is proposed to set up a Metric Conversion Board, on which a wide range of interests will be represented, to plan, guide, and facilitate conversion. The Board will be responsible to the Government through the Minister for Education & Science and will be expected to make appropriate recommendations from time to time after full consultation with those concerned.

Although the Government realises that some compensation may be paid in such unusual and special cases as are accepted by the Government on the recommendation of the Metric Conversion Board it is expected that, as in other countries the costs of effecting the change will, in general, be borne by those incurring them. By allowing time for natural obsolescence and depreciation of plant and machinery the cost of conversion will be greatly reduced. Experience in

other countries such as Japan—where conversion is complete—has shown that by forethought and good planning these costs can be greatly reduced.

The decision to convert is in line with decisions which have already been taken in the United Kingdom, South Africa, New Zealand and South East Asian countries and in announcing it the Government wishes to pay tribute to the work of the Senate Select Committee under the leadership of the late Senator Keith Laught.

**OUR GREAT COUNTRY WAS BUILT
BY MEN LIVING BY THE WORD
OF GOD**

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress receives a tremendous number of communications from constituents covering practically every topic under the sun. It is noteworthy that the overwhelming majority of them are entirely in order and directly related to our basic concept of representative government.

We encourage the receipt of correspondence and occasionally a constituent's letter is so obviously sincere, so fundamentally reflective of general feeling, and so thought provoking to all of us that it merits wider publication and reading.

Such a letter, I think, was sent to me recently by my constituent, Mrs. Clara L. Dyer of Uxbridge, Mass., and I am pleased to include it at this point:

UXBRIDGE, MASS.,
January 15, 1970.

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
Central District Office,
Worcester, Mass.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DONOHUE: I was pleased to receive your report and have read it thoughtfully. I agree with you on each of these important issues and feel they are all extremely important. We were truly thankful for the increase in Social Security payments.

I would like to have you know how I and many of my friends feel about another important issue. We cannot understand why the Government will readily spend so many billions of dollars reaching the moon, mars or any other planet. As for men being sent to the Moon and crashing that monstrosity on it causing the Moon to shake for more than an hour, how dare they do such a thing; just experimenting around up there? We were taught that the Moon controls the tides and how do they know for sure that they will not or have not done something to disturb the delicate balance of the Universe? All parts of the country have experienced unusual weather ever since their experiments, and they have even polluted the upper atmosphere.

Why does the Government feel that everyone is so interested in flights to the Moon? Everyone I know, and speaking for myself I wish they would keep away from it and try to solve some of our earthly problems.

It surely bothers me when the Government will give billions for all of these space flights but if the poor, the starving and the elderly want a decent living there is always so much talk about how they haven't the money. Let them use some of the billions they so foolishly waste on space projects. We have plenty of problems that should be

solved right here on earth. Crime, drugs, pollution, hunger, poverty and first and foremost War. How I wish they would use this money and their knowledge to make a better world for the people on earth.

How can these money men, many who have never known what it is like to be poor and who can give themselves a raise whenever they want to; how can they expect the poor and middle or working class to go along with them?

We were pleased to see that they are making a small cut back but not enough. It will only delay for a time their reaching the moon several more times and the planet Mars. Why do we need so many scientists? It seems to me that we need doctors and ministers far more than scientists.

A lot of laws need changing. It seems the criminals are protected instead of the victims. I would like to have them change the present law and allow Bible reading in school. Our great country was not built on atheism, but by men living by the Word of God. I hope you will do all you can to help solve these earthly problems.

Respectfully yours,

CLARA L. DYER.

ENVIRONMENT DETERIORATING

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, there is no issue that has received greater attention or aroused more concern among Members of this historic legislative body than that of the environment. And yet, the Congress has not equipped itself to deal squarely with the issue.

Today, there is an increasing awareness that we must act now if we are to act at all to protect the world in which we live. Man's technological genius has produced a world whose population enjoys a higher standard of living than ever before. We have more of the things that contribute to the so-called good life than any other generation in history.

But sadly, we must acknowledge that our modern technology has come at a high price in many cases. Slowly, we are beginning to realize that our technological wonders are robbing us of clean air, clean water, our forests and our wildlife, our soil and our minerals. In short, the quality of our environment has been deteriorating.

In the years ahead, will we find our material needs satisfied only to find frustration in the condition of our environment? Will we find ourselves trapped in traffic, choking on smoke, swimming in muck, and trembling from noise?

I am afraid this is the outlook for America unless we develop a rational policy to promote a high quality of life. We cannot stop industrial and technological development; nor should we. We must have an economy which continues to grow. But we must balance quantity with quality.

To do this will require a national commitment like we have never known before. A safe and livable environment in the years ahead will demand a coordinated national policy.

There is no question that Congress has

its part to play in developing this policy. So far, however, Congress has not taken the lead it should have in this field. The reason that Congress has failed to assume its proper role in advancing an environmental policy is that it is ill-equipped to formulate such a comprehensive program.

Simply put, Congress is strapped by inadequate machinery for legislating in the field of the environment. Up until now, Congress has taken a fragmented and disjointed approach to its work on environmental issues.

The diffusion of committee responsibility on matters dealing with the quality of life makes the innovation an evolution of a comprehensive, coordinated policy almost impossible. When you have two or three or even four committees in the Congress dealing with different aspects of a problem in such an interrelated field as the environment, it is impossible to develop a unified, hard-hitting program to meet the crisis.

At the best, this overlapping jurisdiction is inefficient; at the worst, it is unworkable and detrimental to policy formulation.

To correct this urgent situation, I have joined as a cosponsor of a resolution introduced by my colleague from Colorado (Mr. BROTZMAN) and identical to House Resolution 375, originally introduced by Mr. BROTZMAN last April. The resolution calls for the establishment of a standing Committee on the Environment in the House of Representatives. This committee would have full legislative powers over a broad range of issues dealing with the environment. The committee's jurisdiction would extend to water quality, air quality, weather modification, waste disposal of all kinds, pesticides and herbicides, and acoustic problems.

Congress needs a committee with full legislative powers in this field. A coordinating or advisory committee would not suffice.

Furthermore, Congress needs the advice of a professional staff of ecologists, biologists, chemists, and so forth, who understand the technical aspects of this highly complex field. The interrelationships involved require that a systems approach be used to develop a national environmental policy.

Mr. Speaker, we must remember that the threat to the environment will not diminish in the years ahead. Congress must restructure itself to meet the new crisis facing the Nation. A standing Committee on the Environment is essential.

**SMALL BUSINESS ASSOCIATION
OF NEW ENGLAND**

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Association of New England—SBANE—has, since its incorporation in 1938, served with distinction a great number of New England small businesses,

and, indirectly, their national counterparts. I personally have had many opportunities to work with SBANE and have come to depend upon it as a valuable and responsible source of small business information. I want to call the attention of my colleagues to SBANE's recently published "Fact Sheet," which provides an idea of the breadth of its activities.

SBANE FACT SHEET

WHAT IS SBANE?

SBANE is a private, non-profit Association of some 700 New England small companies who believe that through collective and cooperative action, the vital needs of small business in such areas as legislation on the national level and educational programs geared to the small business executive, can be fulfilled. The Association broadly defines a small business as a company with from 1 to 500 employees. The 700 members in the six New England states represent every facet of small business enterprise. Although some 50% of the members are in manufacturing, the growing membership rolls include service firms of every description, retailers, banks, wholesale distributors, consultants, lawyers, CPA's, data processing, etc.

WHY DO BUSINESSMEN JOIN SBANE?

For the SBANE member who participates in just some of the varied programs and services during the course of a year, membership is a good investment. The returns are much greater than the nominal annual dues. Vital services are being added constantly. The Association offers the small businessman a pooling of talent and resources to help him in the day-to-day operation of his enterprise.

WHO RUNS THE ASSOCIATION?

SBANE is not typical of many business organizations where the Officers and Directors hold fancy titles and take bows. SBANE is an active organization. The Officers each have major responsibilities, the Board of Directors meet monthly and a professional staff carries out the policies established by the leadership. Over a dozen committees in a variety of areas are meeting constantly to explore and expand the programs and services. The most important entity in the Association is the members and the leadership strives to fulfill their needs as determined by frequent contacts and communications.

WHAT ARE THE SBANE SERVICES?

Legislation on the national level

SBANE's legislative program is aimed at keeping the Congress, particularly the members of the New England Congressional Delegation and the House and Senate Small Business Committees, abreast of legislative needs and problems that can be affected by our lawmakers. Instead of simply pointing to the problems that affect small business, SBANE makes specific proposals on behalf of the nation's small businessmen. The highlight of the legislative program is a Washington Presentation delivered to members of the Senate and House, usually in May, that consists of Proposals for Congressional Action. Subjects covered in the Washington Presentation in the past have included: Procurement, Taxation, Labor, Pension Plans, Patents, Transportation and Small Business Investment Companies/Small Business Administration.

SBANE is also called upon frequently to testify at various committee hearings on subjects of interest. SBANE's experience in Washington has earned the Association the highest regard of our national lawmakers. Various committees with SBANE study proposed legislation to determine its effect on small business. The Association is in close liaison with members of the New England Congressional Delegation as to the feeling of the membership on current legislation.

Timely Flash Bulletins are sent out to the members whenever important bills are under consideration.

Education

SBANE believes that in order for a small business to succeed, its management must have a continuing desire to improve their skills as an executive by participation in seminars and conferences. Throughout the year several programs are held sometimes in conjunction with a leading New England university. For instance, in the past months SBANE has cooperated with Northeastern University's Small Business Institute in putting on conferences dealing with "Venture Capital" and "Mergers and Acquisitions". Conferences were also held with Boston College on "Corporate Fringe Benefits".

SBANE magazine—New England business

Ten times a year the Association publishes a magazine, NEW ENGLAND BUSINESS, to inform New England small business of the activities of the Association, plus, management educational articles geared to small business. The magazine has a circulation of some 1,700 and is an excellent marketing device for the small business advertiser who wants to reach some of the fastest growing businesses in the area.

"Live-in" seminar—Harvard Business School

The best known of the SBANE continuing educational programs is the three-day "Live-In" Seminar held on the campus of the Harvard Business School. Employing the case study method and four senior professors, this "Live-In" Seminar has provided over 1,000 small business executives, in the past 11 years, with the unique opportunity to live at this renowned business school and discuss a total of 12 cases in the areas of Management, Marketing, Finance and Labor Relations. It is an excellent program, reasonably priced and some 120 executives are expected to attend the January 18-21 seminar.

Caribbean seminars

For the past seven years the Association has sponsored a one-week Caribbean Management Seminar under the direction of David T. Barry, President, David T. Barry Associates, Wellesley, Mass. A faculty of experts and extensive teaching materials are employed. Classes are held in the morning and the afternoons are free for recreation and sightseeing. The purpose of these programs is to allow attendees to get away from their businesses and learn in a pleasant environment how to be better managers.

Breakfast Club

The program to provide the small business executive with an opportunity to hear speakers of special interest with a minimum of time interference with company activities has been established in the Boston area and is expected to spread to several key New England areas. Known as the SBANE Breakfast Club, the program begins at 7:30 a.m. at the Sheraton Lexington Motor Inn. Following announcements of the SBANE activities, a speaker of particular interest to small business is invited to address the gathering and answer questions.

Annual meeting

Every Fall the Association conducts an Annual Meeting and Small Business Conference consisting of symposiums and guest speakers of interest to the small business community. This one-day program also consists of an Exhibition which offers members an opportunity to rent exhibit space and show their products and services to the hundreds in attendance. The program also consists of the annual Election of Officers and Directors.

Trade development

SBANE believes that one way the small businessman can expand his market is through overseas trade development. In 1969 the SBANE European tour of 34 attendees

explored business opportunities. Past trade missions have also included the Far East and Mexico. SBANE works closely with the Department of Commerce, Pan Am and the foreign trade departments of several leading banks in its trade development programs.

Group insurance

Insurance plans not otherwise available to small business are offered through the Association. To date, they include the Voluntary Accidental Death, Dismemberment and Permanent Total Disability Insurance for employees of Association members and two programs of Income Protection Insurance featuring Lifetime Accident Benefits and five years' sickness benefits. Additional group insurance programs are under constant study by the Association for eventual offering to the membership.

Mergers and acquisitions clearinghouse

A Mergers and Acquisitions Clearinghouse program has been established to offer the members an opportunity to register should they plan to either merge, acquire or sell their companies. Companies registered for either a "buy" or "sell" situation are listed by Standard Industrial Classification (SIC Code). Interested parties are matched whenever mutual interest is expressed.

Reduced auto rental

SBANE has entered into an agreement with Avis Rent A Car Systems, Inc. whereby members of the Association receive a 20% discount.

Unemployment cost control

Special arrangements have been made with Gates, McDonald & Company, a nationwide unemployment cost control firm, for members to subscribe to this cost saving program at a reduced fee. Many New England small businesses are not aware of the advantages of close professional scrutiny to keep down the company's experience rating.

Bay State business world

The Association pays each new members subscription fee to the Bay State Business World, a weekly business tabloid, covering news of business and industrial interests. Once a month the Bay State Business World carries a full page of news about SBANE and its programs and activities.

Executive placement

As a service to its members, SBANE maintains resumes of executives interested in employment in New England small companies. These executives are referred to the Association by members, banks, accounting firms, consultants, and representatives of the academic community. This service is rendered at no charge to the member or the job seeker.

Business counselling

Membership in SBANE affords an "extra office" which the member can call upon as a source of information, contacts and references he can pursue for additional information. SBANE through its 32 years of existence has built a close liaison with key people in the academic, governmental, consulting, financial, legal and major New England business community. Many of these people are members of the Association and are always eager to help a member in need.

Governmental liaison

SBANE works closely with virtually every branch of the government that has programs or services available to small business. The SBANE staff and members communicate quite frequently with the SBA, Department of Commerce, Defense Supply Agency Services Region/Boston, and Small Business Specialists at the various defense installations.

Are there any other associations like SBANE?

SBANE is the only regional Association for small businesses in the country. Although there are other national small business as-

sociations, their services are almost exclusively in legislation. They do not offer the extensive educational programs, etc. that SBANE does. The advantage of SBANE as a regional Association is that it is in constant contact to its members through frequent mailings, correspondence and telephone calls to and from the membership. To quote a leading small business official in Washington, SBANE is, "more live-wire than others" and is able to draw grassroots interest and participation.

One vital by-product of SBANE's extensive programs is the opportunity it affords the membership in meeting their fellow small business executives to exchange ideas, thoughts and experiences.

Membership dues

The cost for one year's membership in SBANE is \$50 plus 50¢ per employee up to a maximum of \$200 per year, tax deductible.

There is also an individual membership offered on a very limited basis to employers with no employees and members of large businesses otherwise not eligible to become a member because they employ over 500 people.

Membership in SBANE is an investment in your company and its future through a unified organization dedicated to the growth of the free enterprise system.

MAYOR HENRY MAIER OF MILWAUKEE DISCUSSES SUBURBS AND CITIES

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Mayor Henry Maier, of Milwaukee, discussed recently the need for a national urban policy that would end the suburb-city dichotomy in our metropolitan areas. I include his speech in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBURBIA AND THE CITY: FLIGHT, FIGHT, OR APATHY

(By Henry Maier, mayor of Milwaukee, delivered to Midwest Ecumenical Symposium, Wartburg Theological Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa, October 29, 1969)

Thank you, Father Weber. Throughout history, the city has attracted the restless, the uprooted—men and women hungering for freedom and the opportunity for a better life. Even in medieval Germany there was a saying: "City air makes people free." At the port entrance to America's largest city the inscription on the Statue of Liberty reads: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free."

The wretched refuse of the teeming shore have helped to build the American city, and the restless people have gone on to build the other great cities all across the land. In each case, the new city has stood as a new symbol of liberty, attracting the restless of not only the foreign shore but also the restless, yearning people of the barren countryside.

Throughout these years the American city has been the citadel of freedom and opportunity; but today, the central city in America is a city under seige, a beleaguered city cut off from the rich resources it needs to perform its historic function.

As the city finds itself more and more frustrated in its attempts to provide the good life for its citizens, many of its citizens themselves become frustrated. On a mass scale, they exhibit the classic reactions to frustration: *Flight, fight, or apathy.* Some

do flee the city. Some turn to violence. Others withdraw into silent despair.

What has happened to turn the restless energies of the city back upon itself? To turn its traditionally constructive restlessness into disturbing unease and explosive unrest? What has happened to turn the city fortress of freedom and opportunity into a city beleaguered and under seige?

We as a nation have chosen the path to the beleaguered city of 1969, by not choosing otherwise. Powerful social forces have been unleashed which have had an unplanned impact on our metropolitan areas and particularly to the mother city, the central city at the heart of the metropolis.

In this century we have seen the end of farms as the primary American way of life, even though some of our national policies still perpetuate the agrarian myth. For more than half a century the urban population has outnumbered the rural population. The cities no longer depend upon the farms for their development; the farm now feeds off the city.

In the past 25 years there has been a movement from countryside to city which may well be the greatest migration in the history of the world.

At the same time there has been a vast migration from the city to the suburbs. Two caravans have passed on the urban highway: the Cadillacs of the rich heading for the green fields of suburbia; the jalopies of the poor headed for the hand-me-down housing of the inner city.

These dual migrations have now produced a nation in which there are probably more slum dwellers than there are farmers. At the same time, we are for the first time a suburban nation. More people now live in the suburbs than in the central cities. Politically, this often means that the city is often opposed by both suburban and rural interests in the battle for a greater allocation of our national resources.

The flight to the suburbs has not only been middle class, it has also been largely white. Between 1950 and 1960, the city of Milwaukee lost one-fourth of its middle class housing at the same time the population of its suburbs was increasing by a corresponding twenty-five per cent. Despite this suburban gain in population, only two per cent of the Negro population of the metropolitan area lives outside the central city. In Cleveland, the percentage is even smaller.

The money has moved out of the central cities even as the problems of poverty have moved in. In the Milwaukee metropolis, to cite one example, most of the families with incomes of \$10,000 a year and more live outside the central city. Almost all of those with incomes of \$3,000 a year and less live inside the central city. In 1960, this included one out of nine families in the city of Milwaukee.

If you look at a map of the Milwaukee metropolitan area showing the distribution of family income, you will see the grim story of the causes of unrest in Metropolis, U.S.A.

On the fringes of the area you will see the islands of green, the places with the highest income families, with the best schools, the best homes, and the lowest taxes.

In the center of the map you will see the center of blight and poverty—the only concentration of poverty-level people in the entire metropolitan area, and the area that requires the highest public expenditures.

Between the islands of green and the center of poverty you will find the vast gray areas of the central city where the people live whose incomes is a step above poverty, but still several steps below the level of affluence.

These people of the lower-middle income range must not only pay the costs of servicing the poverty areas, but they must also pay the millions of dollars it costs to provide

city services which benefit the people of the suburban areas.

One-third of the city land is tax exempt, used primarily for institutions that serve the entire metropolitan area—such things as colleges, hospitals, clubs, museums, art centers.

The lower income areas of the central city must also pick up the costs of servicing the poverty areas. The human costs of poverty are uncalculable. But poverty also costs money. In the central city it means extra costs for health, for sanitation, for special school needs, for police and fire protection. These extra costs in my city conservatively estimated at more than \$31 million a year must be borne largely by those least able to pay—the lower income people of the central city. The poor must pay more because they are poor. And these costs must be borne by the property tax—a regressive tax that is not based on the ability to pay.

The local property tax is heavily overburdened because the local property tax was never intended to finance the problems of poverty, of health, of slums, of special educational needs in the age of a highly mobile population.

National studies show that the property tax in the central cities accounts for around 20 per cent of the housing costs of both owners and renters. This is a consumer's tax. It hits hardest those renters with the lower incomes.

In the city of Milwaukee, about 100,000 persons live on fixed incomes—one out of seven—many of them on social security and moderate pensions. If they live in a \$14,000 house, property taxes alone cost about \$52 a month. That's the cost of living they pay whether they own a house or rent it. The roof over the family's head is taxed at a higher rate than any other necessary commodity.

Let me state, ladies and gentlemen, that here in this one corner of Metropolis, U.S.A.—Metropolis Milwaukee as I have described it—is a map of unrest in urban America.

The seeds of unrest are in the poverty areas where the poor—both black and white—live on the bottom rung of the social ladder, cut off from the rich suburban areas by exclusionary zoning practices.

The seeds of unrest are in the gray areas of the lower income people who are uneasy, who feel the effects of inflation and who have to bear the burden of the major costs of the central city.

And some of the causes of unrest are found in the metropolitan area outside the central city, which zone out the poor, which fall to bear their share of the metropolitan burden, and which all too often are abetted by the main custodian of the metropolitan status quo—the metropolitan press which constantly preaches that only the central city status quo should be changed, not the status quo of the metropolitan area as a whole.

All too often, the editors of the metropolitan establishment press live in those suburbs which brag about the quality of their schools, but refuse to admit that the olympic size swimming pool at Green Acres High was built with money that should have provided a remedial reading class at Inner City Tech.

The metropolitan establishment brags: "There are no slums in suburbia." Of course not: The slums of suburbia are in the central city.

This is the metropolitan hypocrisy which has helped to create a system of apartheid in our metropolitan areas and which has bred unrest and rebellion.

The wonder is not that there is unrest in the cities. The wonder is that there is not more unrest; for it is not just the people of deep poverty who are suffering from oppression in the city, but the central city as a whole is suffering from discrimination and neglect by those who profit from it.

Dr. Nathan Wright, Jr., saw this quite well as Executive Director of the Department of Urban Work of the Episcopal Diocese of Newark. Writing of the conditions that led to the riot in Newark, Dr. Wright said that the city as a whole might be seen as a "society boxed in frustration."

Dr. Wright stated, "suburbanites reap the immediate economic benefits from human misery in the city. Suburbanites use the cities' services and help concentrate urban problems."

He made this very significant point: "The nation as a whole takes largely the same 'suburbanite' view of the city. The cities are seen to exist for the convenience of the nation, to be exploited by the all-too easy benefit of one and all. But this thoughtless, myopic attitude has been chiefly responsible for bringing us close to the day of disaster."

A colleague of Dr. Wright's—the rector of an Episcopal Church in a Newark suburb—summed it up quite well: "When we realize how good and pleasant our suburban life is and thank God for it, the city pays for the prayers we pray."

Dr. Charles Hamilton, the co-author with Stokely Carmichael of the Book "Black Power," points out that both the blacks and the whites in the central city are being manipulated.

As the cities are left to be lived in by poor blacks and lower class and middle class whites, Dr. Hamilton said not long ago. "It is no accident that these two groups will be locked in political and economic and, in some cases physical combat."

He said that the crucial point is "whether they realize it or not, their socio-economic problems are being manipulated by and to the advantages of persons and forces existing outside the battleground."

Dr. Hamilton continued: "The rural dominated legislatures do not accidentally deprive cities of fair representation. The inequitable tax sharing plans which fail to relieve high property taxes in some cities like Milwaukee are not the result of happenstance. Who benefits from restrictive zoning in the surrounding suburbs, certainly not the whites and blacks locked in the cities?"

"Under and unemployed black people compressed in the cities rub against misled poor whites who are left behind by their more affluent white cousins and cities blow up."

Dr. Hamilton concluded: "Until poor whites and poor blacks do, in fact, perceive their common economic-political interests, they will continue to be pawns in the hands of others, and we will continue to see frustrations of black people explode, and we will continue to see the fears of poor whites manipulated. Bad, social, and political conditions do not develop accidentally. They are the function and they serve the purpose of those forces that stand aloof and play a vicious game of manipulation of their selfish interests."

Often this manipulation is provided by the metropolitan press whose great game is to pit the underprivileged against the underprivileged in the central city. The great game is to propose one dimensional, single variable solutions to complex multi-variable problems. This was the game played by the journal monopoly press in Milwaukee shortly after the civil disorders of 1967.

At that time, the city had a moment of opportunity to move on many fronts. We had drawn up a 39 point program of middle and long range objectives to get at the roots of many of Milwaukee's social problems. But the journal monopoly chose the single-variable issue of central city open housing and the 39-point program was buried beneath days and weeks of newspaper ink that not only reported conflict but helped to stir up conflict within the central city.

And when it was all over, there was not one more unit of low income housing in the metropolitan area outside the central city

than there was before, there were no more revenues provided to meet central city problems—all the basic problems of the poor, remained. But the metropolitan status quo had been preserved.

In the midst of the headlines for this single variable issue, the 39 points were buried and so was my position calling for metropolitan-wide open housing as a minimum measure to break the white noose around the central city. Nor did the journal monopoly give coverage to any of the voices which lent support to my position—such voices as editorials in the *New York Times* and Madison *Capital Times*, the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Senator Douglas, the Chairman of the National Commission on Urban Problems, or the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. They were just not dramatic enough; no one was marching or picketing in favor of them.

In concentrating on the headlines of dramatic confrontation, the metropolitan press has failed to take note of another factor in the unrest in the cities. This is the real anxiety—justified or not—of some of the lower class whites in the city, the people referred to by Dr. Hamilton in his statement.

Professor Norton E. Long of Brandeis University has put it this way: "Despite the affluence of the middle class, the white lower middle class and white workers are ridden by anxiety. They feel insecure in status, housing, and even jobs . . ." He goes on to say that the wealthy liberals in suburbia can sign open-occupancy petitions with a noble sense of assurance not shared by white ethnics who literally fight for their turf.

Columnist Jimmy Breslin puts it even more strongly and more colorfully in a piece he wrote some time back on the phenomenon of Mrs. Louise Hicks, who ran as a law and order candidate for mayor in Boston. While not sympathetic towards Mrs. Hicks, he says that she has—in his words—"Come up with a reality of the times that smart people in the nation haven't bothered to look for."

"That is," he says, "most white people who still live in the city proper have no sense of wealth because they don't happen to have the cash for it."

"Nor do they have any sense of being privileged. At the same time, they react strongly against solution to city problems forced on them by people who don't live in the neighborhoods with them and don't have even the slightest idea of how people live in a neighborhood. Those white city working people also resent people who have the money and power and who should be responsible for the city but who have left it for the suburbs."

A Mrs. Hicks, he says, speaks for white working people who live in cities that are crumbling. "Live in them," he says, "and work at jobs like bus drivers and longshorement, and take out loans to meet bills. And around them, schools run down and crime goes up and services falter. The racial problem explodes. The only things white working people were ever taught about races at home, in school, and in church was to hate and fear indifference. Now a professor comes out of a school they never saw and says they are evil bigots. The Federal Government says they must change immediately. And everybody at a cocktail party out in the all-white suburbs completely agrees."

Whether or not we agree with these attitudes, I believe we should make every attempt to understand them, just as we should make every attempt to understand the attitude behind ghetto violence. If we do not attempt to understand these attitudes, if we pretend they do not exist because they do not conform with conventional thinking, then we stand the danger of turning our cities into battlefields. Within these attitudes are the seeds of both rebellion and reaction.

More and more the mayors of our be-

leaguered cities must be concerned with both the causes of rebellion and causes of reaction. Reactionary violence can be as destructive as rebellious violence. And I believe we can run into some dreadful things in our society if the causes of rebellion and reaction to it drive us toward the police state.

Social change—radical social change—is needed if we are to remove the causes of rebellion. The danger is that rebellion itself can cause the reaction which will make it more and more difficult to bring about needed social change.

A number of mayors of our largest cities have come to the conclusion that trying to bring about social change in the midst of rebellion and reaction is literally the art of the impossible. Many are retiring from office, discouraged, frustrated by the thankless task of trying to cope with the problems of the beleaguered central city with limited resources of the city itself.

And tragically, the forces that could bring the outside help that is needed stand aloof or contribute to the unrest.

The national government—with its rich command of resources—is more committed to putting a man on Mars than it is on putting men in decent cities in the United States of America.

Our state governments—with their powers to break zoning barriers, to build low income housing in suburbs, to bring about fiscal equity for our cities—these state governments hide and play with social dynamite by not facing up to 20th century urban problems. Their heads are in the sands of the 19th century rural thinking. Legally, it is true, the cities are the creatures of the state; but all too often the state looks upon them as unwanted children, left to starve or to subsist the best they can on a few scraps thrown from the banquet tables of state-wide affluence.

Our metropolitan areas are balkanized, fragmented. The problems of the central city are a spectator sport to the suburban dweller who drives along the freeways between his city job and his bedroom. The freeway is his economic lifeline; who cares that in order to build it thousands of homes of the poor had to be torn down and there is no place to build them again outside the central city?

Decades of Laissez Faire Development within our metropolitan areas have built up walls of racial, fiscal, economic and social segregation that are feudal in concept, inefficient in execution and undemocratic in this age of metropolitan man. They have helped to build a social atom bomb that can go off at any time in our central cities with resulting fall out that will extend far beyond the boundaries of the city itself.

The need today is for open metropolitan communities where there is no segregation by race, creed or credit card. And we need a national urban policy committed to the goal of this kind of metropolitan community.

This national urban policy should strive for balanced communities within our metropolitan areas—balanced according to income groupings. This can be done by changing housing patterns throughout the metropolitan areas. It can be done both by providing more low-income housing in the suburbs and also by eliminating totally restrictive zoning which in essence zones the poor out of suburbia.

There are a number of efforts enrolled to attain these goals. The question of restrictive zoning is now becoming a subject of court contest in a number of localities and may in time be ruled unconstitutional. Secretary Romney's "Operation Breakthrough" to mass produce low income housing units can lead to metropolitan wide low income housing providing that zoning barriers can be reached to provide the necessary land. As a consultant, I have watched with interest a project of the National Association of

Housing and Redevelopment officials to try metropolitan low-income housing strategies in three areas of the country. Another movement on the horizon is the "New Communities" legislation developed by the administration to build balanced new cities and relieve the pressures on the central cities caused by in-migration and population density.

But until we have a national urban policy that commits this nation to an all out attack on the problems of the cities, our cities will continue to rumble with self-defeating unrest.

The commitment will not come easily if, as Dr. Wright suggests, the nation as a whole has a "suburban attitude" toward our cities. The political reality of our time is that the people of the central cities are becoming a decreasing political minority in the nation. They are outvoted by the people of the suburbs, the rural areas, and the smaller towns and villages.

If the people of the central cities are to be heard, they must end their divisions. The people of the city must march together and speak with a single voice on behalf of the central city as a whole. Together they must convince the people of the nation who use the central cities even though they do not live there, that the nation as a whole has a stake in our central cities—that in the long run city and suburb will sink or swim together.

And once again the restless energies of the city must become a great concentrated, constructive force to rebuild the city as an even greater citadel of freedom and opportunity in this nation of cities.

Thank you.

YOUNG WORLD DEVELOPMENT

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of many of my colleagues about the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation and the Young World Development organization.

Much of the credit for the success of both these groups must be attributed to the diligent efforts of the Leonard Wolf family, who reside in my congressional district. Mr. Wolf, a former Iowa Congressman, is now the executive director of the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation and both his wife and daughter have been instrumental in alerting young people to the hunger crisis in this country and abroad through their support of the Prince Georges County Walk for Development.

Prince Georges County participated in the walk for development program on May 25, 1969. Four thousand marchers raised more than \$9,000 on that 1 day to aid a domestic day-care center and to support an overseas Catholic Relief Services nutritional training center.

Two aspects of these walks for development are particularly impressive. First, it is extremely gratifying to see the constructive and enthusiastic manner in which these young people are responding to these very desperate needs in today's world. We have become so inundated with the daily reports of dissent from the young sector of our society that

it is a welcome respite to observe such positive action taking place.

Second, it should be pointed out that these walks for development are leading the trend which the country in general appears to be following; that is, we are recognizing the prevalence of our domestic ills as well as those which face us abroad. Of the total funds raised from these walks, 42.5 percent goes to an overseas project, while another 42.5 percent is retained for a domestic project, in this case one located in Prince Georges County, Md. This again is a most welcome phenomenon because for so many years we have harkened to the cries of famine and starvation in other lands while we have virtually ignored our domestic plight.

I am most pleased to note the establishment of the Young World Development organization as a followup vehicle to the walk for development. Having achieved monetary success through the interest and efforts of young people, it is imperative that this interest be maintained through active investigation and research into the problems of hunger.

It is most encouraging to witness the involvement of dedicated people such as the Wolf family in such a worthwhile effort.

"BOTH MANAGEMENT AND LABOR ARE GUILTY"—A FRANK STATEMENT BY CONGRESSWOMAN SULLIVAN OF THE PROBLEMS OF OUR MERCHANT MARINE

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has been holding extremely important hearings on the future of our American-flag merchant fleet and the proposals of the administration for increasing the shipbuilding program to provide for more subsidized vessels. Our merchant marine is in a deplorable condition; our ships are generally old and obsolete and becoming increasingly uneconomic to operate under present conditions, while the merchant fleets of other nations are increasing in size and cutting deeper and deeper into the business of American shipping.

I have served on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries during my entire career in the Congress, and I have always supported the concept of a healthy and competitive American-flag merchant fleet, and have defended against widespread criticism the policy of subsidizing shipbuilding and ship operation under the American flag. I like to think that this gives me the right to speak out frankly and forthrightly against what I regard as the basic ills of our maritime industry. Perhaps I am too outspoken in this regard, for my comments sometimes upset both management and labor in this industry. Nevertheless, I think the facts should and must be stated.

Hence, in our hearing this morning, when management and labor were represented in full attendance, I put the main issue in rather blunt terms which undoubtedly was stiff medicine for both sides. In view of the importance of the issue, and the danger of misquotation, I am placing my full statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the text is available to all who are deeply concerned over the future of our shipping program, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

Mr. Chairman, I believe in a strong, active, healthy Merchant Marine industry, operated under the United States Flag.

I believe a strong U.S. Merchant Marine is an absolute necessity for the growth and safety of our Country. I have worked for and voted for legislation to make this a possibility for the past 18 years.

However, year after year, we have seen our merchant ships and passenger ships operating under the U.S. Flag disappear, while greater numbers of ships appear under the flags of other countries. Now we are contemplating legislation to build ships at a faster pace and replace many of our worn out vessels.

However, as we plan a replacement and building program, what are we doing to cure the ills and problems that have made so many of our ships disappear from the oceans?

Where does the fault lie? Is the structure of our laws too repressive and inadequate? Is labor too demanding in the manning of the crew? Does management attempt to sit down with labor and plan for the future growth of the industry, not just when contracts are running out—but does management consult at the same time with all factions of maritime labor groups to discuss automation, new types of shipping, etc. now being planned for future construction?

To my way of thinking, there must be closer cooperation between the ship owners, or operators of shipping lines, and the leaders of the men who run, or work on, the ships.

Ships cannot run without crews—and crews cannot work if there are no ships operating under the U.S. Flag.

From the knowledge and experience I've had with our Merchant fleet, I feel both management and labor are guilty.

While Government should not have to settle differences between the two—that's done through collective bargaining—I do believe that Government, namely the Maritime Administration, has a responsibility to sit down with industry and labor at the planning table.

The basic question in my mind is: How can we sell to our U.S. producers of export goods the importance of shipping their export cargoes in American bottoms? Our manufacturers and distributors want to be guaranteed that their products will be handled expeditiously. They want to be sure the ships will sail on schedule.

American exporters need to be sold on using ships that sail under the U.S. Flag. We have the capacity to fill our ships.

What are we doing to use and sell this capacity? We also know ship operators are not going to build new ships unless they can carry enough cargo to make the ships pay.

These are some of the questions and some of the problems that must be answered before we can have a successful program of rebuilding our Merchant Marine.

I believe the answers lie with the ship operators and with the leaders of labor getting together now to plan together for the future.

If this is not done, I can see no possibility for a scheduled, efficient, well-run American Merchant Marine industry. We need one and

want one. With the right kind of cooperation, we can have one.

The future of this great industry depends on full cooperation and understanding.

Remember—our seamen are all U.S. citizens. Their families live under the U.S. economy and their pay must be commensurate with other American industries. I know also that ship owners must make a legitimate profit. An active, healthy industry can achieve both goals.

Cannot all elements of maritime labor sit at the planning table with the ship owners, and work together for a profitable future for all concerned?

If they will do this, I am certain this legislation we are now considering will have full support of this committee and of the American people, and we can again become a nation proud of our Merchant Marine industry.

RAPID GROWTH OF POPULATION

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the problem of population growth has occupied the attention of the House Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population for the past year. So serious has this problem become to us that we published our family planning report—"Federal Government Family Planning—Domestic and International"—on December 22, 1969. The task force is not the only body of concerned citizens that realizes the urgency of this problem, and the need to examine viable family planning policies. Two editorials appeared in the *Evening Star* last week that comment on this problem. The first article is by Michael Harrington, and the second is by James J. Kilpatrick. I would like to have these articles inserted in the *RECORD* for the benefit of all those concerned with the rapid growth of population:

[From the *Washington Evening Star*,
Jan. 20, 1970]

NEW PRESSURE FOR FAMILY PLANNING (By Michael Harrington)

Today there are approximately 200 million Americans. One generation from now, in the year 2000, we are told there will be 300 million. Is there no limit to the number of people who can, and should, inhabit this country?

I am not talking here about the problem of large families and poverty, for there the answer is relatively simple. Because of the lack of information and access to birth control devices, a very large number of poor women involuntarily have many children.

Without violating anyone's conscience and simply by giving these mothers the same free choice as is now enjoyed by the middle class there would be a drop in the number of their babies. Given the decrease in religious opposition to governmental support for such programs there has already been a limited federal involvement in this area.

And I am not raising the question of the population growth of the developing countries, for that, too, is hardly new. Even with the "green revolution" of the last year or so when new strains of grain allowed some of the impoverished lands to make dramatic increases in food production there is still a tremendous pressure from their populations upon limited resources. Here again it is clear that there must be governmental policy in favor of family planning.

But what about affluence? Let us make the assumption—a radical one in the era of Richard Nixon—that the problems of American and world poverty can be solved utilizing, among other means, policies to encourage voluntary birth control. It is then true that there is no limit upon the population once a society is able to feed, clothe and shelter every new citizen? If, as the President told us in his Population Message of July, we are already rushing toward a census of 300 million Americans, shall we then look forward to 400 million, to 500 million—to an indefinite increase in the number of people?

There are, it seems to me, other limits to the number of people than the pressure of starvation. No matter how inventively a society can respond in terms of economic and social planning, there still comes a point when there is too much crowding for psychological and political health.

This is particularly true precisely when affluence is on the increase, for under those circumstances every additional citizen has a claim to his share of consumer goods and services. A majority of the American people have never flown in an airplane yet anyone who travels cannot help but be overwhelmed by the tremendous increase in numbers, noise and irritation in this country's airports during the past decade.

But if one thus argues that there are limits to the desirable size of a nation's population and that they are not simply defined by the ability to provide basic necessities, that proposition has the most radical consequences. The decision as to family size has always been regarded in the United States as a matter of completely private choice, an almost sacred domain which is barred to the public authorities. How can the state proceed in this area without infringing on fundamental liberties?

There are some reforms which would be fairly simple. The tax system is indifferent to family size: It provides the same deduction for each new child. It would be possible to progressively decrease this allowance so that a family would have to bear some of the social cost which its increase in numbers would impose upon society. Such an innovation would, however, obviously only have a modest effect.

And there are those who suggest that our plight requires radical action. Kenneth Boulding has written of "space ship earth," a planet which has used up many of its basic resources and polluted its environment. Under such circumstances there would be a technologically ingenious form of scarcity and rather than throwing products away after using them we would have to recycle them so that they could be used again. And if this were the case the necessity to limit population of citizen-consumers would become imperative. Some have even discussed compulsory family limitation.

I do not have the answers to these disturbing questions and I suspect no one does yet. But the paradox is that it is Richard Nixon who insists upon asking them. He probably has done so because, as in the case of his remarks on ecology, this is an area which is in the talking, but not the appropriating stage. And yet this conservative Republican President may well have raised one of the most radical issues in our history.

[From the *Washington Evening Star*, Jan. 23,
1970]

WE MUST THINK OF STRICT CURBS ON POPULATION

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Alan Barth of the *Washington Post* has been writing editorials in this town since 1821, or for roughly 150 years. He is among the most experienced men in the pundit racket; and you might have supposed he

would have learned, by this time, never to write a piece of satire unless the piece is preceded by an editor's note: "The following article is writ sarkastick."

Alas for the venerable sage. Flinging caution to the winds, he tried his hand the other day at a satire on population control. His modest proposal was for a licensing system, by which prospective parents would have to apply to a state board, like undertakers, doctors, or plumbers, for licenses to engage in the parent business. No permit; no progeny.

Well, the roof fell in, and Barth backed up in a thousand words of rue. The race, it seems, is not always to the Swift. Yet even as he was doing penance for wit, another writer was tackling the same theme—Richard D. Lamm of Denver, in the *January Journal* of the American Bar Association. And Lamm was not kidding. He is a member of the Colorado Legislature and the principal author of Colorado's much publicized abortion law. In an excellent essay, he examines the legal prospects for population control. By control, he means just that: Control.

The notion is shocking. It flies in the teeth of ancient commandments: "Be yet fruitful, and multiply; bring forth abundantly in the earth, and multiply therein." The Psalmist painted the accepted picture: "Thy wife shall be as a fruitful vine by the sides of thine house; thy children like olive plants round about the table."

As Lamm remarks, the prospect also flies in the teeth of trends at law. Ironically, the famous *Griswold* case of 1965, which struck down Connecticut's archaic law against the use of contraceptives, may one day have to be turned on its head. If voluntary measures fail to stem the tides of population, a lawful course may have to be devised to compel contraception.

Barth, Lamm and countless other thoughtful observers begin with the same premises. At present rates of population growth, our world is headed for disaster. Either the birth rate must go down, or the death rate must go up. Programs of voluntary birth control have not wholly failed, but they have generally failed; meanwhile, prodigious efforts are being exerted to prolong man's life.

Here in the United States, to be sure, the outlook is not so grim. Our growth rate has dropped to 1.1 percent a year. An inventive technology doubtless could find ways of feeding, clothing, housing and employing our own people for another century or so.

Yet even here, the 1.1 percent growth rate promises to bring some sobering changes in the lives of our people before this century ends. Our children will live to see overcrowding of our cities to a degree not yet understood. The costs of expanding public services, even in an expanding economy, stun the imagination. As the Conservation Foundation has pointed out, 36.5 million gallons of water must be provided annually for every thousand new Americans—plus sewers, treatment plants, garbage trucks and classrooms.

The United States cannot be viewed in isolation. We are part of mankind, and this is mankind's problem; it will not be possible to separate ourselves economically or ecologically from the rest of the world. What we can do—must do—is to provide leadership and prudent example in the urgent business of slowing population growth. The possibility of killing off our old folk, like aged Eskimos on ice floes, is politically unthinkable; but the possibility of strictly limiting births is thinkable indeed. We must think on it.

Perhaps Barth and Lamm are not so far ahead of the public after all. In 1969, a Gallup Poll found that 44 percent of those polled thought such limits eventually would be necessary. The time for this idea hasn't come yet; but as Americans fight traffic and much of the world fights famine, the time gets closer year by year.

DRUGS IN NORWELL, MASS.

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the town of Norwell, Mass., like thousands of other towns and cities across the Nation, has a serious drug abuse problem among its youth. But what makes Norwell different from many of the other towns with similar problems is the fact that Norwell has recognized that drug abuse was not a problem in itself, but a symptom of deeper social ills.

During this past summer a group of Norwell residents met regularly, to learn about and to discuss their town's drug situation. Out of that series of meetings came a report that goes far beyond the drug question alone, but looks into the social conditions that lead intelligent young people from middle-income families to "turn off" from the life around them and "turn on" to drugs.

It is a challenging and provocative report, and I am pleased to be able to present a summary of their findings to the attention of my colleagues. It is the kind of searching introspection that must be undertaken nationally if we are ever to find a lasting cure to the drug problem.

(The following appeared in an October 7 newspaper here in the Boston area from the Associated Press.)

Today, in private, graveside services at Forest Lawn Memorial Park, the Linkletter family buries daughter Diane, 20 whose death plunge Saturday he blames on LSD—"a tiger in her bloodstream."

Art Linkletter says parents should learn the truth about drugs, alcohol and narcotics—"and get this information to their children in a rememberable, sensible, non-panic way repetitively."

"From the fifth grade up", the entertainer says, "children should be ground thoroughly in the danger of putting chemicals into their systems as they are walking across a super highway with their eyes shut".

"Since this has happened to Diane, you can not imagine the number of people who have called, wired, written me—important people, well known, who have daughters in sanitariums, children who have killed themselves."

"All of a sudden they're coming out and telling me—", his voice choked and halted, "yes", he said. "Many are lawyers, bankers, so called pillars of decency—journalists." He knows none of them personally.

We in Norwell have shared in similar tragedies; unfortunately those of us engaged directly in the drug program know that Norwell will face similar incidents among our young people in the future unless as a town we come alive to our situation and work towards real solutions. Too much time has been spent, talking without positive directions, initiating scatter programs lacking coordination, and showing a general misunderstanding of the many facets of our present drug culture. Understanding first requires each of us to recognize that a drug culture does exist. Then we must honestly evaluate our existence in light of it and resolve our relationship to it both for ourselves and our families. This evaluation process is slow and laborious and requires much searching for answers during which we develop a need for dialogue with each other. We must share our thoughts and pool our ideas to build a healthy community in which to raise our children. The challenge

lies with every citizen. They must act, for without action it is their children that may be caught in the hideous world of drugs.

This report has been prepared to stimulate action, to show positive direction and to make positive recommendations of steps to be taken to begin to establish a permanent structure to better serve our community.

It is the work of a small group of citizens although the basic program as developed and outlined on page 8 was to draw on a large segment of the community and thereby represent a better cross-section. The community did not respond. The excuses are many and often repeated but all are symptoms of a fatal apathy that steals into each of us and lulls us into fake contentment until a grim reality too late snaps us into action.

The small group that did work this summer worked hard. They worked together with many hours of discussion, often in disagreement, but it was good honest dialogue that cut through the facade of superficial knowledge and misconception. It was frustrating, the information often contradictory, source material lacking, expert help non-existent, yet they persisted and their results are recorded in this report and are truly worthy of your review.

No one became an expert on drug abuse since that was not the intent nor indeed would it, in the final analysis have solved the problems. Instead they changed in attitude. They learned to listen and evaluate and found drugs not "the problem", but rather the *symptom* of the problem. They found a rigidity in our social structure that does not readily accept change and departure from the established social patterns. Yet our young people cry for change and when we honestly listen and evaluate, we can see and admit change is due. Something new is needed. Hence this report talks of changes.

Some of the more important of these changes will be found under education. Here is our direct contact with our young people. Here certain changes are most urgently needed both in quality of teachers and material taught. The limitation of time and lack of professional talent in education within the group permitted them to only suggest approaches fully aware they must be detailed by those better qualified. Some of the ideas are exciting and new. Slowly our neighbor communities are also awakening to the need to extend themselves beyond previously established and traditional programs of education. One should note in The Patriot Ledger on Wednesday, October 22, a review of a new Humanities class being started in Scituate High School which was planned by the members of the English department during a Humanities summer workshop. Also significant in the same news item was the use of students by the school committee to assist in the evaluation of the new program.

Change also will be found in the discussion of prevention. We need change in attitudes of people toward the law and its enforcement, change in attitudes towards each other and specifically between parents and children. These words are often said, but for those who took the time this summer to evaluate them in the light of the current drug problem, they have new meaning and new applications.

In the area of assistance we found a lack of resources which necessitated not just a spirit of change, but the development of new ideas and new facilities. In this one area professional input was available and is reflected in the programs outlined. Here one can find immediate positive steps that can be taken and must be taken to improve the heretofore weak and ineffective program. To assist in understanding the material in this report concerning Norwell, a report developed by citizens like the reader, I would

recommend a recent issue of Time magazine, September 26 on "Drugs and Youth". Perhaps it all can be summed by paraphrasing the slogan of Alcoholics Anonymous:

"Give us the courage to change that which must be changed.

Give us the will to accept that which we can not change.

And the wisdom to know one from the other."

Let us extend ourselves and hopefully create a warmer, healthier and enriched community where our young people will think twice about the need to "turn on" with drugs.

HANS KRAUS GIFT TO NATION

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of Members of this body a very significant gift that has been made to our National Library—the Library of Congress. This gift of 162 manuscripts relating to the history and culture of Spanish America was made by one of my constituents, Hans P. Kraus, of Ridgefield, Conn. Mr. Kraus, who owns a rare book firm in New York City and who came to the United States from Vienna in 1939, explained:

This is a modest token of my gratitude and sincere thanks to the United States, a great nation whose hospitality and spirit of freedom and equality have made it possible for me, once a poor refugee, to attain a decent place in free human society.

This warm tribute to our country and to our National Library is indeed gratifying. We owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Kraus and to other Americans who have enriched the collections of the Library of Congress, making it preeminent in the world.

I commend the articles describing Mr. Kraus' gift that appeared in the Library's Information Bulletin to my colleagues:

[From the Library of Congress Information Bulletin, Jan. 22, 1970]

ACQUISITION NOTES

A collection of 162 manuscripts relating to the history and culture of Spanish America in the colonial period, 1492-1819, has been given to the Library of Congress by Hans P. Kraus of Ridgefield, Conn. In announcing the gift, the Librarian stated that "these manuscripts represent the most important acquisition of Hispanic materials since the late Edward P. Harkness presented to the Library in 1929 the Harkness collection of Spanish manuscripts from the early years of the colonial history of Mexico and Peru. The Kraus collection is significant not only for the wide range of information it contains about Spanish colonial history but for the light it sheds on the early history of the territories now included in the United States."

Mr. Kraus, head of the firm of H. P. Kraus, dealers in rare books and manuscripts, which he founded in New York in 1940, is a well-known collector and bibliophile. He is also chairman of the board of directors of Kraus-Thomson Organization, Ltd. A native of Vienna, who is now a citizen of the United States, he has lived in America since 1939. He is a member of the Bibliographical Society of America, the Bibliographical Society of England, the Gutenberg Society, and the

Groller Club, and he is a Chevalier of the Legion of Honor.

Included in the Kraus collection are contemporary colonial writings that document exploration of the New World, the government of New Spain (Mexico), the workings of the Inquisition, taxation and economic conditions in the colonies, Spanish relationships with the Indians and the French, and the loss of parts of the Spanish empire to American encroachment.

One of the earliest documents is a contemporary manuscript copy of Amerigo Vespucci's letter of September 10, 1504, to Piero Soderini, "President" of Florence, in which the explorer discussed all four of the voyages, giving new and unpublished detailed information, especially on the third. Verrazano's explorations are documented in two folio volumes containing 49 manuscripts—letters, documents, and transcripts—relating to Giovanni da Verrazano and his family. One of these manuscripts is an early authoritative transcript of a text on his most famous voyage, that undertaken in 1523 for Francis I of France, on which he surveyed the eastern seaboard of North America from Florida to Newfoundland and discovered Long Island, Staten Island, the mouth of the Hudson, New York Bay, and Manhattan Island.

Three original manuscript documents relate to Alvar Nunez Gabeza de Vaca, a pioneer in the conquest of Mexico and the exploration of Florida, yielding data on the family life of this heroic survivor of de Soto's disastrous expedition. Other important material, hitherto unused, on these early Spanish attempts to colonize Florida and the territories north of Mexico is contained among the extensive and significant records of the government of New Spain entered in the great order-book of Viceroy Luis de Velasco (the elder). As well as the autograph of his eminent predecessor Don Antonio de Mendoza, the first Viceroy, this contains a monumental and complete record of the vital work performed by this great servant of the Spanish Crown in 1550-1552 in organizing the first large area of mainland America to be peopled by Europeans. On the other hand, a bloody setback for the Spaniards in their attempt to make their strategic Florida outpost a frontier colony is found recorded in the Kraus collection in an early narrative of the episode in 1567-1568 in which the French Captain de Gourgue took revenge on some of the Spaniards who had brutally massacred Jean Ribaut and his pioneer French Florida settlers in 1565. This vivid exploit is placed in the enthralling context of the ventures and feats of de Gourgue and his family in the war-torn France of this period, as set out in a unique collection of original and autograph documents from the family archive. Nonetheless, the history of obscure periods in Florida's 17th-century history is illustrated as well, for the Kraus collection includes an enlightening series of autograph letters from successive Governors of the colony, the sequence of whose tenures can be established for the first time from this source.

The Zumarraga Papers originated in the archive of Fray Juan de Zamarraga and of his successors in the see of Mexico. The 116 original letters and documents that they comprise concern the government and administration of Mexico; the country's social structure and culture; the living conditions of the Indians; the Catholic Church and the religious orders in Mexico; and public health, education, professional life, the arts, and public works in the first century and a half of Spanish rule in mainland America. These manuscripts in the Zumarraga Papers bear the signatures of the Emperor Charles V, the Empress Isabel, their daughter Joanna, their son Philip II of Spain, and their descendants Philip III and Philip IV, Kings of Spain, as well as many others. Another invaluable col-

lection of documents, contemporary with these letters to the great first Bishop of Mexico, illuminates the hotly debated career of his colleague, the celebrated Fray Bartolomé de Las Casas. The most exciting discovery here is a long autograph letter, the text of which has never appeared in print, setting out his requirements of becoming Bishop of Chiapas, placed in the context of an absorbing series of opinions given to the Emperor on the questions of how the European settlers ought to treat the American natives and how the Spanish Crown ought to give a due reward to conquistadors who until then had lived on the forced labor of the Indians. These are materials vital to the study of the controversial New Laws of the Indies of 1542, which Las Casas inspired Charles V to approve; and they amply explain why the Emperor felt he had to withdraw some of the Laws in 1545, in face of the nearly revolutionary opposition of the colonists.

The latest dated items are six lengthy dispatches sent in 1819 from Mexico to Spain by the Viceroy Juan Ruiz de Apodaca, Count of Venodito, which foreshadow the impending loss of part of the empire; they contain extensive information on the government, condition, and defense of the Spanish territories that are now part of the United States, especially Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California, with frequent references to American and other forces and settlements in Louisiana and Florida.

When the processing and arrangement of the Kraus collection is completed, it will be available for the use of scholars in the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress. Further detailed releases of information on these documents, now in preparation, will highlight the significance of individual items of outstanding importance in the collection. It is hoped that scholarly editing and publication of many of these texts may follow.

STAFF ACTIVITIES

The Librarian of Congress, L. Quincy Mumford, and Mrs. Mumford, were hosts at a luncheon on Thursday, January 15, in the Whitall Pavilion in honor of Mr. and Mrs. Kraus.

Mr. Mumford expressed to Mr. Kraus the gratitude all scholars must feel for his generous gift of these manuscripts to the national library, where they will be available for scholarly use. In reply Mr. Kraus gave a very moving speech in which he told how grateful he was to the United States, to which he came as a poor refugee in 1939, for the opportunities it had given him, and how happy he was to be able to present this "token" of his appreciation to the country of his adoption. He also revealed that Lessing Rosenwald, another great benefactor of the Library, had enabled him to marry and to remain in the book business by buying rare books from him in 1940, the first large sale the young book dealer had made.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 10, 1970]
VESPUCCI MANUSCRIPT GIVEN TO U.S. LIBRARY
(By Henry Raymond)

A narration by Amerigo Vespucci of his four voyages to America between 1497 and 1502 has been donated to the Library of Congress as part of a collection of 162 historical documents spanning 300 years of colonial Spanish America.

The collection, donated by Hans P. Kraus, a leading New York dealer in rare books, also includes letters from Emperor Charles V, his daughter Princess Joanna and King Philip II of Spain. Although some of the material is known to scholars, a number of the original manuscripts have never been published.

In an announcement to be made in Washington today by L. Quincy Mumford, the Librarian of Congress, the documents are characterized as "the most important ac-

quisition of Hispanic materials" since the late Edward P. Harkness, the philanthropist, gave his collection to the library in 1929.

Dr. Richard H. Boulind, a Cambridge University specialist in Latin-American history who catalogued the collection, said here yesterday:

"As a whole, the documents offer a fresh and vivid picture of the Spanish Court's administration of mainland America from the time of the conquest of Mexico by Hernán Cortés in the decade of the fifteen-twenties to the decline in 1819.

"Specifically, it details some of the less known controversies between the court and the Viceroy over the living conditions of the Indians and the conduct of the Catholic Church."

One of the earliest documents is a contemporary copy of a 17-page letter by Vespucci, the Italian navigator whose first name, Amerigo, was given to the continent of America. The letter, dated Sept. 10, 1504, was written to Piero Soderini, the gonfaloniere (president) of Florence, describing all four of Vespucci's voyages to the New World.

The letter, which was believed lost for several centuries, was obtained by Mr. Kraus from a Swiss dealer in 1955 after secret negotiations worthy of the best Florentine intrigues.

"I saw a photographic reproduction of the manuscript at the Vespucci exhibition in the Palazzo Vecchio in 1954," Mr. Kraus said yesterday in an interview at his bookstore at 16 East 46th Street.

"The original, which had been hidden in a vault, was a document of fundamental historic importance, far more detailed than other Latin versions of the voyages printed in 1505. Through devious ways—which I'd rather not discuss—I was able to get the original in Switzerland a year later."

Mr. Kraus, a native of Vienna who came to the United States in 1939 and has since built a reprint and rare-book business valued in excess \$70-million, explained yesterday some of the reasons for the gift.

"This is a modest token," he said, "of my gratitude and sincere thanks to the United States, a great nation whose hospitality and spirit of freedom and equality have made it possible for me, once a poor refugee, to attain a decent place in free human society."

In donating the manuscripts to the Washington library, Mr. Kraus who valued the collection at \$1-million specified that he was prepared to finance the publication of facsimile reproductions and translations of the Vespucci letters and of other documents never before published.

These include some of the 116 original letters and manuscripts from the archives of Fray Juan de Zumarraga, first Archbishop of Mexico, and of his successors in that see. The documents—among them letters signed by Charles V; Joanna, Princess of Spain and Portugal, and Phillip II—are dated between 1527 and 1660.

Since original manuscripts relating to the Spanish court and the American colonies are rarely found outside the official archive of the Indies in Seville and the national archives of Mexico and Peru, Mr. Kraus was asked how he obtained the Zumarraga collection.

TRADE SECRETS

"Just say they came from dealers who have good connections in Mexico," Mr. Kraus said with a smile and obvious pride. "These are trade secrets that cannot be revealed."

Some of the letters of the Spanish sovereigns to their administrators in Mexico appear to contradict the belief frequently found in Anglo-Saxon textbooks that they were indifferent to the fate of the Indians.

In a manuscript by Joanna, signed "Yo, la Princesa" (I, the Princess), dated Valladolid, March 16, 1556, the colonial administration is advised of complaints by the Archbishop of Mexico that "Indians are regularly

drafted into [construction] gangs without food or other necessities."

Nor did the church escape royal vigilance. On March 4, 1561, King Philip wrote a bristling letter to the Viceroy of New Spain (Mexico), charging that the religious orders were violating court regulations in the construction of monasteries.

"The houses are built very close to one another," the King complained, "so as to be on rich, fertile, well-watered ground near the city of Mexico, while 20 or 30 leagues or more of territory populated by Indians is left without houses to instruct the Indians, owing to the unwillingness of the friars to settle in hilly or torrid areas.

"The King therefore orders the Viceroy to see that in the future, monastic houses are built at least six leagues apart."

OTHER DOCUMENTS

Other documents include three manuscripts written at the time of Alvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca's exploration of Florida, correspondence between Spain and Mexico on the controversial social reforms of the celebrated Fray Bartolomé de Las Casas, and 49 manuscripts relating to Giovanni da Verazano's travels from Florida to Newfoundland.

The latest dated items are six long dispatches sent in 1819 from Mexico to Spain by the Viceroy, Juan Ruiz de Apadaca, Count of Venodito, which foreshadow the impending loss of part of the empire.

They contain extensive information on the defense of the Spanish territories that are now part of the United States, such as Texas, New Mexico, New Mexico, Arizona, and California.

A TRIBUTE TO A GALLANT SOLDIER—MEDAL OF HONOR WINNER, POSTHUMOUSLY, PFC. CARLOS J. LOZADO

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of sorrow and yet deep pride that I rise today to relate the story of the final moments in the life of a gallant young man from Puerto Rico who gave his life in Vietnam in service to this Nation and the ideals for which it stands.

Pfc. Carlos J. Lozado, U.S. Army, distinguished himself by conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life. For this supreme sacrifice above and beyond the call of duty a grateful Nation bestowed upon him the Medal of Honor.

While serving as a machinegunner with the 1st Platoon, Company A, 2d Battalion, 503d Infantry, 173d Airborne Brigade, Private Lozado encountered the enemy for the last time on November 20, 1967, at the battle of Dak To in the Republic of Vietnam.

There he poured deadly machinegun fire into the ranks of an advancing North Vietnamese company which attacked his outpost on a lonely trail with terrible force. As the assault continued Private Lozado cut down 20 of the advancing North Vietnamese troops and completely disrupted their initial attack. He then remained in an exposed position and continued to fire at the enemy despite the pleas of his comrades to withdraw.

When the North Vietnamese launched a heavy attack on the forward west flank of Company A with the intent to cut them off from their battalion, Company A was given the order to withdraw. Realizing that if he abandoned his position there would be nothing to hold back the surging tide of North Vietnamese soldiers, Private Lozado called for his comrades to move back as he remained entrenched in his position.

Only meters away the enemy continued to advance on three sides as he valiantly provided life-giving cover to his company as they withdrew. He made his decision realizing that a delay in withdrawal on his part meant almost certain death. Yet, he continued to deliver a heavy, accurate volume of suppressive fire against the enemy until he was mortally wounded.

What can one say, Mr. Speaker, about a man who gives his life for his comrades? What can one say, Mr. Speaker, about a man who sacrifices his life for his friends and the traditions, ideas, and future hopes of his Nation?

Private Lozado's deeds and heroism are an example and inspiration to every member of the U.S. Armed Forces.

His actions remain in the highest tradition of the U.S. Army and exemplify the extent to which the Americans of Puerto Rican ancestry, and of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, are contributing to the war effort in Vietnam. Heroism of this type transcends boundary lines, oceans, and status of citizenship. Private Lozado is an American in the finest sense and he, together with the many members of the American fighting forces of Puerto Rican background, shall not be forgotten.

To his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Leo Lozada of my congressional district in the Bronx, his wife, Mrs. Linda B. Lozada, and his infant child, I wish to extend, once again, my deepest sympathy and gratitude on behalf of all the peoples of this Nation.

PERCY PLAN ELIMINATES NATO PAYMENT DEFICIT

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, according to an article in yesterday's Chicago Tribune, my colleague from the other body, the senior Senator from Illinois, CHARLES H. PERCY, achieved some rather remarkable results when he conferred last week with various Government officials of West Germany.

The Tribune's Washington finance editor, Louis Dombrowski, reports that the arrangements worked out by Senator PERCY will enable our Government to eliminate the entire balance-of-payments deficit resulting from American troops assigned to NATO forces in West Germany.

The article, which speaks for itself, attests to the special qualifications of Senator PERCY to negotiate successfully in this field of activity in behalf of our Gov-

ernment. He deserves the praise of all Americans.

Mr. Dombrowski's article follows:

PERCY'S PLAN ON PAYMENTS (By Louis Dombrowski)

WASHINGTON.—The United States is on the edge of a major accord with its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization that could eliminate the balance of payments problem of maintaining American troops in Europe. Much, if not all, of the credit for the diplomatic breakthrough should go to Sen. Percy [R., Ill.].

Percy, who returned from Europe last week, reported in an interview that the three primary West German political parties have agreed in principle to the Percy concept of "burden-sharing."

Under this concept, the balance of payments cost of maintaining foreign troops assigned to NATO forces would be paid by the country in which the troops are stationed.

15 BILLIONS ANNUALLY

The United States, for example, has 310,000 GIs under the NATO banner. The cost of maintaining these troops and their dependents amounts to 15 billion dollars a year, of which 1.5 billion is the balance of payments cost.

Thru bilateral negotiations with the German government, the United States has induced West Germany to pick up 80 per cent of this payments loss under an "offset agreement" whereby Germany buys American bonds denominated in deutschmarks and the funds are used to maintain the troops. However, these bonds are interest-bearing and redeemable in five years: earlier, if Germany needs foreign exchange.

The Percy plan would change all this. Instead of bilateral agreements, the plan would be multilateral. Instead of the United States in effect paying interest on funds to maintain troops for German defense, Germany would pay for the common defense with money appropriated in the West German budget, Percy said.

PLAN OUTLINED

The extent of the burden sharing was outlined by Percy. Right now, he said, the United States must pay 250 million dollars a year for 70,000 German nationals who work for American military units. The United States also must pay for construction of facilities which will remain in Germany after the Americans leave, for power, and even for transportation on the state-owned railroads. The United States even pays German property taxes.

Burden-sharing would require West Germany to pay for all these items as well as for such supplies and equipment as paperclips, carbon paper, and so on, he said.

The Illinois Senator said he used three weapons to convince the West Germans that burden sharing was the approach to use.

GERMANY REDEEMS BONDS

First, unknown to German Chancellor Willy Brandt, the German central bank recently redeemed ahead of schedule 500 million dollars of the offset bonds, further contributing to the American balance of payments deficit.

Second, Percy threatened to co-sponsor the resolution of Senate majority leader Mike Mansfield [D., Mont.], which would withdraw 100,000 American troops from NATO, and third, President Nixon's veto of the labor and health, education, and welfare appropriations bill, which was a dramatic sign to inflation-conscious Germans of the United States' intention to reduce its spending.

PRAISES COOPERATION

Percy praised the cooperation he received from the White House in pressing forward

with his plan, especially from the treasury and defense departments. He said the state department was cautious toward the plan because it did not wish to disturb the friendly relationships between Germany and the United States.

"Under President Johnson," Percy recalled, "it was a lonely battle. I was on my own. It is different under President Nixon."

DIRECT ELECTIONS: AN INVITATION TO NATIONAL CHAOS

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, my opposition to direct election is well documented, if not well known or well taken. The seeming impossibility of putting the issues of "direct election" on the line is frustrating. In the rush for the bandwagon of majoritarianism, the factors which should be stressed in this debate have been totally ignored. Defects inherent in the proposal to abolish the electoral system are passed over in favor of the enthusiasm for a reform which the people want. The refusal of direct election proponents to see this proposal in its true perspective, in relationship with the effect it will have upon each and every one of the moving parts of the federal system, is as unhealthy as it is dangerous.

Conspicuously absent from any debate presently directed toward electoral reform is consideration of what was once known as the Katzenbach proposal which would remove the human element from the electoral vote system. Perfecting the present system by providing that the electoral votes of each State be cast automatically for the winner of that State's vote has logic—but not popular appeal going for it.

This effort to perfect our system by thinking in terms of pure democracy borders, in my opinion, on the realm of insanity. Democracy, to be meaningful, effective, and just, must first be practical. To perfect the system of government and at the same time diminish or eliminate the voice of minorities within that system is a perfection we cannot afford.

Theodore H. White has put it correctly when he states that what is pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee is a proposal "to abolish the federal system." By so doing, the vital elements which allow for minorities to participate and to have some impact within the system—are being destroyed. Black citizens should take careful note of what is about to happen in the Senate—for it will have as much if not more effect on our civil rights than confirmation of any of the Nixon Supreme Court nominees.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial by noted historian and author, Theodore H. White. Mr. White's comment on direct election is taken from the January 30 issue of Life magazine. It follows:

DIRECT ELECTIONS: AN INVITATION TO NATIONAL CHAOS

(By Theodore H. White)

(NOTE.—Mr. White has closely followed the campaigns of the last four Presidents. His most recent book is "The Making of the President, 1968.")

Last September, in a triumph of noble purpose over common sense, the House passed and has sent to the Senate a proposal to abolish the Federal System.

It is not called that, of course. Put forth as an amendment to the Constitution, the new scheme offers a supposedly better way of electing Presidents. Advanced with the delusive rhetoric of *vox populi, vox Dei*, it not only wipes out the obsolete Electoral College but abolishes the sovereign states as voting units. In the name of The People, it proposes that a giant plebiscite pour all 70,000,000 American votes into a single pool whose winner—whether by 5,000 or 5,000,000—is hailed as National Chief.

American elections are a naked transaction in power—a cruel, brawling yearlong adventure swept by profound passion and prejudice. Quite naturally, therefore, Constitution and tradition have tried to limit the sweep of passions, packaging the raw votes within each state, weighting each state's electoral vote proportionately to population, letting each make its own rules and police its own polls.

The new theory holds that an instantaneous direct cascade of votes offers citizens a more responsible choice of leadership—and it is only when one tests high-minded theory against reality that it becomes a nightmare.

Since the essence of the proposal is a change in the way votes are counted, the first test must be a hard look at vote-counting as it actually operates. Over most of the United States votes are cast and counted honestly. No one anymore can steal an election that is not close to begin with, and in the past generation vote fraud has diminished dramatically.

Still, anyone who trusts the precise count in Gary, Ind.; Cook County, Ill.; Duval County, Texas; Suffolk County, Mass.; or in half a dozen border and Southern states is out of touch with political reality. Under the present electoral system, however, crooks in such areas are limited to toying with the electoral vote of one state only; and then only when margins are exceptionally tight. Even then, when the dial riggers, ballot stuffers, late counters and recounters are stimulated to play election-night poker with the results, their art is balanced by crooks of the other party playing the same game.

John F. Kennedy won in 1960 by the tissue-thin margin of 118,550—less than 1/3 of one percent of the national total—in an election stained with outright fraud in at least three states. No one challenged his victory, however, because the big national decision had been made by electoral votes of honest-count states, sealed off from contamination by fraud elsewhere—and because scandal could as well be charged to Republicans as to Democrats. But if, henceforth, all the raw votes from Hawaii to Maine are funneled into one vast pool, and popular results are as close as 1960 and 1968, the pressure to cheat or call recounts must penetrate everywhere—for any vote stolen anywhere in the Union pressures politicians thousands of miles away to balance or protest it. Twice in the past decade, the new proposal would have brought America to chaos.

To enforce honest vote-counting in all the nation's 170,000 precincts, national policing becomes necessary. So, too, do uniform federal laws on voter qualifications. New laws, for example, will have to forbid any state from increasing its share of the total by en-

franchising youngsters of 18 (as Kentucky and Georgia do now) while most others limit voting to those over 21. Residence requirements, too, must be made uniform in all states. The centralization required breaches all American tradition.

Reality forces candidates today to plan campaigns on many levels, choosing groups and regions to which they must appeal, importantly educating themselves on local issues in states they seek to carry.

But if states are abolished as voting units, TV becomes absolutely dominant. Campaign strategy changes from delicately assembling a winning coalition of states and becomes a media effort to capture the largest share of the national "vote market." Instead of courting regional party leaders by compromise, candidates will rely on media masters. Issues will be shaped in national TV studios, and the heaviest swat will go to the candidate who raises the most money to buy the best time and most "creative" TV talent.

The most ominous domestic reality today is race confrontation. Black votes count today because blacks vote chiefly in big-city states where they make the margin of difference. No candidate seeking New York's 43 electoral votes, Pennsylvania's 29, Illinois' 26 can avoid courting the black vote that may swing those states. If states are abolished as voting units, the chief political leverage of Negroes is also abolished. Whenever a race issue has been settled by plebiscite—from California's Proposition 14 (on Open Housing) in 1964 to New York's Police Review Board in 1966—the plebiscite vote has put the blacks down. Yet a paradox of the new rhetoric is that Southern conservatives, who have most to gain by the new proposal, oppose it, while Northern liberals, who have most to lose, support it because it is hallowed in the name of The People.

What is wrong in the old system is not state-by-state voting. What is wrong is the anachronistic Electoral College and the mischief anonymous "electors" can perpetrate in the wake of a close election. Even more dangerous is the provision that lets the House, if no candidate has an electoral majority, choose the President by the undemocratic unit rule—one state, one vote. These dangers can be eliminated simply by an amendment which abolishes the Electoral College but retains the electoral vote by each state and which, next, provides that in an election where there is no electoral majority, senators and congressmen, individually voting in joint session and hearing the voices of the people in their districts, will elect a President.

What is right about the old system is the sense of identity it gives Americans. As they march to the polls, Bay Staters should feel Massachusetts is speaking; Hoosiers should feel Indiana is speaking; Blacks and other minorities should feel their votes count; so, too, should Southerners from Tidewater to the Gulf. The Federal System has worked superbly for almost two centuries. It can and should be speedily improved. But to reduce Americans to faceless digits on an enormous tote board, in a plebiscite swept by demagoguery, manipulated by TV, at the mercy of crooked counters—this is an absurdity for which goodwill and noble theory are no justification.

CHRISTMAS IN VIETNAM

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the loneliest times for our courageous

fighting men is Christmas when they must be thousands of miles from their homes and loved ones in the jungles of Vietnam.

Being away from loved ones at Christmas is a heavy enough burden for many, but the added stress of spending the holidays in a battle situation make their lives even more difficult.

Last Christmas, Mr. Speaker, our colleagues and their staffs supported several projects to raise money to send gifts and food to these brave men in Vietnam. One of these was for men of the Americal Division.

Most of the credit for this project should go to a member of my staff, Miss Mary Ellen Terziu, whose brother is stationed in Vietnam. Miss Terziu organized this gift-raising drive and the packages, which were distributed through her brother brought much happiness to a group of servicemen.

Special thanks are due to the Humble Oil Co. for the thousands of candy bars they contributed for this project and Pan American Airlines for assistance in transporting the gifts.

Our fighting men deserve all the support we can give them and, according to the servicemen themselves, some of the strongest support comes in the form of remembrances received from home.

My office has received letters from Vietnam expressing gratitude to those who brought Christmas a little closer to home for many American servicemen. Quotations from a few of them are included herewith:

Seasons greetings from sunny Vietnam. The greatest morale capability in Vietnam is letters and packages from friends and relatives from the world.

Two weeks ago I was caught out in the field for three days without food and only rice paddle water. We were unable to be resupplied due to inclement weather.

Although everyone was tired, wet and hungry, the biggest complaint was the absence of mail which comes with the resupply.

I wish to sincerely thank those persons who so thoughtfully sent me the fantastic Christmas present. I would also like to compliment you on the wise selection of presents. We greatly appreciated all the food, toys and literature. I would like to take this opportunity to wish each and everyone a very merry Christmas and Happy New Year for you have made mine more enjoyable. (Sp/4 John Terziu.)

The Electronic Ground Sensor personnel of the Americal Division in Vietnam wish to sincerely thank you for the wise selection of Christmas presents.

Thirteen packages were received and were distributed throughout the division. This includes GIs in Chu Lai, Hill 270, LZ professional, LZ Bronco, Duc Pho, San Juan Hill, LZ Hawk Hill, LZ Stinson and here at LZ West.

There was also some candy left to be distributed to refugee children in Hiep Duc. We sincerely appreciate your thoughtfulness and wish you a prosperous New Year. (The LZ West Sensor Team.)

The three of us at our bunker location west of Chu Lai, Vietnam, had the privilege to share the goodies that you so generously sent.

Our location is an isolated fire support base with no PX or mess hall facilities. Your thoughtfulness was appreciated. (Sp/4

Walter E. Carlson, Sp/4 John Farran, Sp/4 Larry Fairchild.)

We here in Vietnam greatly appreciate the gifts you sent us. Thank you for your thoughts during the Christmas season. (Sp/4 John E. King.)

On behalf of the 46 men and officers of the Americal Target Mission Force, I would like to express our appreciation for the Christmas packages.

The gifts arrived on Christmas Day and were distributed among our field outposts and local refugee centers. The yo-yos, paddle ball sets and other toys have already won the hearts of every Vietnamese child using them.

Your gesture certainly helped to bring the holiday season a bit closer to all of us. (Lt. James D. Tegeder.)

CONGRESSMAN EDWARD I. KOCH
REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, this week I am mailing out 200,000 copies of my fourth newsletter to my constituents.

With the thought that my report might be of interest to our colleagues, I am submitting it for printing in the RECORD:

CONGRESSMAN EDWARD I. KOCH REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON, FEBRUARY 1970

Dear Constituent and Fellow New Yorker, I have served a full year with the Science and Astronautics Committee, and the President's new space budget will soon be before the Committee.

I was as proud and excited as the most ardent supporter of our Apollo program during the two moon landings by our astronauts. And yet, when I considered the \$19.4 billion spent to land the first two men on the moon (on the last trip we left behind \$67 million of junked equipment), I concluded that the program should continue, but on a more modest scale. Last spring, when the Committee considered NASA's budget, I was one of four members of the Committee who sought to reduce the authorization for the manned space program. I was doubly upset when the Committee increased NASA's authorization budget by \$258 million over the amount requested by the Administration, with the bulk of the increase going to the manned space program. During the Committee hearings I ascertained, as a result of my questioning NASA officials, that the purpose of manned space flights is basically limited to determining the physiological and psychological effects of space environment upon men, and that the scientific objectives are secondary and could be achieved more effectively and economically using unmanned spacecraft. For these reasons I voted against the increase in the budget and filed a minority report setting forth my position:

"In a period of extraordinary and urgent demands upon our national resources brought about by enormous defense expenditures, and pressing economic and social problems many of which are not being met adequately, I regard it as at least unwise, at most outrageous, for Congress to increase the already large-scale expenditures for manned space flight." (Excerpt from Dissenting Views of Hon. Edward I. Koch.)

This year I will continue to use my position on the Science and Astronautics Com-

mittee for opposing unnecessary or excessive expenditures for manned space flights. There is something seriously wrong with our national priorities which put a shuttle to the moon before a shuttle to LaGuardia Airport.

A TRIP TO CANADA

A number of parents in our district have told me about the growing exodus of draft-age Americans to Canada. In some cases these were parents whose sons had already emigrated. On December 29, I went to Canada to see for myself and to talk with some of the estimated 50,000 young Americans who have emigrated to that country primarily to avoid the draft and military service. Those I met told me that I was the first U.S. Congressman to make the trip for this purpose. I visited Toronto, Ottawa, and Montreal to find out who these young people are, why they have emigrated, and how they are adjusting to the new life they have chosen.

For the most part they are sensitive and mature young people who emigrated from every section of the United States. They have been outraged by our prosecution of the Vietnam War (some of them have served in Vietnam); they have been victimized by the brutality of military training; and they have been alienated by what they see as intolerance and hypocrisy in American society.

I met with five members of the Canadian Parliament in Toronto. They are delighted with what they consider to be talented and educated young Americans who have chosen to pursue their careers and raise their families in Canada.

Many of the young people I saw are deeply saddened by parents who have practically disowned them, while others are greatly strengthened by parents who have stood by them. In either case, they regret they can no longer visit their families in the U.S. The young Americans in Canada that I met nourish no hatred for their country.

As a result of my trip to Canada, I have received an enormous amount of mail from all parts of the country, much of it critical. Those letter writers who attempted to enter into a rational dialogue with me made it clear that they find it repugnant to deal with the problem presented by these exiles in Canada while our young men are still drafted and are sent to Vietnam to fight and sometimes die. I understand that feeling and so in responding to those writers, I state that our primary goal at this time must be to stem the flow of young men leaving the country. That can be done if we terminate the draft. Pending its termination, we should provide that no draftee will be sent to Vietnam without his consent and add to the existing draft regulations the status of selective conscientious objector. One receiving such a classification would be required to perform noncombatant service in the Armed Forces or an acceptable form of alternative civilian service as that now performed by traditional conscientious objectors.

I also tell them that there will not be an amnesty offered to those in exile as long as the war in Vietnam continues. However, it is important to open up the discussion of that matter so that we can begin now to think of the options which should be made available to these young men.

This is a most difficult problem but one which we must face and I shall try to begin a dialogue in Congress and among concerned citizens which does not resort to the harsh rhetoric that makes it often impossible for good Americans to rationally discuss the consequences of the Vietnam War still growing like a cancer in the American body politic. If some do not think we owe such concern to the young men of this country, can they not at least agree that such concern is owed to the parents of these young men?

Nothing takes the place of first hand observation. And I have suggested that other Members of Congress go to Canada to observe the situation and report back their conclusions to the Congress.

MARIHUANA

During the past year our country has been forced to take a hard look at marihuana because of the attention it has been given by the press and because of the younger generation's continued insistence in experimenting with it. Until recently, the subject of marihuana in Congress was considered "political poison" but recent discussions and debate have now led to proposals for the reduction of the existing severe penalties for marihuana possession and 85 Congressmen have joined in co-sponsoring my bill to establish a Presidential Commission on Marihuana. The bill, which I originally introduced in May of last year, does not suggest whether marihuana should be legalized; rather, it provides an opportunity for a Commission of nine fair-minded individuals to study the medical, social and legal consequences of marihuana use. After a year's consideration the Commission would present recommendations for legislative action at all levels of government—local, state and federal.

On October 15 and 16 the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Revision of Laws held hearings on my bill. Both the Departments of Justice and HEW spoke favorably in behalf of the Commission concept and agreed that an evaluation of marihuana is needed.

The bill has been endorsed by the five District Attorneys of New York City, New York State's Attorney General, and Mayor John V. Lindsay.

No further action has yet been taken by the House Committee but in the Senate, where the Commission bill was considered along with other drug legislation, the concept was adopted in part. The Senate has passed its drug bill revising the federal penal code for drug abuse and included a provision establishing a committee appointed by the Attorney General and the Secretary of HEW to study marihuana. The bill has yet to be approved by the House and it is my hope that the House will take the "marihuana committee" proposed by the Senate and give it the stature of a Presidential Commission.

TAXES

In my newsletter of last June, I reported on the progress of the tax reform bill. As you know, the tax bill was passed by Congress and signed by the President. Several bills which I co-sponsored are part of the new law. They include tax reform such as—

A minimum tax on the loophole income of wealthy individuals

A reduction of the oil depletion allowance

A curb on hobby farm tax losses

And the following tax relief—

An increase in the personal exemption from \$600 to \$750 over a four year period.

An increase in the standard deduction from 10 to 15 percent and an increase in the maximum allowable deduction from \$1,000 to \$2,000 over a four year period

A reduction in the tax rates of single individuals, regardless of age, who maintain their own homes.

I am especially pleased in having been responsible for an amendment to the tax code which will now permit middle income tenant-stockholders to deduct their pro-rata portion of mortgage interest and property taxes in cooperative housing projects where New York State subsidizes apartments for low income families. I hope this new law will encourage mixed-income housing in the City's growing co-op movement.

I will continue to press for more tax reform which can be translated into tax relief for the hard pressed urban taxpayer.

ISRAEL AND DAVID ROCKEFELLER'S PRIVATE OPINION

I am very concerned about the change in our foreign policy vis-a-vis the State of Israel. The new doctrine expressed by Secretary of State Rogers which has been euphemistically described as a "balanced policy" must be opposed by those of us who believe it is in the national interest as well as morally correct to support Israel and provide it with the arms needed to defend itself from the concerted attacks of the hostile nations surrounding it including those by terrorist organizations.

You may have seen the newspaper article describing a meeting on December 9, 1969, between President Nixon, David Rockefeller and several others. The sense of the article implied that Mr. Rockefeller, among others, had urged that the United States alter its Mid East policy so as to make it more acceptable to the Arab States. I met with David Rockefeller on January 8, 1970 to ascertain whether that report was accurate and he confirmed that such advice had been given to the President. I advised him that he and I were in total disagreement on this subject.

Mr. Rockefeller was distressed that I would publicly comment upon his position expressed as a private citizen. I pointed out to him 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, press coverage and public discussion about private meetings with the President of the United States are to my mind not only appropriate but essential in our democratic society. Those in public office and in private life must be held accountable for the positions which they advocate affecting the policies and goals of our government.

Sometimes the most gratifying experiences for a Congressman do not come with the passage of legislation but rather when he has the opportunity to make a difference at a critical juncture in an individual's life.

On a recent Monday morning, my office received a call from a woman whose brother was dying of a rare disease. His case was further complicated because of his rare blood type. His critically needed operation had already been postponed once because compatible blood could not be found. Over the weekend the patient's mother had appealed over the radio for blood and she had gone from hospital to hospital looking for blood; only one pint had been found while ten were needed.

The family asked us for help. My staff called the Army blood center and was advised to contact the New York Blood Center while the Army volunteered to contact the American Association of Blood Banks. By noon of the same day, four pints of the young man's blood type were on the way to his hospital and six more pints were put in reserve for his operation the next day.

In less than a week the young man's mother wrote me, "Today I saw my son walk out of his room in the hospital, into the hall for the first time in over a year with a big smile . . ." and she reported that he is on the way to a full recovery.

It was a moving experience for a Congressman and his staff.

MY ACTIVITIES IN NEW YORK CITY

On October 29th the Board of Estimate approved a 99 year lease whereby the City gave the State Urban Development Corporation authority to develop Welfare Island, despite protests from myself and the local planning board that there had not been adequate time for the community to examine the details of the proposed lease.

In December, I met with the NYC Corporation Counsel and told him that the lease could adversely affect the City. Sub-

sequently, eight modifications were made so as to provide the City with greater control over the \$200 million development plan. But, the most objectionable provision was not revised, namely that the plan can still be changed by the Mayor and Mr. Logue of the UDC without public hearings.

Along with Planning Board No. 6, I am opposing the U.N. Development Corporation's plan to create a superblock (43rd-45th Sts. between 1st and 2nd Aves.) to accommodate expansion of U.N. facilities. The original plan which the community approved was drastically altered by the Corporation. The new plan creates an area of unjustifiable density with three office buildings, most of whose space will be used by businesses not related to the U.N. Given the City's desperate need for housing, such a plan seems inappropriate. Moreover, there are no guarantees that site tenants can be relocated within the neighborhood at comparable rents. This plan has yet to go before the Board of Estimate for a final decision. Those concerned should make their protest known to Mayor Lindsay and Percy Sutton, Borough President of Manhattan, and send me copies of your letters.

I am working with the Yorkville Community to persuade Gimbels, which is building a new store at 86th St. and Lexington Ave., to make improvements in the overcrowded subway station there. Gimbels received a special zoning variance to build this store and will benefit from the presence of the subway station. I believe it has an obligation to contribute to the renovation of the station. We are still pursuing this matter. Again, let Mr. Bruce Gimbel hear from you and send me a copy of your letter.

Unconscionable rent increases are now being extracted from small service stores in many neighborhoods of our district. I am actively supporting commercial rent controls to limit these increases. I waged a similar battle for rent controls of uncontrolled residential rents back in 1968. The merchants now seeking such rent control are forming under the name SOS (Save our Stores) Committee.

From January 5th through the 16th, Congress was in recess and I took the opportunity each morning to go to subway and bus stops to meet with constituents. The number of people who stopped to discuss matters with me at my "sidewalk office" far exceeded my expectations and made clear how valuable these occasions are.

MASS TRANSIT

In conjunction with my Mass Transportation Trust Fund bill, which now has 105 House co-sponsors, I held a transit conference at New York University on November 8th.

The principal speaker was Department of Transportation Under Secretary James Beggs who set forth the Department's position in supporting contract funding for mass transit.

Contract funding, as outlined by the Administration, would enable the Federal government to enter into long term contracts before the Congress appropriates money for the liquidation of the government's obligations.

My bill establishes a trust fund which would be largely independent of annual Congressional appropriations. The trust fund would be financed by the existing 7% auto excise tax and it would operate much like the Federal Highway Trust fund that has provided over \$45 billion for roads in the last 12 years—while only \$800 million has been provided by the federal government for mass transportation.

Of greatest concern to me is the indication that the Administration is still unwilling to make a significant commitment to mass transportation. President Nixon proposes that we make \$3.1 billion available for

contract funding in the next five years; this is a meagre sum for a nationwide program when one considers that the Second Ave. subway alone will cost more than \$1 billion. Unless sufficient funds are committed for the 1970's, it will be impossible for municipalities to get underway in updating their transit systems and untangling the morass of local traffic congestion.

Congressional hearings on my trust fund bill will soon be held. Regardless of which financing mechanism the Congress finally chooses this year, contract funding or the trust fund, we must get a binding commitment for long-term federal financing of mass transit. And most important, that commitment must be billions more than the Nixon Administration now proposes.

Your comments on this newsletter and any proposals you might have on any subject are of interest to me. Please write to me c/o House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515.

If you need assistance, call my New York City office at 264-1066 between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on weekdays.

WOMEN AND CHILDREN—VICTIMS OF TYRANNY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in the shouting and the tumult over the school tragedy which has been imposed on the South many Members do not have the opportunity to witness the appalling human cost of this lawless oppression of a people.

Today I received a letter from a Baton Rouge schoolgirl and another from a distraught mother in neighboring Plaquemine. It is a disturbing sign of the tyranny under which our people live that I find it desirable to delete their signatures and addresses to prevent retaliation by officials of their own Government.

I submit these pathetic letters for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

BATON ROUGE, LA.,
January 19, 1970.

SUPREME COURT,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS OF THE SUPREME COURT: At this time I am a student at Broadmoor High School of Baton Rouge, Louisiana. You probably get hundreds of letters from people voicing their opinion on your recently passed order of the desegregation ruling. I am writing this letter for my own peace of mind. Since, it will be a good many years before I myself can vote, I suppose this is the least I can do to protect our (at this time) great nation. I believe, at this point, the immediate integration in our area will start, with the new school term in the fall. Although I am considered very mature for my age I will only be a junior starting next school term. I realize I will need an education for any future plans I have. As job requirements are getting higher all the time, I will probably have to settle, as an ordinary wife and mother, when I would rather, further my education and become a very good secretary, typist or receptionist: I really had made big plans when I found in my first semester of typing I could perfectly type sixty words per minute. Now since this ruling has been made all my plans are practically destroyed. I come from a middle class home, and at this time we are above our

income in bills, so this eliminates the possibility of a private school. I especially would like to graduate for my parents. My sister had a good opportunity to complete her education, but she didn't accept it, now it is up to me to get the diploma I would cherish so greatly. Because of you men the opportunity has been taken from me. I know you probably say, "if she wants an education she will go to the school the federal government sends her to." Well, I say what happened to Freedom of Choice? You, so called upper class people want the negro to paint themselves white so bad, you have to make a rule like the one you have made.

The one rule I go by is: Nobody can make anyone do anything they don't want to do! I recall that "all men are created equal"; so what gives you the right to tell others what they HAVE to do. I also recall a certain provision in the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which forbids discrimination in our public schools. I very much agree with this bill, but I feel what your judges have ruled is discrimination and it is probably the first big step leading our nation into complete dictatorship.

In our area negroes don't want to be white, they don't want to go to white schools. Of course they should have their choice, but they accept the fact there is a great difference in our races, and would prefer to stay segregated. What you men are doing is not going to better our country. There will probably be ten times more drop outs, because of lack of money for private schools. If I were a parent I would refuse to send my children to a school where they will be associating with so many of the lower income areas. I understand all negroes aren't such of a person but 99% live in slum areas and they have learned many filthy manners that ANY decent young person shouldn't be associated with. I, for one, along with many others wouldn't endanger my life by going to school in a slum area, neither white or black.

I don't expect this letter to change any of your minds, so I just want to thank all of you for really messing up the chances of my education.

Sincerely yours

P.S.—I would also like to tell you what this will do to our public schools. The white parents aren't going to vote on taxes to support the public schools if their children don't attend. How do you plan the upkeep of the public schools?

PLAQUEMINE, LA.,
January 30, 1970.

HON. JOHN R. RARICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Would you please be kind enough to answer some of the questions that my children asked of me about our complex society of today. Having been taught justice, they cannot understand what is happening to them under the constitution of the United States today.

Enclosed is a verse that I wrote for my son while in basic training. He assures me that he knows what God he is supposed to serve but not what country.

As a widow, I struggled hard and exhausted all my resources trying to educate my children. We have never received federal or state aid. We worked!

My son, unable to attend college, approached the Naval Recruiting Offices hoping for training that would be of benefit to his future.

Now, I have a daughter who cannot attend school without fear of rioting. Do not tell me that this fear is foolish when all around in neighboring schools children are being stabbed and cut-up. Would not my son be of better service at home protecting his sister than away in some ocean on an aircraft carrier?

Where does human rights begin and end in this country? Are they for some and not for others?

Your answers, sir, I will pass on to my children. They are waiting.

Sincerely yours,

TO MY SON IN SERVICE

I have loved and nurtured you from your very first cry,
And I'm sure that I shall on the day that I die.
But for me, son, you must stand head-up and proud and tall
If not, I don't much care if you stand at all.
For your God and your country you must willingly serve
With an unchanging faith and an unflinching nerve.
This will not make you famous, nor will it win applause;
But a man's not a man 'til he stands for a cause.
For today and yesterday it's being done and been
By everyone who dare call themselves men.

CONTRIBUTIONS FROM FOUNDATIONS TO THE EDUCATION FUND OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the president of the Missouri League of Women Voters has been kind enough to furnish me with a list of contributions from foundations to the education fund of the League of Women Voters, together with other pertinent information that I think would be of interest at a time when the work of foundations and political organizations is being studied.

1968 income

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| League of Women Voters of the United States..... | \$835,265.37 |
| League of Women Voters Education Fund..... | 453,908.09 |
| Total | 1,289,173.46 |

Gifts from foundations

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| League of Women Voters of the United States..... | 0 |
| League of Women Voters Education Fund | \$298,662.24 |
| Percentage of Foundation Gifts to Combined Income of League of Women Voters and the Education Fund..... | 23% |

1968 gifts from foundations to the Education Fund

| | |
|-----------------------------------------|------------|
| Lazarus Foundation | \$200.00 |
| Ivy Fund | 52,000.00 |
| Shell Oil Companies Foundation..... | 500.00 |
| Sears, Roebuck Foundation..... | 42,512.24 |
| Tilarid Foundation | 2,000.00 |
| American Conservation Association | 10,000.00 |
| Ford Foundation | 185,000.00 |
| Institute for International Order..... | 2,500.00 |
| Central Exchange Foundation..... | 250.00 |
| Peter E. Strauss Trust..... | 1,000.00 |
| Fidellis Foundation | 500.00 |
| Public Affairs Service | 350.00 |
| Stern Family Fund | 1,500.00 |
| Shapiro-Viertel Foundation | 350.00 |

Total

298,662.24

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, February 4, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Behold, Thou desirest truth in the inward being; therefore teach me wisdom in my secret heart.—Psalm 51: 6.

O God, our Father, who desirest truth in the inward life, in this disturbing day when falsehoods wear the masks of truth as they appeal for the allegiance of men, grant unto us the spirit of discernment and the wisdom of the wise that we may not be deceived by the followers of evil who wear the flower of heaven on their lapels and seek to disguise their low motives by the lofty flavor of high sounding words.

Help us to keep looking at that which is good and true and excellent that we may keep in step with Thee as we move forward to a better day when our Nation shall be great in spirit, great in good will, and great in the brotherhood of men.

In the spirit of Him who is the way, the truth, and the life, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 6543) entitled "An act to extend public health protection with respect to cigarette smoking, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. PEARSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3154. An act to provide long-term financing for expanded urban mass transportation programs, and for other purposes.

MARIHUANA LAWS

(Mr. HUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, with the crime rates in the District of Columbia leading those of most other major cities, I find it somewhat less than amusing that the political parties in this city are preoccupied with efforts to outdo one another in advancing proposals to downgrade the penalties for violations of the marihuana laws.

Not surprisingly, the radical District of Columbia Democrat Central Committee voted to legalize marihuana on the theory of the "no worse than alcohol" argument. The committee reasoned that present penalties for infractions of these laws have contributed to a serious lack

of confidence by youth in the judicial system and, therefore, the laws should be repealed. The lack of confidence, I contend, must certainly be in those who hold themselves out to the public as "leaders" and who suggest that confidence in the judicial system might be restored by doing away with those laws with which they do not agree. This kind of confidence we can do without. Of course, the committee members propose appropriate controls on the use of marihuana by minors and drivers because they are really not certain about the harmful effects of the drug.

In my estimation, it is just so much doubletalk to propose the legalization of marihuana on the one hand, a drug integrally associated with the serious problem of drug abuse among youth, while at the same time suggesting appropriate controls on the drug's use by minors. The only problem that would really be solved by the proposal would be to relieve court dockets somewhat and remove substantial burden of enforcement from law-enforcement authorities.

The move to legalize marihuana, to which the Republican City Council Chairman Gilbert Hahn, Jr., has in effect lent belated support in proposing token penalties, must be viewed as nothing more than a misguided effort to curry the favor of admiration of youth by using the issue of marihuana laws as the symbol of the so-called generation gap. This indeed, is a disservice to both youths and parents, and I have yet to see the latter make any concerted drive to legalize what is an increasingly serious problem, drug abuse among teenagers. In this regard, and while only an indication of public sentiment, I might remind my colleagues of the Gallup poll of last October which revealed that 84 percent of the adults polled were opposed to legalizing marihuana.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S 1971 BUDGET REARRANGES OUR NATIONAL PRIORITIES WHILE KEEPING FEDERAL BUDGET IN BALANCE

(Mr. BEALL of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BEALL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in his budget for fiscal 1971 President Nixon has made a major accomplishment. He has managed to rearrange our national priorities while at the same time keeping the Federal budget in balance.

It would be easy—and I might add the more usual practice—for the President to call attention to matters of domestic concern simply by appropriating more money for additional programs. Mr. Nixon, however, has taken a much more courageous and more difficult course. He has reordered the priorities by reducing expenditures in defense and other activities and redistributing the money among domestic programs. Further, he has shown a determination to improve the deliverance of Federal assistance in areas of domestic need where he has wisely re-

duced the request for some programs and increased it for others, thereby indicating a desire to make our Federal operations more efficient.

Certainly the fact that Federal appropriations for human resources will now exceed those for national defense should be an encouragement to the many people who have been calling for a change of emphasis in the expenditure of the Federal tax dollar.

Additionally, this budget shows a will on the part of the Chief Executive to bring new programs to bear on the many problems facing our people at home. Additional money for water and air pollution, education and manpower, health and housing clearly demonstrate the willingness on the part of the Government to provide assistance in areas of great need. Further, the fact that a request is made for new programs in public welfare encourages those of us who have felt that our outmoded welfare system is seriously in need of change.

Perhaps most important of all, is the fact that in the budget for fiscal 1971 a request is made for the first funding of a revenue sharing program. There is no doubt but that State and local government units have been seriously hampered through their inability to finance programs with the tax resources available. It is also evident that the long-range solution for many of our problems requires the support and involvement of people at the local level. By funding this revenue-sharing proposal, even though meager at the start, the Nixon administration is indicating that it is honestly committed to the decentralization of domestic programs and to better coordination among the various levels of government.

I think President Nixon is to be congratulated on this document to provide for the needs of the American people in the next fiscal year because as I have said at the outset, it provides a reordering of priorities, a change of direction and above all, accomplishes this within a balanced budget necessary to attain for the American people real, rather than inflated, economic gains.

FRENCH PRESIDENT'S VISIT

(Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, as Chief of State of America's oldest ally, President Pompidou of France deserves a warm welcome from the Congress when he visits Capitol Hill February 25.

This will be the first time in 10 years a President of France has paid an official visit to the United States. It responds to President Nixon's visit to Paris a year ago, and gives the American people the opportunity to match the enthusiastic outpouring of esteem accorded Mr. Nixon by Parisians.

The visit was first planned by President de Gaulle, who had visited the United States briefly in 1963 to attend the funeral of President Kennedy and

again last spring for General Eisenhower's rites. The plans were carried forward when he was succeeded by President Pompidou.

Americans inevitably differ over some French policies. Differences occur in the best of friendships. These differences are transitory and minor when set against the enduring cooperation that has always brought these great sister republics together in all major crises beginning with the American Revolution and exhibited dramatically just a few years ago when France instantly pledged support to the United States in the Cuban missile crisis.

Certainly, upon the occasion of President Pompidou's official visit, all Americans and especially those in the Congress must be called upon to set aside transitory differences for a more appropriate setting and join in welcoming the French Chief of State. In doing so, we salute the ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity we have always shared with France since our own Constitution was established.

THE 22D NATIONAL CHILDREN'S DENTAL HEALTH WEEK

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, this week the Nation is observing the 22d National Children's Dental Health Week. Throughout the country dental societies in cooperation with schools and civic groups are carrying out special programs to once again call attention to the importance of good dental health and its relationship to overall health.

As ranking minority member of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I have become acquainted with some of the facts concerning dental disease and the Federal programs dealing with this aspect of health.

Dental disease is of nearly universal incidence. Nine out of 10 of us suffer from it. The average 15-year-old has had one-third of his teeth attacked by it, and nearly half of our youngsters under that age have never visited a dentist. We spend several billions of dollars in the private sector and millions in the public sector each year for dental care services. A great deal of this money is spent to repair the ravages of disease that could have been prevented. In this connection in the report from our Appropriations Committee on the fiscal 1970 budget, we stated:

The Committee is concerned about the lack of a coordinated program for dental health of children while so many federal dollars are being spent under Medicaid and similar programs to treat dental conditions in adults that could have been prevented.

I am pleased therefore to see that in President Nixon's budget for fiscal 1971 which he sent to us on Monday he is requesting an increase of \$5 million for the National Institute of Dental Research specifically earmarked for a program to prevent dental caries, or cavities, the most common manifestation of dental

disease. It is especially fitting that this request should coincide with National Children's Dental Health Week. It also is a fortunate coincidence that this first year of the seventies marks the 25th anniversary of the initiation of community water fluoridation as an effective means of preventing dental caries. Incidentally, that first successful experiment was conducted in Grand Rapids, Mich., the hometown of our distinguished minority leader.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in my remarks a statement issued by President Nixon on the occasion of the 1970 observance of National Children's Dental Health Week:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 17, 1970.

On the occasion of the National Children's Dental Health Week, I am pleased to greet and applaud the members of America's dental professions.

This year's observance is especially significant because it marks the twenty-fifth observance of the initiation of community water fluoridation. When Grand Rapids, Michigan and Newburgh, New York pioneered in this endeavor, they helped to improve the dental health of their citizens and to establish the medical safety, economy and efficacy of community fluoridation as a major national weapon against dental disease. Today, more than half of our people served by public water supplies enjoy the proven benefits of fluoridation.

We can be proud as we reflect on this and other milestones we have attained in dental health, and we can be confident as we plan to extend our success into this promising new decade.

RICHARD NIXON.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a Nation. In 1967 the United States produced 2,966,000 metric tons of aluminum which was more than the combined total of the next five leading nations.

PUNG PRODUCES PROFITS

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include pertinent material.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in this day and age when the high cost of Government is more likely to produce deficits, instead of surpluses, and Government agencies keep asking for more, and usually produce less, it is refreshing to find a public servant who is cast from a different mold.

I refer to Edmund J. Pung, St. Louis County, Mo., recorder of deeds.

After completing 2 years of his 4-year term, "Ed" Pung has returned to St. Louis County a profit of over \$500,000.

To those in Congress who might wonder how this is possible in today's "burgeoning bureaucracy," I recommend that they read the following article:

PUNG PRODUCES PROFITS

Edmund J. Pung, St. Louis County Recorder of Deeds, in making his annual report to the citizens of St. Louis County, reports that the gross receipts for his office in 1969 were \$422,097.00. Expenditures were \$256,593.42, showing a net profit to St. Louis County of \$165,483.58. The expenditures included a 6% cost of living raise across the board to all employees, plus additional 5% raises as earned under the Civil Service regulations.

Although Mr. Pung's original budget for 1969 did not include the 6% cost of living raise, his office was still able to absorb this raise and return 1% (a total of \$2792.58) of his original 1969 budget to St. Louis County. This was accomplished by the effective use of office modernization.

Pung's office recorded 76,020 Deeds, there were 9070 Releases, a total of 26,095 Uniform Commercial Code and 3930 Non Uniform Commercial Code transactions, 7230 Marriage Licenses issued, 2662 copies made, 2113 affidavits, 23,912 note identifications and 9066 miscellaneous recordings during the year 1969.

Mr. Pung has completed the third year of his four year term in office. Within this period he has returned to St. Louis County a net sum of \$500,078.17. In addition to this he has returned \$41,158.18 from his allotted budget for the past three years. In conjunction with these amounts he reduced his budget from a total of \$361,833.00 that his predecessor had requested for 1967 (the year Pung took office) to a sum of \$277,622.15 and has constantly reduced his budget; the other two years being \$256,593.42 and \$236,057.25. Combined with these savings and returned revenue, the St. Louis County Recorder of Deeds has earned and saved for the citizens of the County better than \$700,000.00. The future will also reflect increased savings to St. Louis County due to the modernized money saving improvements made in this office.

BUDGET IN BLACK SPELLS BLUES FOR FEDERAL WHITE-COLLAR WORKERS AND SERVICEMEN

(Mr. FULTON of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget message must have come as a shocking surprise to the Nation's Federal white-collar workers and military men.

It must have come as a shock also to the Members of Congress who studied so long and voted so substantially for the concept of comparability pay for Government workers.

The shock certainly must have been shared by our often unjustly maligned and ever-underpaid postal employees who have been asked to throw their support behind the very controversial administration postal reform plan if they are to receive a pay raise that has been due them since last January 1.

In essence the President's budget message, while admitting Government white-collar workers deserve a 5.4-percent raise tentatively scheduled for this July 1, asks that it be deferred until 1971.

At the same time, he says he will support the increase for postal workers, but only if the 600,000 rank-and-file postal employees give him solid support for his postal reform plan, a plan which many of them feel is not necessarily in the in-

terest of the Post Office Department, the postal service, or the post office personnel.

If I recall correctly, the President received a 100-percent increase in salary last year. The Congress last year received a 41-percent increase in salary. Social security recipients are receiving a 15-percent benefit increase as of January 1 of this year through legislation which was passed by the Congress and signed by the President.

These are, with the exception of the social security increase, well beyond mere cost-of-living increases. Even the spending requests for operating the White House is forecast to increase by \$1.1 million in the coming fiscal year. Included in the new White House budget request is a "special assistance" allowance of some \$700,000 "for expenses necessary to enable the Vice President to provide assistance to the President in connection with specially assigned functions."

Here again is an increase substantially above the cost-of-living rise for the past calendar year.

In calendar 1969, the cost of living due to inflation went up more than 6 percent, and yet what is proposed for the Federal white-collar workers may not even match the cost-of-living increase which will have accrued since the last pay increase of July 1969. In certainty, it will not if it is delayed until next January.

In summary, the Federal white-collar employee is being asked to foot the bill for inflation while the blue-collar workers are being told they must make the same sacrifice unless they are willing to deal for their due pay raises by supporting a postal reform program which many feel to be of dubious merit.

The Federal white-collar workers find this treatment totally unacceptable.

Certainly the postal workers are going to find it distasteful.

And, hopefully, the Congress will demonstrate its profound displeasure.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MICHEL and to include several editorials.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Ohio) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. McCLURE.

Mr. CLANCY.

Mr. SCHERLE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MURPHY of New York) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. RARICK in two instances.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. CORMAN.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana in five instances.

Mr. CABELL in two instances.

Mr. FUQUA.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3154. An act to provide long-term financing for expanded urban mass transportation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1438. An act for the relief of Yau Ming Chinn (Gon Ming Loo).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 5, 1970, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1607. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the administration of the Federal employees' group life insurance program by the U.S. Civil Service Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1608. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the administration of the leased-housing program, Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1609. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report of the Office of State Technical Services for the fiscal year 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 14(b), Public Law 89-182; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1610. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to curtail the mailing of certain articles which present a hazard to postal employees or mail processing machines by imposing restrictions on certain advertising and promotional matter in the mails, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1611. A letter from the Chairman, Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting the annual report of the Conference for the year 1969, pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 575; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1612. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens found admissible to the United States under the provisions of section 212(a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1613. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(d) (6) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 8413. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to prescribe health care cost-sharing arrangements for certain surviving dependents, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-828). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7267. A bill to require the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to reopen and redetermine the claim of Julius Deutsch against the Government of Poland, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-829). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 15062. A bill for the relief of sundry claimants, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-830). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL (By request):

H.R. 15689. A bill to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 15690. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to remove the prohibition on the use of annual leave in the first 90 days of employment for employees appointed for 90 days or more; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself, Mr. CARTER, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. VANDER JAGT, and Mr. WOLD):

H.R. 15691. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for special project grants for the provision of family planning services and related research, training, and technical assistance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 15692. A bill to prohibit the movement in interstate or foreign commerce of horses which are "sored", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DULSKI (for himself, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. GROSS, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. NIX, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WHITE, Mr. McCLURE, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. PURCELL):

H.R. 15693. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to exclude from the mails as a special category of nonmailable matter cer-

tain material offered for sale to minors, to protect the public from the offensive intrusion into their homes of sexually oriented mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GARMATZ (for himself, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. KEITH):

H.R. 15694. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 15695. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 15696. A bill to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 15697. A bill to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of the entire amount of carrying charges paid on installment purchases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.J. Res. 1076. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO (for himself, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. REES, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. BEALL of Maryland, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. HALPERN, and Mr. EDWARDS of California):

H. Res. 820. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the National Collegiate Athletic Association; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. McDADE, Mr. ADAIR, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr.

KUYKENDALL, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. CLARK, Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, and Mr. TAFT):

H. Res. 821. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the National Collegiate Athletic Association; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SISK (for himself, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SMITH of California, and Mr. LATTA):

H. Res. 822. Resolution to establish a Select Committee on Lobbying Practices; to the Committee on Rules.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

385. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Common Council of the City of Mount Vernon, N.Y., relative to Federal financing of health, education, and welfare, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE—Wednesday, February 4, 1970

The Senate met at 11:30 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, it is not in our worthiness but in our need we come to Thee. Fill this sacred minute with a sense of Thy reality that the deliberations of each succeeding hour may be in tune with Thy spirit. May what we say and what we do speak with equal eloquence. We do not ask to see the distant scene but for courage to take the next step and wisdom to move steadily in the right direction. When burdens seem too heavy for human strength and problems beyond finite wisdom, infuse our lives with divine strength and that higher wisdom which comes from the beyond so that we may have a good conscience and the Nation be well served.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, announced that on today, February 4, 1970, the President had approved and signed the following act:

S. 476. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Zuck.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of yesterday, the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the majority leader.

IT IS TIME FOR THE TRUTH ABOUT LAOS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it is generally recognized that John S. Knight, head of the Knight newspaper chain, is one of the most thoughtful and constructive observers of the American and world scene.

With that premise, I would hope that every Senator would, and every citizen could read Mr. Knight's signed Sunday "Notebook" of February 1 entitled "It's Time Nixon Told Public About U.S. Role in Laos."

I ask unanimous consent that this article be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

IT'S TIME NIXON TOLD PUBLIC ABOUT U.S. ROLE IN LAOS

Some nine years ago—Jan. 1, 1961 to be precise—I was saying something like this:

"What should concern us today is the possibility of U.S. military intervention in Laos, a mountainous little Buddhist country about the size of Idaho which lies between Thailand and Burma to the west and the two Vietnams on the east.

"Since 1954 (mark the date), the United States has given an increase of \$398 million to sustain Laotian independence and keep Laos out of the communist orbit.

"The forces which hope to dominate Laos comprise the Pathet Lao, a communist guerrilla movement, and the communists of North Vietnam. The Southeast Asia Treaty Orga-

nization has charged that troops from North Vietnam have infiltrated Laos.

"Great Britain and France, both signatories to the SEATO pact, have shown no interest in rushing to the defense of Laos. If anything is done the United States will be expected to act.

"Our military involvement there would be, as President-elect Kennedy stated in the campaign, 'the wrong war at the wrong place and at the wrong time'—unsound militarily, unnecessary to our security and unsupported by our allies.

"No Russian soldiers died in Korea and none will die in Laos if we are silly enough to get caught in a conflict where there is no chance of winning decisively and achieving permanent peace in that region."

Nearly a decade has elapsed since that warning was first printed, a period in which Vietnam and not Laos was to provide the setting for a bloody war in which more than 40,000 Americans have died.

Yet we have never been idle in Laos despite reassurances from Secretary of State William P. Rogers that "we are not going to fight any major wars on the mainland of Asia . . . We are not going to send American troops there."

As revealed by James McCartney of the Knight Newspapers, here is a brief summary of American activities in Laos:

The U.S. is providing massive air support to the Royal Laotian Army now combatting the communists.

United States bombers from both Vietnam and Thailand are attempting to interdict infiltrators into South Vietnam on the Ho Chi Minh Trail which travels through Laos.

U.S. fighters are being used for tactical air support to Laotian forces.

U.S. helicopters are being used to transport Laotian forces from one scene of combat to another.

U.S. advisers are all but running the Laotian army. Some are Central Intelligence Agency employes attached to the American embassy with innocent sounding titles.

There are 2,150 Americans in Laos, 830 of them in official government positions. The U.S. has lost at least 100 pilots on Laotian missions and about 25 other Americans have been killed in line of duty.

This summation of U.S. engrossment shows a marked similarity to the Vietnam war buildup in the early 1960s.