

H.R. 19197. A bill to regulate interstate commerce by requiring certain insurance as a condition precedent to using the public streets, roads, and highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 19198. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTINGER (for himself, Mr. BRADEMAS, and Mr. MCCARTHY):

H.R. 19199. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. SIKES):

H.R. 19200. A bill to assure safe and healthful working conditions for working men and women; by providing the means and procedures for establishing and enforcing mandatory safety and health standards; by assisting and encouraging the States in their efforts to assure safe and healthful working conditions; by providing for research, information, education, and training in the field of occupational safety and health; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 19201. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 19202. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax simplification, reform, and relief for small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 19203. A bill to permit immediate retirement of certain Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 19204. A bill to provide for Government guarantee of private loans to certain motorbus operators for purchase of modern motorbuses and equipment, to foster the development and use of more modern and safer operating equipment by such carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 19205. A bill to amend title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to authorize financial assistance for the development and improvement of street lighting facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 19206. A bill to prohibit the intimidation, coercion, or annoyance of a person

officiating at or attending a religious service or ceremony in a church and to make such acts a Federal offense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 19207. A bill to provide for a training program for organized crime prosecutors, an annual conference of Federal, State, and local officials in the field of organized crime, an annual report by the Attorney General on organized crime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 19208. A bill to provide for the protection of children against physical injury caused or threatened by those who are responsible for their care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 19209. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for better control of interstate traffic in explosives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 19210. A bill to regulate the importation, manufacture, distribution, storage and possession of explosives, blasting agents, and detonators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 19211. A bill to assist in the provisions of housing for the elderly, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 19212. A bill to provide early educational opportunities for all preschool children, and to encourage and assist in the formation of local preschool districts by residents of urban and rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 19213. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that the amount of the annuity payable thereunder to a widow shall not be less than the amount of the annuity which would have been payable to her deceased husband if he were living and otherwise qualified to receive an employee's annuity thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 19214. A bill to restore to Federal civilian employees their rights to participate, as private citizens, in the political life of the Nation, to protect Federal civilian employees from improper political solicitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 19215. A bill relating to the control of organized crime in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 19216. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide assistance in the design and construction of transportation services and facilities meeting the needs of the elderly and the handicapped; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 19217. A bill to amend the act of August 12, 1968, to insure that facilities constructed with assistance under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 are designed and constructed to be accessible to the elderly and the handicapped; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 19218. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to protect consumers against careless and erroneous billing, and to require that statements under open-end credit plans be mailed in time to permit payment prior to the imposition of finance charges; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 1368. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to confer upon Congress the power to enact reasonable laws defining obscenity and regulating the publication, both spoken and written, of obscene material; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself and Mr. DINGELL):

H. Res. 1209. Resolution to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 3; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. Res. 1210. Resolution to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 4; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 19219. A bill for the relief of Elvia R. Benavides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 19220. A bill for the relief of Zoi Lopolou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 19221. A bill for the relief of Agustin Pinera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 19222. A bill for the relief of Dr. David G. Simons, Lieutenant colonel, U.S. Air Force (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 19223. A bill for the relief of Kyung Bong Kim, his wife, Bok Soon Kim, and their children, Sun Hee Kim, Yong Bac Kim, Mi Hee Kim, and Young Bal Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 19224. A bill for the relief of Merton A. Searle and George W. Bowers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CLEAN AIR CARAVAN TESTS AUTO POLLUTION CAUSES

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Sun Electric Corp., located in my district, has successfully developed the first practical instrument for the measurement of carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons generated by automobiles.

For the first time, State and Federal agencies have available to them a fast, accurate, reliable means of testing vehi-

cles for compliance with emission standards. The automobile industry now has available to it a means of testing vehicles as they come off the production lines.

Auto maintenance shops now have available to them a means of double checking their work to make certain that they have properly serviced an auto to meet emission standards.

On June 15, Atlantic Richfield launched its "Clean Air Caravan" program in Los Angeles. This involved nine panel trucks, each equipped with two Sun model 910 infrared exhaust emission testers. As a public service, the motorists of Los Angeles have been given free tests on their cars to determine the amount

of pollution they are generating, and to receive recommendations as to what can be done by the motorists to improve the situation. The response to these tests has been very encouraging.

The auto manufacturers have been making great strides to improve their engines, and the oil manufacturers are now marketing lead-free gasoline. It is now up to the motorist to become conscious of his social obligations to do his part in cutting down on air pollution.

It has been proven that if a gasoline engine is properly tuned and adjusted, little if any undesirable pollutants are emitted. Periodic testing of vehicles with an infrared-type tester can warn vehicle owners that his vehicle is emitting un-

desirable exhaust and should have his vehicle tuned.

The Sun Electric Corp. is to be congratulated for its development of the infrared exhaust emission tester to combat air pollution. This device is both timely and important in our efforts to keep our environment clean and healthy.

I should like to place in the RECORD today an article which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times concerning Sun Electric's infrared exhaust emission tester, and its testing by Atlantic Richfield.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, June 17, 1970]

"CLEAN-AIR CARAVAN" TESTS AUTO POLLUTION CAUSES

So you think someone should do something about air pollution. How about starting right in with the family car?

Sun Electric Co. of Chicago and Atlantic Richfield Co. will help out. Sun Electric is now manufacturing equipment that can test the amount of pollutants coming out of your car's tailpipe. It can also analyze what's causing the pollution and thereby enable you to correct the problem at your service or auto facility.

Atlantic Richfield is making the testing system available beginning Wednesday by mounting it on a light truck. The unit will be called the "Clean Air Caravan."

The public service is now available in Los Angeles and "if the response is as good as anticipated," it will be offered soon in Chicago, Philadelphia and other major cities.

"We can expect to reduce hydrocarbon-carbon monoxide emissions substantially in most cars where we find a high-level output of these pollutants," said H. Barton Douglas, a West Coast marketing manager for Philadelphia-based Atlantic Richfield.

The analysis hardware consists of a group of infra-red and electrical sensing units, which quickly measure carbon monoxide and unburned hydrocarbon emissions at engine idle and normal operating revolutions, and a pollution control valve testing system.

While the engine is running, a metal probe is inserted into the tailpipe, a tachometer lead is clamped onto a sparkplug wire and another device is attached to the engine oil filter opening. From the instrument readings trained personnel can determine the existence of such discrepancies as improper air-fuel mixture, dirty air filter or a plugged pollution control system.

"We can analyze and advise on corrective measures, but the actual cleanup of pollution is accomplished by each motorist taking prompt action as advised," said a Richfield executive.

COMMUNISM, REVOLUTION, AND ANGELA DAVIS—HOW MUCH PROOF IS NEEDED?

HON. JOHN ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I am appalled by the notion that there are still within the teaching profession apologists for a teacher who is a self-admitted Communist and who is apparently deeply implicated in a crime of the utmost revulsion—the murder of a judge kidnaped in a conspiracy involving convicts on trial.

Mr. Speaker, if there is in this Nation a sickness represented by self-proclaimed

"revolutionaries," then most certainly the cure to such a serious disease must not lie in allowing its propagation and spread. I have always felt that Miss Angela Davis should never have been hired as a teacher on the UCLA campus. I believe that we owe these students the highest quality education possible, taught by a faculty characterized by high professional competence, untarnished integrity, and the ability to imbue their students with the highest moral and ethical principles.

I am placing in the RECORD a most commendable editorial, published August 24, 1970, in the San Gabriel Valley Daily Tribune, with the hope that the action described by the American Federation of Teachers is directed toward this end, and that ridding our campuses of such clearly destructive influences will strengthen and ennoble the learning process.

The editorial follows:

TOOK A KILLING TO AWAKEN MANY

We think the majority of delegates to the American Federation of Teachers who, during their convention in Pittsburgh, rejected a motion condemning the University of California Regents for not rehiring Angela Davis as a member of the UCLA faculty are right—regardless of their reason.

During the long course of the Angela Davis affair we have objected to the contention that academic freedom was involved in seeking to rid the University of an admitted Communist. Many educators have maintained that it is. Now, however, there has been added damning evidence that she may be complicated in the murder of a Marin County judge. She is a fugitive from justice and has been placed on the FBI "most wanted" list.

Thus, to most people, it has now become evident that Angela Davis is not the type of person who should be on the public payroll as an instructor for our college students.

We say most. For at Pittsburgh one delegate from Los Angeles shouted, "It's Angela Davis today. Tomorrow it can be someone else."

We wish the delegate was correct and that steps were taken to rid our campuses of other instructors and professors who enjoy the benefits of this society, yet seek its destruction through overt acts or insidious undertones.

It is unfortunate that it took the shocking slaying of a judge to awaken some to the danger Angela Davis presents and the realization that she does not belong on our campuses as an instructor.

MAN OF TRUE STATURE

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, recently there came to my attention a warm tribute to that beloved statesman and former distinguished chairman of the Democratic National Committee, the Honorable James A. Farley, which appeared in the St. Joseph, Mo., News Press, and I would like to take this opportunity to share it with my colleagues:

MAN OF TRUE STATURE

It is tough to be in the public eye, especially in the national spotlight over a long period of years.

That spotlight is revealing. If there are

feet of clay it eventually shows them up. Few emerge from that great attention unmarred, unblemished.

But James A. Farley is one who has. For more than 40 years he has been a national figure, yet his image comes through as fresh and unblemished as the day he started in politics and business.

This thought comes as a result of a warm and cordial note Mr. Farley sent recently to a top executive on this newspaper. The two have been friends for 43 years, have frequently visited each other back East.

Their friendship antedates even the start of the campaign Mr. Farley spearheaded and which put Franklin D. Roosevelt in the White House for a stay of 12 years, one month, and eight days.

James A. Farley is high in the national esteem. Of him it can fittingly be said, "There is a man."

THE 31ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE GERMAN INVASION

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Polish Government in exile continues to function in London as the official voice of the Polish people. Its President, His Excellency August Zaleski, traditionally issues messages to the Polish people to commemorate events of major historic significance.

On September 1, the 31st anniversary of the German invasion of Poland in 1939 which marked the beginning of World War II, President Zaleski issued the following message:

Once more on September 1st we have an anniversary of the attack upon Poland by Nazi Germany which, in collusion with Soviet Russia, unleashed the Second World War.

This war caused immense suffering for many peoples. Of all the world's nations, Poland underwent the greatest sacrifices, both in the calamities to her people and in cultural and material losses.

The Poles never lost hope, however, and fought in the ranks of the Polish Home Army and on all battlefields of the last war in units of the Polish Armed Forces maintaining their faith in the victory of the ideals which constitute 1000 years of Polish historical tradition.

Unfortunately, the end of hostilities did not bring Poland her long awaited liberty. The only country to derive benefits from this war was Soviet Russia which was co-responsible for its outbreak and which, contrary to the principles of the Atlantic Charter, forcibly seized many regions in Europe and Asia.

It is the duty of Poles in the free world to remind the public opinion all the injustices inflicted upon the Polish Nation during the Second World War and after its termination, and to maintain the hope of the final victory of liberty and justice.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, August 15 was the 50th anniversary of the victory of Poland over Russia in the Battle of Warsaw in 1920 which in the days before Yalta was celebrated as "Polish Soldier's Day." I insert in the RECORD at this point the text of President Zaleski's statement commemorating this date in Polish history:

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VICTORY OF POLAND OVER RUSSIA

Citizens of Poland and Poles in the free world:

The Battle of Warsaw in 1920 terminated the victorious Polish-Russian war. It had started by order of Commander Joseph Pilsudski, when the First Cadre Company of the Polish Forces/nucleus of Polish National Army/crossed the boundary of the Russian-dominated part of Poland on August 6th, 1914, followed by the Polish Legions.

Similarly on August 6th, 1920, the Chief of State and Commander-in-Chief, Joseph Pilsudski, "lonely in his study at the Belvedere Palace" decided on his plan of genius for the attack against the Soviet-Russian armies besieging the capital of Poland. By a Napoleonic manoeuvre from over the river Wleprz, he broke up and forced to retreat those very armies which were intending to destroy Poland, following the order "over the corpse of Poland to the West".

This great Polish victory in 1920 safeguarded the freedom and independence, not only of the Polish Republic, but also of the neighbouring nations which had regained their independence after the First World War. This victory also stopped further progress of the Red Army towards Western Europe, and protected it from the terror of Russian imperialism. That it could happen was entirely due to the attitude of the whole Polish nation and the bravery of her soldiers.

The Second World War started by Nazi Germany in complicity with Soviet Russia proved that Poland's victory in the Battle of Warsaw in 1920 prevented the Russians putting into action their plan of conquest at that time. But, that the rulers of the Kremlin still adhere to this plan, is shown by their present strategic moves on the continents and oceans of the world.

In face of these ominous aims of Moscow, and with the memory of the world-famous victory of 1920 which saved Poland from Russian slavery, we Poles in the free world should be ever watchful for every step in the domain of politics and strategy which could endanger the rights of Poland; and in full agreement we should protest aloud at any movement appearing on the horizon to threaten the security of Poland and Europe. And we should always remember that for each protest to be of real weight and strength, complete accord and unity of action is necessary in our political programme of regaining freedom and independence for the Republic of Poland.

The example of such unity was given in 1920 by the Council for the Defence of the State and the Government then in Warsaw. This national concord greatly contributed to the victory in this "decisive battle of the world", in remembrance of which was established in independent Poland—"Polish Soldier's Day", which the nation celebrates on August 15th, on the festival of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary.

THOMAS KESSING DIES IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp4c. Thomas E. Kessing, Jr., a courageous young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I should like to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

THOMAS KESSING DIES OF WOUNDS—SILVER SPRING YOUTH WAS KILLED BY VIET MINE

SILVER SPRING, August 27.—Spec. 4 Thomas E. Kessing, Jr., 19, of Silver Spring, died Tuesday of wounds he received in an enemy

mine explosion in Vietnam, the Department of Defense announced yesterday.

He was wounded by the explosion of a Claymore mine August 8 while on a night patrol about 30 miles north of Saigon in Binh Doung province.

Specialist Kessing was transferred August 16 to the 249th General Hospital in Osaka, Japan where he died of internal injuries and infection from his wounds.

He was awarded the Purple Heart and the Army Commendation Medal for heroism as a result of the August 8 incident.

The citation states that Specialist Kessing "contributed immeasurably to the success" of the night patrol.

He had recovered from a malaria attack just a week before he was wounded. He served 58 days in Cambodia, according to his father.

At the time of his death he was a member of the 25th Infantry Division. He had been recently transferred from Company D, 5th Battalion, 3d Brigade, 9th Infantry Division.

Specialist Kessing enlisted in the Army on August 15, 1969. He completed his basic training at Fort Bragg, N.C. and his advanced training at Fort Gordon, Ga. He began his tour of duty in Vietnam January 10, 1970.

He was born in Takoma Park, Md. He attended Montgomery Blair High School and received a high school equivalency diploma after entering the Army.

An avid swimmer, he spent the summer before he enlisted as a life guard and manager of the swimming pool at an apartment house in Silver Spring.

After his three-year term of duty in the Army was completed he had planned to become a radio disc jockey.

Specialist Kessing is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas E. Kessing, Sr., of Silver Spring; three sisters, Mrs. Mary Jane Hottinger, of San Francisco; Kelly L. Kessing and Patricia Kessing, both of Silver Spring; and his grandmothers, Mrs. Oliver O. Kessing, of Norfolk; and Mrs. Mami Beck, of Chapel Hill, N.C.

PRECEDENTS IN WATER POLLUTION CONTROL SET IN OREGON

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, Oregon is justifiably proud of its precedent-setting efforts to control air and water pollution and preserve the uniquely high quality of its environment. The development of a statewide comprehensive water pollution program in Oregon dates back to 1938. In 1951, the Oregon Legislative Assembly established the first statewide air pollution control program in the Nation. Last year, Oregon created an independent department of environmental quality with expansive policy-making and law-enforcement powers.

As a recent article in the New York Times points out, Oregon has tough antipollution standards, perhaps as tough as exist anywhere in the country. The article is a study of efforts to bring the pollution-ridden Willamette River back to life. It describes the difficult job of renewing our natural resources once they are polluted, and makes clear this is a long and very gradual process. It also points out that environmental con-

trol is a matter of adept politics and adequate incentives.

I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

TOUGH RULES SAVING A DYING OREGON RIVER (By E. W. Kenworthy)

PORTLAND, ORE.—One day last week, the fall Chinook salmon began to flow out of the Columbia River into the Willamette, swimming 25 miles through a highly developed port-industrial complex at Portland Harbor reach, struggling up a man-made fishway over the 50-foot falls at Oregon City, and finally fighting their way to the upstream headwaters where they will spawn.

As the Chinook struggle upstream, tabulators at the falls count each one, hoping for another increase in the run. If the count is up, it will be an event of some national significance—visual proof that a Federal-state program to clean up the Willamette River, until a few years ago one of the nation's foulest, is continuing to make steady progress.

Antipollution officials across the country are watching the Willamette clean-up effort for guidance on how to deal with extreme levels of pollution from sewage and industrial wastes.

COMBINATION OF FACTORS

Among the observations is that the improvement of the Willamette's water quality—which officials point out still has a long way to go—resulted from a fortunate combination of factors: strong public outcries, with resulting political reaction and commitment, good state and Federal cooperation, forceful leadership, tough standards and the cooperation of industry.

The gradual increase in the fall salmon run—from a meager 79 in 1965 to 6,957 last year—already backs up more sophisticated scientific evidence that the Willamette cleanup indeed is working.

In part, the increased salmon run can be attributed to a new, \$4-million fishway at the falls to help the salmon over the hump and the augmenting of flows around the dam at periods of critically low water. But, as the Department of Environmental Quality said in a report this month: "Without cleanup of the river, investment in the new fish ladders would have been an almost wasted expenditure."

The Chinook and other migrating fish shy away from severely polluted water. A chief reason is lack of oxygen supply—a major indicator, along with the amount of disease-bearing bacteria and dangerous chemicals, of the health of a waterway.

Fishery biologists say that migrating fish need water with five parts per million (p.p.m.) of oxygen, and that if the oxygen reaches below four p.p.m., fish may not enter a river. In years past, during low water in the summer and fall, the dissolved oxygen supply often reached zero in the most polluted Portland Harbor reach of the Willamette.

"BIOLOGICAL CESSPOOL"

Besides creating other problems, the huge amounts of organic wastes dumped into the Willamette voraciously consumed the river's oxygen in decomposition.

Inundated with heavily organic industrial wastes from nine pulp and paper mills, as well as vegetable processing and meat-packing plants, other industries and firms, the lower Willamette was described by the Izaak Walton League as late as the spring of 1967 as a "stinking, slimy mess" and a "biological cesspool."

Between Portland and Willamette Falls, globs of bacterial slime that fed on nutrients, mostly wood sugars from the pulp mills, formed beneath the surface and mats of decaying sludge, dislodged from the bottom by the formation of gasses in the summer-

heated river, rose to the surface and floated like rafts down the river until they disintegrated and sank to the bottom again. Life in such water was scarce indeed.

By contrast, Kelly Conover of the Oregon Fish Commission said in a recent interview that he believed that within a few years the fall chinook run would reach 110,000, and Kenneth H. Spies, director of Oregon's Department of Environmental Quality, reported that the quality of the river had improved to the point that much of the stream above the falls was "reasonably safe" for swimming.

The main stem of the Willamette is 187 miles long. The state's four larger cities—Portland, Salem, Corvallis and Eugene—lie on it. Serious pollution dates back to the late twenties. In 1938, the voters approved creation of a State Sanitary Authority, forerunner of the Department of Environmental Quality established in 1969. When the Authority began its pollution control program in 1939, there were only 23 municipal sewage plants in the valley, and none was on the river's main stem, where all major cities discharge raw sewage into the river. All valley industries dumped their waste into the river without treatment.

PULP AND PAPER MILLS CITED

Municipal progress was slow. It was not until 1957 that all cities on the river had installed primary treatment of sewage—the settling out of solids which removed 35 per cent of organic matter. Industrial progress was even slower. In 1957, a Department of Interior report found that 70 per cent of the oxygen-demanding waste produced in the valley came from the nine paper and pulp mills, and 90 per cent of the waste actually entering the river came from these mills.

By far the largest share was contributed by five sulphite-process plants—two Publishers Paper Company mills owned by the Los Angeles Times at Oregon City and Newberg, two crown Zellerbach Corporation mills at West Linn and Lebanon, and a Boise-Cascade Corporation.

The turning point came in 1967—a turning point that state and Federal officials attribute to a concatenation of luck, timing, politics and personalities.

In the governorship campaign of 1966, Robert Straub, the Democratic candidate, noted public concern and made pollution his principal issue. Tom McCall, the Republican candidate, was only too ready to do battle on this ground. As a television broadcaster, Mr. McCall, in 1967, had made a documentary film entitled "Pollution in Paradise."

In the campaign, the two candidates outdid each other in promising to restore the state's environment. The campaign set the climate for future achievement.

GOVERNOR TAKES CHARGE

Mr. McCall won. Soon after he took office, the man who had been chairman of the State Sanitary Authority for 25 years died. The Governor wanted to appoint John D. Mosser, a former State Representative, to the post. But he also wanted Mr. Mosser to serve for a few months as Director of Finance and Administration, and Mr. Mosser agreed.

Thus, to dramatize his own commitment to environmental reform the Governor appointed himself chairman of the Sanitary Authority for the interim. He ordered hearings throughout the state as a preliminary to issuing standards of water quality for every river in the state.

The authority was aided by two Congressional acts—the Water Quality Act of 1967, which required the states to set water quality standards for interstate waterways, and the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966, which increased Federal funds to aid cities in building sewage treatment plants.

In May 1967, Oregon became one of the first three states to have its standards ac-

cepted by the Department of the Interior. At the same time that it issued its standards, the authority also published an enforcement plan dealing with every stream and every city and industry on each waterway. The Governor then stepped down as chairman and appointed Mr. Mosser, who set about the job of enforcement.

In a recent interview, E. J. Weathersbee, deputy director of the Department of Environmental Quality, explained that, because of public support, Mr. Mosser had no trouble with either the legislature or industry.

TOUGH STANDARDS SET

"Mosser," he said, "was brilliant and persuasive, logical, and tough when he had to be, and industry fell in line. He just let them know we were going to clean it up, and that was it, and nobody argued with him."

The Sanitary Authority not only set standards for the Willamette below the falls—classified as an interstate waterway because of tidal flow—but set equally tough standards for streams wholly within the state.

It also set a discharge limit on oxygen-consuming wastes for every municipal sewage plant and every industry.

In doing so, it made no provision for future growth, declaring that the limit was all the stream could take and maintain its quality, and that future growth of a city or plant had to be taken care of by increased efficiency in handling pollutants. Sulphite pulp mills were given until July, 1972, to install primary and secondary treatment and recovery systems for chemical liquors.

Industry was given an incentive to meet these imposed standards and increase efficiency—a write-off of 5 per cent a year on state corporate taxes until 1978 to help cover the cost of installing pollution controls.

What have been the results of this program on the Willamette?

By late 1968, all cities in the basin had installed secondary treatment plants for sewage. By 1968 all paper and pulp mills had installed primary treatment and were removing 100,000 pounds of settleable solids daily that had been going into the river.

At present, five of the nine mills have both secondary treatment and chemical recovery systems; one has chemical recovery, and the rest have until July, 1972, to complete installation of secondary treatment and chemical recovery. The only foot-dragger, according to state officials, is the Boise-Cascade plant at Salem.

By 1972, Mr. Spies predicts, the overall reduction of municipal and industrial waste in the basin will be between 90 and 94 per cent.

Oxygen-consuming discharges of the paper and pulp mills, which formerly accounted for 70 per cent of the oxygen-demanding waste, will be 38,500 pounds a day, down from 130,000 pounds in 1969, and only slightly above the 35,000 pounds expected discharge from city sewage plants.

One result of the controls has been that the waters of the Portland Harbor reach are meeting the standard of five parts per million of oxygen set by the state and approved by the Department of the Interior in 1967. The lowest average monthly content of oxygen taken from the water has gone from 1.5 p.p.m. in 1957 to 3.3 in 1967 to 5.6 in 1969.

At the same time, anyone taking a boat trip up the Willamette today would hardly call it a clean river. Federal and state pollution officials do not contend it is. They recognize vast problems still to be overcome—so-called "non-point discharges from logging, soil erosion, animal feed lots, irrigation seepage, and, of course, population growth.

Nevertheless, they point to the Chinook in the fishway and contend that, at present anyway, they have "a river on the way to restoration."

THE POLITICS OF PEACE

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the August 1970 edition of the Washington Monthly includes an article by Mr. Sam Brown that is one of the most sensible and reasoned histories of the antiwar movement yet to appear in print. Mr. Brown points out that those opposed to the war on moral grounds have always decried violence and have consistently attempted to enlist the wider community in their cause, from blue-collar workers to Members of Congress. He enunciates the direction the peace movement must take and the clear need for leadership from public officials, and I urge all those who wish to see an end to the carnage in Southeast Asia to pay heed to the responsible guidelines set forth in this cogent analysis. I urge all those concerned about this war and about the avoidance of future Vietnams to give this article their most careful attention.

The article follows:

THE POLITICS OF PEACE

(By Sam Brown)

When I visited the North Vietnamese and NLF representatives in Paris last February, they made it clear that they had never counted on the American left to end the war. Madame Nguyen Thi Binh, the foreign minister of the Provisional Revolutionary Government (of the NLF), remarked that she found student radicals very sectarian and reluctant to touch political power. She continued that the confused assortment of political objectives on the left—from legalizing marijuana to overthrowing the government to providing free abortions—dilutes the political impact of the peace movement. The result, she suggested, is that the Vietnamese people and American soldiers carry the burden of America's social problems. Insofar as unrelated issues are tied to the peace movement, weakening it, Vietnamese people and American soldiers die every day because the peace movement has exported the costs of America's social problems to Asia.

I found these Vietnamese revolutionaries far more thoughtful than most young American revolutionaries. Their private conversation was radically different from their strident, ideological press releases, and they seemed to bear little malice toward the American people. They didn't express hatred for Middle America, or even for the soldiers in Vietnam. The negotiators seemed to be tough-minded realists, who expect a long war and don't believe that America is anywhere near collapse. In short, these communist leaders are very connected to reality, where political self-delusion can cost people their lives.

One such delusion within the American peace movement has been the notion that we can retain a private dimension of political morality for ourselves. We define the significance of peace rallies in such a way that we cannot lose our purity. So if Jerry Rubin or the Black Panthers offend people from a peace platform, we conclude that Jerry Rubin's style is his own business and the Black Panther platform is logically separable from the war—therefore the offended people should pay attention to the anti-war political message independently of its context. We cannot be responsible for their confusion or stupidity.

Thus doves reason that they have the best of situations: if the war ends, they can take credit for political effectiveness; if it continues, they have personally separated themselves from the war policy. The problem, as Madame Binh pointed out, is that there is no private realm for people dealing with the politics of war. The significance of our acts in the peace movement is politically determined, not privately defined. Every time a 16-year-old high school student steps off the curb for a demonstration, there is a political effect. The war may be nearer or further from its end, according to the political impact of his action. This places an awesome responsibility on those who lead others into action.

The responsibility will be increasingly important as it becomes clearer that President Nixon is committed to some kind of non-defeat in Indochina which he calls "winning the peace." There is no evidence in his history that he could withdraw all troops from Vietnam and stop all bombing if doing so would be described as a defeat. This means that building peace politics is not superfluous. American, Cambodian, and Vietnamese bodies are still being blown apart every day, and only a peace movement which reaches Richard Nixon's constituency can stop it. Doves must find lessons in the past five years of anti-war activity to avoid both the errors of previous strategies and the fiction that the war will dissolve of its own accord. Neither Vietnamization nor a naive peace movement can end the war.

Since November, 1969, the President and Vice President have used the apolitical purism of many committed peace people to split the non-moral opposition voters make political decisions largely on issues of tone and style rather than on the basis of rigorous foreign policy analysis. The right wing of potential peace supporters—those opposed to the war for a variety of non-moral reasons, ranging from its economic cost to the futility of seeking a conventional military victory—tend to cave in to Presidential authority, especially when the tone of his message is more congenial and positive than that of the doves who hold that we cannot grind an honorable peace out of a dishonorable war. The potential peace voters respond favorably to the calm, authoritative demeanor of the President behind the mahogany desk during a television broadcast, and they like neat, clean, thoroughly American behavior. They don't like long hair, campus protest, or, in short, anything which irritates the nerve endings of middle-class values. They may dislike the war, but they dislike radicals far more. Moreover, they inherit this country's anti-intellectual legacy, so that if the President calls for "team spirit" and the peace movement calls for "communal solidarity," they go with the President. For them, "communal solidarity" smacks of the red specter and academic snobbery.

The Middle Americans who favor an early end to the war hold the political balance between continued Nixonian Vietnamization or worse, and an early end to the war. A substantial majority of them would vote for "withdrawal from Asia as rapidly as possible commensurate with the safety of the troops" if the arguments pro and con were presented in commune and communicate with the non-ideologues who want to end the war, and his message is not one of rapid withdrawal but of "winning the peace" and avoiding humiliation. And except for the 1968 campaigns and a brief moment last October 15, the peace movement has not been able to talk with, or feel with, its potential allies. The apparent result is that the President has disarmed his domestic critics while the peace constituency has grown larger than ever. I think he will lose on his peace-with-victory tightrope in the long run; but for now, even after Cambodia, the combination of support for this President and a peace majority is another

paradox in the string of Catch-22 insanities which have characterized the war—prepared by a liberal President who spoke of ending the Cold War, begun by a President elected on a peace platform, waged by executive order to export democratic self-determination to half of another country, escalated in the interest of protecting the troops, and continued on the grounds that it is the shortest road to peace.

Those of us in the peace movement who have worked for five years on campuses, in campaigns, and in community activities like the Moratorium bear a large share of the responsibility for our alienation from the potential doves in Middle America. The fact that they support the President in a crunch follows partly from historical accident, partly from errors in political judgment by the morally committed, and partly from a lack of courage among the politically astute.

Insofar as the split within the peace movement stems from the student base of most anti-war activity, historical accident is largely to blame. I do not think students would have taken themselves seriously as a political force had the war not begun during the civil rights movement. In the early Sixties, young people learned that voting and precinct meetings were not the only effective forms of political activity, that extra-legal demonstrations worked in the face of a moral horror, and that American leaders often displayed both cowardice and hypocrisy in race relations. The civil rights movement, with all its implications about American politics, was almost a necessary condition for anti-war activism on the campuses.

It was also important that the war was begun by a Democratic President, for Lyndon Johnson's presence in the White House silenced many of those who are now doves against a Republican President. Hubert Humphrey, Arthur Goldberg, Edmund Muskie, Larry O'Brien, Adlai Stevenson III, Birch Bayh—none of the party establishment came close to breaking with Johnson. Even the intellectual community, which might have been expected to provide some leadership was so closely tied to the Administration that its members—McGeorge Bundy, Francis Bator, Richard Neustadt, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and so on—were reluctant to speak out at first. So were the foreign policy experts, such as Roswell Gilpatrick, George Ball, Averell Harriman, and Cyrus Vance. The result was that students were the original peace constituency almost by a process of elimination. Through the draft, we felt the war with the kind of harsh self-interest which motivates most political activity. The first major anti-war demonstration took place in front of the White House in the spring of 1965, organized by SDS. Senators Morse and Gruening spoke, sealing the alliance between students and brilliant eccentrics. When Eugene McCarthy announced his candidacy in November of 1967, everyone assumed that students would be his most consistent supporters, although all the pros, including Robert Kennedy, advised McCarthy against stressing student support.

To say that students have formed the core of anti-war activism does not mean that relative to other age groups. That is part of the silent majority myth. But I do think that young peace activists tend to have made certain moral judgments about the war, beyond pragmatism. This is a source of strength for the peace movement in that it provides the strongest motive for opposition to the war and also removes the recurrent trap of wavering doves: the victory wish. People who believe that the war is immoral are tempted to dampen their activity when a vision of conquest is dangled before their eyes. In fact, most of us who have worked to end the war for some time believe that any semblance of a military victory in Vietnam would be disastrous for the United States. It would convince many Americans

that the war was right and that it could be successfully repeated elsewhere. Also, a military triumph would go a long way toward replacing the Jeffersonian-revolutionary image of America as a place of hope with a Roman image of this country as a conquering empire.

If the conviction of young people has been a source of strength, it has also been responsible for much of the self-containment of the peace movement. And the significant fact is not that active dissent began on the campus, but that it has largely stayed there.

When anti-war activities began on the campuses, most of us were convinced that political education could end the war and that America was sufficiently biased against foreign conflicts to make it impossible for the government to wage war with substantial internal opposition. The draft forced us to confront the war early; and since we reached our decision to oppose American Vietnam policy largely through an intellectual process, we were confident that the country could do the same. So there were teach-ins on Vietnam in 1965 and 1966, and the Vietnam Summer of 1967 was originally called Teach-Out, a campus effort to reach into the community.

The weaknesses of the citizen education campaign became apparent very soon. For one thing, students presupposed a level of basic knowledge about Vietnam that simply didn't exist in most voters. If, in 1965, a student went to a doorstep and the lady said, "I don't know, the President knows more than we do," he became quickly frustrated with such blind deference in the face of facts about the war.

Students found that most voters employed a contorted decision-making process to analyze American involvement in Vietnam. It seemed that they should have been against the war until they knew enough about the issues to argue for it. Instead, people supported the war until convinced that America was wrong, placing the burden of proof on the students and then being fairly complacent about studying the evidence. Many students found it morally repugnant that a citizen could support Lyndon Johnson's war without having read Bernard Fall, the Vietnam hearings, or even Douglas Pike and the SEATO Treaty, without knowing the history of the Viet-Minh or of French colonialism in Indochina, and knowing little about Ho Chi Minh, Marshal Jean De Latre, or Ngo Dinh Diem.

It became quite easy for students to react against Lyndon Johnson's use of Middle America's historic anti-intellectualism with a kind of academic chauvinism readily learned from prominent professors. Thus it followed that since every intelligent person was against the war, anyone who supported LBJ was a fool, immoral, or both. With President Nixon reduced to visceral patriotism and respectable demagoguery to carry the war, the argument has been pushed to its conclusion: that people who support the war for immoral or irrational reasons should not count. This judgment is often felt but seldom expressed, because it runs headlong into the left's emphasis on participatory democracy. Unfortunately, irrationalities matter in democratic politics, and peace is not here just because we want it, or even if we can demonstrate on paper that it's a good idea. In order to build a successful peace movement, one must believe that Middle America should count, even after a week's canvassing in Ogallala, Nebraska, or Peoria, Illinois. The alternative is to join with classical aristocrats, who find the paper ballot a rather crude and absurd method of making political decisions.

Students found it difficult to break the ethos and life style of the campus in order to spend their time in homes and businesses. Canvassing operations and education campaigns require a great deal of organization

and commitment to work which is generally tedious. A demonstration, on the other hand, only requires going someplace for a few hours, at least for the non-organizers. The atmosphere at a demonstration is one of a communion of peers, often with recreation and a heady emotional sense of solidarity. Moreover, the civil rights movements had given demonstrations an overtone of moral outrage, and that was precisely the message that the peace movement wanted to communicate: that the Vietnam War is a moral outrage.

Unfortunately, anti-war demonstrations did not succeed in dramatizing the moral aspects of the war, largely because the war was taking place halfway around the world. The sit-ins in the South could demonstrate the moral imperatives of the civil rights movement. One could see the violent clash of behavior against principle, and the connection to the law was clear. Peace demonstrations at draft boards and troop shipping stations attempted to make the same point regarding Vietnam, but the appeal to conscience was too vague or too strained. McGeorge Bundy and Robert McNamara were tucked away in an impeccably proper bureaucracy. They never delivered any napalm in person, and certainly never wore the coarsely hostile face of a Bull Conner.

Civil rights demonstrations had another advantage: they could appeal to the political self-righteousness of 75 per cent of the country in order to defeat the South. This was a significant political lever which the anti-war movement has never had. In order to accept the idea that the Vietnam war is immoral, one must admit that his whole country is capable of perpetrating great wrongs and that he himself is partly culpable. This is difficult for any of us to do. It is far more difficult than deciding that the South's brutal racism is immoral in the face of the non-violent courage of Martin Luther King.

Vietnam demonstrations also developed a high existential content, especially as the war dragged on beneath Russian platitudes. At some point it became necessary for all of us to do something, regardless of the political effect, in order to separate ourselves from the government. This year's May 9 demonstration was a good example. There had to be some response to the Cambodian invasion and Kent State. Because something had to be done and peace people knew how to produce demonstrations, a quick demonstration was put together. The May 9 rally in Washington was cathartic for everyone already committed against the war—a communion of the wounded, complete with a mass swim-in in the Lincoln Memorial reflecting pool and speeches about every conceivable issue on the left. But the rally had little political effect on those not already on our side.

The failures of demonstrations as a peace tactic tended to restrict the morally-based anti-war movement to the campus. And, during gestation on the campus, it continually moved toward the left. The enemies became generalized into the System and the solution into revolution. Anyone who added a new plank to the canons of the left was considered purer than his predecessor, and the movement shifted in order to identify with its purest elements. People became unwilling to accept those opposed to the war for less comprehensive reasons. They had to be written off as opportunists and moral reprobrates.

This is the first vicious cycle of the student peace movement: the longer it fails to end the war, the farther left it moves, splintering itself into multiple groups in the process, which in turn makes it more difficult to develop the new constituencies necessary to end the war.

I cannot argue strongly for a single-minded peace strategy without considering

the emotional costs. Obviously, there are reasons for leftward sectarian impulses, growing out of the history of the Sixties—when this country identified many domestic problems and solved almost none. There is good reason for a healthy cynicism. A young person in this country has seen little but war, the draft, riots, racism, assassinations, pollution, and governmental ineptness since he came into political awareness. A person who is 21 has dim memories, if any, of the early Sixties, when there was a great deal of hope in America.

On a deeper level, there is a strong sense among young people of alienation from the values which built the American economy—impulse repression, acquisitive drive, and status mobility. These frustrations add up to a strong motive for believing that America's problems are insoluble, and that the war is but a symptom whose termination will be of little use.

Finally, there is a feeling that the war cannot be ended on terms other than the Carthaginian Peace acceptable to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Obviously, any tough-minded political discipline toward ending the war is senseless if the chances of success are zero. The existential alternative is to keep one's purity, protect one's life style, and demonstrate a personal separation from the war policy.

This is a dilemma for those who believe that the war is wrong: defeat appears likely and recommends that people withdraw into a personal purity, while ending the war requires that people move toward Middle America and become politically effective.

To unravel this problem, I think a few false issues must be separated out. First, personal appearance, language, and life style have nothing to do with the substance or purity of one's political views. Behavior that is offensive to Middle America neither establishes nor identifies real political differences; it merely offends Middle America. Burning the flag or shooting obscenities at an anti-war rally is for many doves a shortcut for the years of hard work which would make real political enemies on substantive issues. If done for its political effect, such action creates needless liabilities and fosters the self-deception that one is politically righteous in proportion to how much he is despised.

Another kind of false purism follows from an inquisitorial tendency on the left to exclude as many people as necessary to insure the holiness of the group. This is the opposite of the political instinct, which is to include as many people as possible in the interest of achieving an objective. You take your allies where you can, not necessarily making heroes of them, but keeping them in the camp.

It's very dangerous to generalize a personal code of moral absolutism into politics. Many of us cannot accept the draft for this war on personal, moral grounds. But I find it ethically untenable to suggest that everyone who doesn't agree with us is automatically immoral—unworthy of respect and human consideration.

Such absolutist judgment would represent a curiously non-situational ethic for a generation which accepted and popularized situational ethics in sexual relationships. Middle America is still sexually Victorian on the whole, but politically pragmatic, while students are politically absolutist and sexually situational. One could, as Richard Nixon has, drive a truck through the gap.

On either side of this gap the combatants act like members of the old religious sects, where different rules govern one's conduct toward people outside the group as opposed to those within it. Thus, it becomes possible for an honest, fair-minded judge to display a total disregard for due process in dealing with a long haired radical. On the other hand, it is possible for people on the left—whose internal ethic calls for a loving ethos,

an understanding of human weaknesses, concern for the poor, and non-violence—to direct blind hatred toward Middle America, to call people pigs, to glorify militance, and to display considerable cultural condescension toward "hewers of wood and drawers of water," from tobacco farmers to cab drivers to hard hats. The response is obvious.

Sect-like behavior is the source of a second vicious cycle within the peace movement. People in the middle respond to the sign language involved and to the external codes of conduct, not the internal ones. Sectarian violence on the left is the most salient aspect of what the press calls a peace-youth cult.

Perhaps strategic violence in the anti-war movement is yet another legacy of the civil rights movement during which young people have seen that pompous official statements on the futility of violence consistently ring false against the scramble of politicians to throw money and concern into any urban riot area. But most Americans don't feel guilty about the war, nor do they feel that young demonstrators are its victims. Again, the moral imperatives of the peace movement have been different and weaker than those of civil rights. In any case, I find political violence wrong in principle, and anti-war violence is also strategic nonsense, creating even more needless enemies than flag-burning.

Sectarian violence on the left is the complement of the hard-hat phenomenon on the right. They represent the culmination of the familiar process of polarization.

The real crux of the dilemma over protecting principles comes when it is necessary to make judgments about issue priorities—to choose among contending goals in the interest of effectiveness. This is particularly difficult for young people, who dislike the notion of effectiveness itself because it represents to them the very craving for success that alienates them from America. They have seen too many allies announce with supercilious dignity that they are going to be effective within the system and then drown all moral commitment in self-advancement.

Many older doves not so alienated from success or the work ethic are also wary of the effectiveness trap. Some can remember the Cold War Fifties, when liberals adopted Brooks Brothers suits to "effectively" protect those falsely accused by Joe McCarthy. And liberals continued to adapt themselves to the times until they decried the missile gap in 1960 so they could be effective in making social reforms and finally began the Vietnam war to demonstrate that they were more flexibly effective anticommunists than the hawkish Republicans. In a sense, the trap is responsible for the whole Vietnam mess; for the last generation of liberals made an ideology of effectiveness and finally came to believe in their own tactical compromises.

In order to handle the effectiveness trap, people must have enough self-confidence to believe that the steps necessary to end the war will not erode their commitment to other issues. Adopting a style that does not offend Middle America is itself no compromise of principle. The danger comes when liberals transform Brooks Brothers suits into political disaster, and today's doves must be able to tell when an acceptable style becomes a substantive sell-out.

People must also believe that the war can be ended. Otherwise, they join many students in the non-effectiveness trap—if you decide that it is impossible to win on anything, it makes sense to go down to defeat shouting the pure gospel on as many moral issues as possible. If, on the other hand, doves decide that the peace movement can in fact end the war, then the purest anti-war position is the one which ends the war fastest without compromising the principle that the war is wrong. That position would undoubtedly be tough-minded in that

priorities must be chosen and sacrifices made in the interest of ending the war. Jerry Rubin may have to be excluded from a platform to keep John Lindsay, because, coldly, Lindsay is far more politically valuable than Rubin in any successful anti-war strategy. The position would also be painful—it would even be necessary to cultivate dovish potential among racists. But the position would also recognize the daily blood cost of the non-effectiveness trap.

I think everyone who has a moral commitment against the Vietnam war feels some of these drives toward left sectarianism. Certainly I do. On the night of the Cambodian invasion, part of me wanted to blow up buildings, and I decided that those who have waged this war really should be treated as war criminals. There must be a certain point in the midst of an insanely malevolent situation at which any sane person wants to become a maniac. Discipline and caution appear deceitful.

But despite past frustrations and failures, I think that political self-discipline is precisely what is necessary to end the war. My own feeling is that this war is in fact less intellectually intractable than the long-run problems of pollution or the distribution of wealth in America, and less emotionally deep-seated than alienation from the Protestant work ethic or the overwhelming problem of race. But it throws up an enormous psychological barrier to the perception of these problems, simultaneously draining the nation of lives, resources, hope, and conscience. Therefore, I think that ending the war is a necessary first step toward meeting more difficult problems, even though ending the war may mean short-run sacrifices of efforts to cope with them.

Also, you have to have faith that the American people will choose the more humane political path when confronted with clearly stated alternatives, and then you work to state the peace choice persistently in the most acceptable style. Until you lose that faith permanently, left sectarianism must be regarded as politically foolish, and only lack of courage causes people who believe so to remain silent.

These realities have been clear for some time. They were paramount in the plans for the Vietnam Moratorium, drawn up in the spring of 1969, when the politics of Vietnam were considerably less carnal than they are now. Nixon and Agnew had not wrapped their policy in the flag, nor had polarization proceeded to the point at which many hawks would cheer the killings at Kent State. But it was clear, at least to our ideological minds, that the President was not going to withdraw from Vietnam quickly and blame the consequences on the Democrats. This option, which so many commentators thought likely because of its "peacemaker" attractiveness and the fact that it would direct any McCathayite backlash at the Democratic Party, was rejected in favor of a Presidential desire for an outcome with victory written on it somewhere. It seemed that he was going to get out of Vietnam as slowly as possible, while selling the idea that he was getting out as fast as possible.

By spring, many doves had recovered enough from the doldrums of the 1968 campaign to consider new peace initiatives. Jerry Grossman, a Massachusetts businessman, first suggested the outlines of what became the Moratorium. Beginning with a student base, because that was all we could count on, we wanted to develop a single-issue citizen organization with sufficiently electric appeal to create a majority for withdrawal from Vietnam.

When we announced the Vietnam Moratorium in June of 1969, the four coordinators felt that it would indeed take a great deal of political self-discipline to succeed with our strategy: to gradually attract new peace constituencies on the right without either mak-

ing unacceptable compromises or cutting off the left. We had to avoid following the ADA path (drifting to the right ideologically without gaining new support) and alienating the left at the same time.

The Moratorium plan for October 15 was to start on the campuses and organize outward into the community, seeking to slowly build peace constituencies. The public message was immediate withdrawal, which was then a radical position relative to the entire American political spectrum. We hoped to start in October with one day's cessation of "business as usual" and increase the moratorium period cumulatively by one day each month until the war ended. The initial call and the founding statement were very centrist documents. We tried to set a moderate tone in everything—from the choice of the word "moratorium" rather than "strike" to our constant encouragement of activities that would appeal to people just to the right of our student base—such as vigils, church services, candlelight ceremonies, and community canvassings. If we had started with more money, more visibility, or more Congressional support, we would have deemphasized our campus base even more; but, lacking all three, we had to organize from the campuses outward. Our specific targets for October were the social groups which had displayed sympathy for the peace movement—the clergy, women, senior citizens, doctors, lawyers, and educators—and we also attempted to reach labor unions and minority groups.

Across the summer of 1969, we received little press coverage and less support from Congressmen and Senators. David Mixner did most of the browbeating on the Hill and got nothing but smiles and encouragement from everyone but the handful of consistent doves, such as Congressmen McCloskey, Adams, Brown, Reid, Edwards, Koch, Ryan, Fraser, Riegle, and Ottinger and Senators McGovern, Hughes, McCarthy, Hatfield, and Goodell. There was a perceptible lack of raw courage on the part of most elected officials. Part of it was rationalized by the "extended honeymoon" argument that President Nixon would extricate us from the war if he had time enough. There was also a strong reluctance to criticize the President, growing out of a contagious inability to distinguish between the office and the man in it.

Two things happened in the fall of 1969 to make a summer's worth of low-profile organizing pay off in October. One was the Labor Day recess, when most Congressmen went home and discovered a great deal of disgruntlement with the war. They often found anti-war activities being supported by surprisingly "straight" people. Congressmen react very quickly to broad-based constituent pressure, and endorsements came in rapidly during September.

Also, Congressmen react to an informal perception of national mood, which they get from the media. Washington is a funny town, and things often occur largely because the right people say they will. Averell Harriman began saying that he thought the Moratorium was a good thing, and so did Ramsey Clark. Bernard Nossiter wrote an article in *The Washington Post* in which he struck a favorable tone and anticipated widespread activity on the 15th. A few columnists responded, and soon the mood became right in Washington. With the luck of this favorable mood, we convinced enough media people that a lot of things really were going to happen on October 15. Once the media began doing Moratorium previews, Congressmen with sensitive noses for publicity began to nibble at the Moratorium in the interest of a good headline. Most people on the Hill want to be helpful on the day they can get big press coverage—but not otherwise, or the next day.

October 15 was far more successful than we had even hoped, as Moratorium activities

took place in more than 500 towns across the country and on most of the nation's campuses. The events were well covered, the tone was good, and many new groups were brought in. There were a lot of professionals: 700 attorneys in Boston, 25,000 people at a Wall Street rally, businessmen in Chicago, government and social workers, advertising and publishing people. Walter Reuther and Roy Wilkins participated, and the Moratorium was endorsed by many of the establishment Democrats who had been so reluctant to break with Lyndon Johnson over the war. There was a great deal of euphoria within the ranks of local Moratorium groups, and we at the national office found that success spawned an atmosphere of hope that new constituencies could be won over and that the movement would snowball. Although October was far bigger than we anticipated in terms of national impact and therefore did not fit in well with our plan of escalating peace actions, the four coordinators were quite optimistic.

Within a month the bubble had burst. The President's speech of November 3 and the reputation of the Mobe (New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam) neutralized many of the new peace activists in the Congress. Many of them felt that they had done their bit for peace in October and that it was prudent to coast for a while. The New Mobe leaders—Ron Young, Stewart Meachem, Cora Weiss, Fred Halstead, Richard Fernandez, and others—did their best to establish a non-violent commitment through the press, short of excluding hard left groups from the platform; but many people in Congress and the press still chose to see them as simply a bunch of Trotskyites, socialists, draft-dodgers, and militants. They conjured up visions of the leaders of the Pentagon march of 1967 and the Chicago demonstrations of 1968 descending on Washington for November 15, 1969.

The mood in Washington before November 15 was very tense. The press dwelled on the threat of violence, the Administration stalled negotiations on demonstration permits, and the citizens of Washington were afraid to open their doors to peace marchers. Meanwhile, we tried unsuccessfully at the Moratorium to keep our activities on November 13 and 14 separate from the Mobe's large demonstration in Washington. But the Moratorium became a generic term for all anti-war activity, including the big march. We decided to support the Mobe activities, partly because we thought they clearly intended to have a nonviolent demonstration, and partly because the events were going to happen anyway and would reflect on the whole peace movement. We doubted the wisdom of centralized marches and demonstrations at that time, but we found it impossible on balance to publicly criticize or abandon the demonstration of November 15, thereby splitting the peace movement and isolating the demonstration's sponsorship farther to the left.

The weekend of November 15 came off well, even with the Weathermen in town. On Thursday their leaders came to the Moratorium requesting an "expression of fraternal solidarity" in the form of \$20,000. In return, they offered to give us an expression of fraternal solidarity by making the case for non-violence at the Weathermen strategy sessions. We refused. The next night there was a great deal of window-breaking around Dupont Circle and an assault on the South Vietnamese embassy (reportedly led by a police agent known as Tommy the Traveler). The police responded with tear gas and billy clubs. The Saturday crowd of some 300,000 was peaceful—governed by its own mood of flower-calm protest. There were no confrontations with the police (in fact, there was scattered fraternization) until the demonstration at the

Justice Department against the Chicago conspiracy trial. Before 4:00 p.m. on Saturday there were no arrests—very unusual for a crowd that large.

But the tone was still wrong. The press focused on Saturday because it was going to be big and virtually ignored the impressive two-day March Against Death. Almost 50,000 people walked from Arlington Cemetery past the White House to the Capitol steps in a continuous, single-file procession. Each person carried a candle and a placard bearing the name of an American GI killed in Vietnam or of a dead Vietnamese or a destroyed village. The placards were dropped in coffins at the steps of the Capitol as the candles were blown out. But the press concentrated on the big demonstration, previewing it with speculation about the extent of violence and reviewing the day with crowd estimates and the usual line about the day's being generally peaceful with a few spicy violent actions by radicals.

The Saturday crowd was overwhelmingly young, partly because many young people had been angered by the President's first super-patriotic defense of the war in his November 3 speech. The Vice President made his barroom debut on November 13 with his first roundhouse at the media. The wedge was driven between the young moralists and the temperate pragmatists. The latter were partly neutralized by the November polemics from the White House, so they stayed away in even greater numbers than non-students usually stay away from demonstrations.

After November 15, Middle America saw the peace movement more than ever as a youth-based effort, with a sizable element of what seemed to them to be kooks, freaks, and lazy hippies. They saw it that way, even though it was largely untrue, and what they saw became operative for skittish Congressmen. Between then and the Cambodian invasion, virtually no one on the Hill did any peace work. Even committed doves were asking to be let off from speaking engagements on April 15. That is not only a bitter commentary on the state of the peace movement but also an indictment of the responsibility of traditional leaders on vital questions of peace and war. They were coming to us to be let off, and we were going to them pleading for support. We couldn't agree on a strategy, but it was generally assumed that we would provide the initiative and they the support. The world was upside down.

This is a third kind of vicious cycle within the peace movement: if you can't get straight, Middle American, Congressional support, the peace movement is seen largely as a youthful cabal, which makes it impossible to attract Congressional support. Only a fortuitous national mood with the proper temperate tone or strong Congressional leadership can overcome that problem.

If polarization and the peace movement's youth identity had removed Congressional support after November, the Moratorium was also afflicted with fatigue. November 15 was a hard act to follow. There was a kind of huge peace orgasm in Washington that Saturday, and everyone went home to sleep it off, convinced that the war would never end if that demonstration had no effect. For the previous several months, families had been strained and studies neglected to generate the enthusiasm and organization for two months' demonstrations. The people were simply tired and resigned to the nation's acceptance of Nixon and his Vietnamization program.

There was also a fairly strong backlash against October 15, which took place in many little towns and went largely unreported. There were many places where October rallies had been put together in rather bizarre fashion by people regarded locally as the oddball biology teacher, the left-wing minister, and the kooky lady. After November, patriotic solidarity rose to attack such people by firing teachers who wore black armbands,

harassing participating students, and passing anti-demonstration ordinances. We spent a great deal of time trying to help the victims of this backlash.

We had trouble generating any enthusiasm out of the national office, and we really didn't have much to give. We discovered that our plan for a continuously building peace movement had succumbed to the cyclical rhythm of campus protest, the political season being fall and spring. December Moratorium activities were small in most places, and we abandoned the idea of escalating the Moratorium period each month. We fell back, regrouped, and made plans for a series of spring actions at income tax time focusing on the cost of the war.

During the period between November and April, the other coordinators and I found ourselves trying to cope with some of the Moratorium's failures, and recognizing new ones. For one thing, I became convinced that there was a serious lack of long-term commitment among many students. Time after time, students came to the national office arguing that the system had failed to respond to their efforts, but it almost always turned out that the students' efforts had consisted of little more than canvassing for a weekend in a 1968 primary, attending an October rally, and participating in some marches. They had not yet accepted the fact that ending the war would take a long time and a great deal of dirty work.

The Moratorium also had severe bureaucratic problems. The organizational structure followed from a kind of three-pronged anti-authoritarianism within the peace movement. There was a good deal of genuine intellectual anti-authoritarianism among those who had been active long enough to see an Administration composed of all the great humanitarian liberals in the country start a war, who had personally witnessed the Mississippi Freedom Democrats' challenge being sold out (by Hubert Humphrey) at the 1964 Convention or who had found the CIA in control of the National Student Association in 1967. Who wouldn't develop an anti-leadership bias? This source of anti-authoritarianism inspired a great deal of the enthusiasm for McCarthy in 1968.

There was a purist branch of anti-authoritarianism, which taught that organizational discipline was in fact essential to the cause—but only after one made absolutely sure that the leadership was selflessly concerned with the pure gospel and not playing petty reform politics. The problem was that the Moratorium was playing reform politics in the sense that we were seeking political alliances with anyone against the war. We didn't feel we were operating in the wheeler-dealer school of political self-advancement, but some of the activities of the Moratorium clearly resembled traditional political bargaining. I considered that part of being serious about ending the war.

Finally, there was the normal amount of scrambling for leadership posts in all the Moratorium offices. People always debunked and frequently deposed the leadership if they felt they could do a better job.

The leadership problem was inherent in any organization of people who were peers in age, especially since there was no one of stature to offer himself as a full-time organizer for peace. Unlike 1968, there was no candidate to rally around. At the Washington office, we felt that young people always respond better and work harder if they have a part in formulating their objectives. At the same time, we felt that organizational efficiency is wiped out unless you reach a kind of consensus that discipline is necessary for operation. Otherwise, it's really impossible to organize a worthwhile canvassing campaign, for example, where discipline is critical for getting people where they are supposed to be, at the right time, with the right opening lines, and with the information processed so that it will be useful.

The leadership question was most important in dealing with the left. I found it absolutely imperative that the Moratorium define itself away from the hard left in order to regain the constituencies we had reached briefly in October.

But White House polemics had made it futile for us to try to organize these groups because we were tied to what Middle America regarded as militants. Strategy aside, the labels pinned on the peace movement made it impossible to establish a credible commitment to non-violence, which was important to all four of us at the national office. It was incredible to me that President Nixon had managed to label us as the source of violence in the United States. Every month, he in effect takes \$30 from every American taxpayer to ship across the Pacific Ocean along with 20,000 draftees. This is the installment payment on the 400 or so caskets and several thousand amputees and cripples that come back across the ocean each month. Every month tons of bombs are dropped on Vietnamese villages at the President's order, and yet he can find 10 sticks of dynamite on West 12th Street in New York and speak as though the apocalypse were upon us because the peaceniks are at it again.

One of the reasons the President can get away with such nonsense is that many of us in the peace movement failed to dissociate ourselves strongly enough from violence on the left. While I thought it morally necessary to separate ourselves from those who advocate violence, I found it very difficult to do. After the Dupont Circle violence of last November 14, I said for publication that I thought those people should be arrested and processed for criminal charges. I also said that it is outrageous to gas, beat, and press inflated multiple charges against window-breakers and petty vandals, but that part never got reported. The press stories came out to the effect that I thought the people had gotten what they deserved. Similarly, I've said on numerous occasions that the country will fall apart of internal hemorrhage if the war is not ended, and it always comes out: "If the President doesn't end the war, we're going to tear the country apart."

Splitting from the left was one of those tough, grisly decisions forced upon the peace movement by the politics of war. Although I couldn't buy the purist argument that only the hard left deserved credit for peace activities (an argument used to exclude people like Senators Harris and Mondale), it was personally difficult to break with friends in the Mobe and politically dangerous to split the peace movement when the chances of attracting real Congressional leadership seemed so low. And it also involved clear responsibilities for what happened afterwards, because I believe that if the hard left is really isolated, it will be repressed. If the moderate peace leadership stands up and says, "We intend to create a peace organization with a strong commitment to non-violence," the political impact of that will be to say "and that makes us a lot different from those kooks." No matter how hard you emphasize to the press that you will fight for the civil liberties of the people on your left, they will divide the groups into good guys and bad guys, leaving the latter fair game for Mitchell and Kleindienst.

It almost takes the press clout of the President to draw fine distinctions in the media. At the Moratorium, we could draw the coverage, but we could never really control how it came out. This made it impossible to move to the right without baiting the left with Agnew rhetoric, which we refused to do.

The responsibility question weighed heavily in our strategy sessions this past winter, even though we may have vastly overestimated the Moratorium's effectiveness as a buffer between the government and the Mobe. We have argued for some time that

we on the left have to take responsibility for the consequences of what we say. When William Kuntzler says we've got to overthrow the government by force, but not by violence, to a 15-year-old kid that means break windows and throw bricks. You can't retreat into academic distinctions between moral force and physical violence after speaking on a political platform.

All these problems—Nixonian polemics, Vietnamization, fatigue, the question of the left, bureaucracy—plagued the Moratorium during the peace movement's "low profile" period from November until Cambodia. At the Washington office, we tried to resist the opening to the left which tempts all groups on the left that don't hold power. In order not to become another SNCC or SDS, the national coordinators had to repeatedly say no to the left options within the Moratorium. David Mixner was the toughest on this question, and I was second house rightist. Local Moratorium offices commonly fought the same battles that were going on in the Washington office.

Two conclusions became obvious in April. First, the national Moratorium office was more of a burden on the local groups than a help. We were in danger of becoming peace bureaucrats, full of jurisdictional squabbles and petty fights, with no sense of joy or purpose in what we were doing. So we decided to do what all stale organizations should do—disband, and let the good local groups survive on their own and the bad ones fade away.

The second conclusion was more fundamental: that our strategy was right but that our base was wrong. I am convinced that it is not possible to build a successful peace movement simply on a student base. Not enough students have the stature, capacity, or inclination to run a tightly-disciplined peace movement, which would be required to make them effective and keep them moving toward Middle America. Even if such an organization were possible, students alone would be unable to attract a majority of the American people to any politically effective peace position. Students can have an impact, since most Americans still don't want to hate their own children. But you must have strong leadership off the campuses to set the tone and direction of the anti-war effort and to give it hope.

This second conclusion made it easier to go to Capitol Hill in April and tell the hesitant doves that if they cared about peace in Vietnam they could provide the leadership. Through the entire history of peace politics, Congressional doves had very seldom spent a full day's effort on the war. They gave speeches on occasion. But within the Senate there was no organization, no regular meetings, no commitment to get together and sublimate their egos to produce a piece of legislation, no serious intention to debate the war on the floor of the Congress, no effort to raise the money to use television in response to the President, none of that. This was particularly galling right after the Carswell vote in April, when these same Senators had come from nowhere to beat him with hard work and internal organization. They had also undercut the moderate peace leadership and the new constituencies of October. In October, we had one resource to use in dealing with the left—we could deny them speakers and publicity if they didn't move toward the center. But in April we had no cards: a rally of 80,000 people was held in Boston with no control over hard-left factions because our support on the Hill had evaporated.

Our message had paltry effect compared with the invasion of Cambodia, of course. But even Cambodia failed to provoke the kind of leadership necessary to move the Congress and take the war to the country. The initial spurt of enthusiasm in the Congress, especially in the Senate, has largely ebbed. Regular meetings of anti-war Senators

have ceased, and there is little evidence of the cooperation or initiative necessary to effect a strategy to end the war.

The outline of a successful anti-war strategy, it seems to me, is clear: the appeal must be made in such a way that Middle Americans will not ignore the substance of the argument because of an offensive style. Support for such an appeal exists. After all, immediate withdrawal is not a radical proposal in this country today, and careful analysis of the polls shows that all political stances on the war must be couched in terms of reaching the quickest possible termination. This indicates that a quick political settlement or immediate withdrawal can become a majority position if the message is presented in a strong but palatable fashion.

While peace activists should not underestimate potential support for an anti-war position, we should also avoid underestimating President Nixon's commitment to some sort of victory in Southeast Asia. I believe that the President's "new" image as a cool, neutral majority-maker, a consummate politician who responds and shapes rather than leads, considerably understates his ego commitment to the war. We are dealing with a man who has a full-time awareness of himself as history—the first President ever to name his own doctrine, the Nixon Doctrine, which I suspect was motivated as much by the simple desire to place his name on the books as to enunciate whatever its meaning is. We are dealing with a man who felt called upon by the world to issue a "State of the World" message, to dwell upon its historic primacy, and to quote himself 27 times in the document while citing all other human beings in history only three times (all three of these quotations were of Secretary of State Rogers agreeing with the President). The President has read the history books and knows that the great Presidents of the United States won wars. He even knows what room of the White House was used to announce the great wartime decisions.

These ego commitments are very harsh terms in which to describe a crucial motive for the Administration's continuation of the war, but I find no others which makes as much sense. There is no more plausible way to explain why the President did not end the war right after he came into office, with little or no political risk. Nor can I otherwise explain his total aversion to Congressional moves toward sharing the political responsibility for ending the war.

The President's personal commitment to the war helps explain why he goes for the political groin to justify his actions. He uses patriotism and the flag, which are deep-seated loyalties for most Americans, to stimulate support for a war which clearly calls forth no such loyalties. He uses the media presence of the Presidency to characterize the opposition as near traitors. I think the President has won a large part of the Vietnam debate in the past merely by naming the teams. When it's the Silent Majority versus the Loud-Mouthed Militants, the Silent Majority wins every time. He and the Vice President have also managed to sell the incredible notion that the press of the United States is leftwing. People who believe that have obviously never attended a convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, where the sentiment is overwhelmingly conservative, verging on outright jingoism.

Since the country drifts toward impatience for withdrawal as the war drags on, the President will have to continue seeking the jugular if he clings to the victory wish. This is one of the greatest dangers to the peace movement; for when the dialogue over the war is degraded past a certain point, it ends. (Liberals should remember the converse: that when the dialogue is elevated to a certain level of generality, involving, for example, petty squabbles over doctrinal minutiae, then the talk goes on forever without action.)

People can no longer talk to each other, and confrontations based on tribal sign language become the norm. In all political likelihood, most of Middle America would line up with the President in any such jungle warfare.

The atmosphere of debate over Vietnam is already so debased that it will be very difficult to take the high road—to offer the American people the kind of positive tone and hope which would stand out by contrast with the President's increasingly defensive and visceral statements. It will be impossible to do so without very strong leadership. I suppose that is the heart of my feelings about the peace movement—that the strategy can be devised, that the constituency is there, but that these assets are useless without strong, non-student leadership. The money will follow evidence of leadership. If my analysis of President Nixon's objective in Vietnam is on the right track, the task will be very difficult, but all the more imperative.

The leadership must have the media presence to counter the President's enormous TV influence. Someone must respond to his smears on the patriotism of doves. A figure like Harold Hughes would have great impact if he said in effect: "Look here, Mr. President, we're not talking about campus bums. We're talking about whether Vietnam is worth continued killings and maimings. I fought through Europe in World War II and consider myself as American as anyone, but that was 25 years ago. And the fact is that Vietnam stands between us and everything America hopes to become." The leadership must be willing to talk about Vietnam in terms that will appeal to Middle America—to rename the teams so that we start on ground zero with the hawks, rather than at an emotional disadvantage.

Part of the new message must be the destruction of the silent majority myth. The only clear lesson of the polls is that most Americans want an end to the war. If the President were to use television to justify withdrawal on the grounds that we had done all we could or that the South Vietnamese government was corrupt and unworthy of support, the silent majority is largely produced by the American propensity to defer to the President. In March of 1968, for example, the Gallup poll showed 40 per cent for and 51 per cent against stopping the bombing of North Vietnam. After President Johnson stopped the bombing, the polls showed 64 per cent for and 26 per cent against his decision. The silent majority appears quite malleable.

Not only must the silent majority argument be exposed as a sham, but the popular characterization of doves as militant, long-haired kids and the silent majority as middle-aged and middle-class must be dispelled. Young people as a group are not more dovish than old people, nor do overeducated eggheads tend to be more dovish than "the folks." In fact, the polls show that college-educated people in their twenties are consistently more hawkish than older non-college graduates, by a significant margin of about 20 per cent.

In addition to establishing a tone acceptable to Middle America, renaming the teams, and destroying Presidential myths, the peace leadership should use the media to make becoming a dove more psychologically attractive to Middle Americans. Prior emphasis on the moral aspects of the war has meant that the first psychological step toward an anti-war position has of necessity been the admission that the United States is somehow evil. Since many people are unable to make that jump, an admission of American guilt should not be asked of all potential supporters. To the extent that we in the peace movement have played down the pragmatic arguments for peace, we have weakened our case and lessened our chances

of ending the war. It is in no way inconsistent with our moral opposition to the war to lay much greater stress than most of us have as yet on the great practical benefits of peace.

This new peace leadership should be composed of Senators, Congressmen, governors, mayors, businessmen—all the straight people who are willing to make a firm and unequivocal commitment against the war. The spokesmen should be those most visible and most attractive to Middle America, those who can speak intelligently about the war with strength rather than condescension or aloofness.

The five co-sponsors of the Amendment to End the War already has a list of some 75,000 people who responded to the Senators' television special after Cambodia, which could be the beginning of a peace constituency. What is needed is commitment from a large number of people willing to cast a "bullet" vote for peace. This commitment may be less organized than a party or formal corporate structure.

The new peace leadership must make it clear that it is in for the duration—until the end of American involvement in Indochina. The cyclical activity of the anti-war movement has had a double disadvantage in the past: during periods of upswing, the peace movement has overestimated its effect and thus paved the way for subsequent acute frustration and resignation; during the downswing, the government has underestimated latent anti-war sentiment, and this has possibly contributed to adventurism.

If the focus of the peace movement could be shifted to the new and long-awaited leadership, young people would be far more effective politically. I don't think we have to hide who we are, or even what we say. We should merely recognize the fact that the political balance on the war is held by people with different life styles. Students could be a left, moral pressure on the coat-and-tie leadership. Students could make it clear to Richard Nixon that they will write his history and that all wars are not heroic. They could make it clear that there are costs held against those who wage this war. Those who wage the war should be constantly reminded that they are responsible for a moral horror—like the British Viceroy in colonial India. Every time the Viceroy showed his face in public he saw a silent Indian holding a sign which read "Assassin." Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon should be subject to the same treatment. We should make them aware that there are large numbers of people in this country who hold them responsible for criminal activities and who believe that those who wage the war cannot cast off the responsibility merely by leaving office.

There is no assurance at present that a new peace leadership is forthcoming, although recently several prospective leaders have been leaning toward conscience and away from conservative careerism. If these people were to emerge, I believe that it is quite possible to build a peace constituency and create a national atmosphere in which it would not be possible to wage the war. This would be partly a matter of national mood, which is highly volatile and heavily influenced by unexpected events.

A renewed peace movement would also exercise political clout, apart from its impact on the nation's war temperature. The National Rifle Association is an unpleasant model; but if a tiny fraction of the population can stop gun control with organization and the bullet vote, then the peace movement can stop the war. The new constituency would have obvious potential in 1972.

All these ruminations have been predicated on certain traditional assumptions: that people's political opinions should count, that democracy can be made to work, that there is enough good will left in the country to make

it work, and that given a choice between rational alternatives, Americans will choose the most humane course. At the same time, the American people have shown that they will not respond favorably to violence committed in the name of ending the war, or to a version of democracy that romanticizes about participation of the poor and the black but ignores the middle, or to peace advocates who think demonstrations are a substitute for the sustained work of peaceful persuasion.

But the "system" should not be applauded even if the war were to end tomorrow. For five years, it has provided no real way for people to express their views of a war which was presented to them as a test of manhood. The system provided no public debate over whether we should enter the war, but instead permitted or leaders to involve us by stealth. This critical failure gave inertia to the propagation of the Vietnam war and sneaked the flag onto the battlefield—leaving the peace movement at an enormous political disadvantage. The system has provided poor information to voters and little active leadership for a position of obvious principle.

If the war is now ended by political action, as I believe it can be, some will undoubtedly argue that the system has vindicated itself. That argument, however, is self-deceiving; for in many crucial respects our system has already failed and requires radical reconstruction.

But that is premature retrospection. If the war can be ended only with such self-delusion, we should end the war now and fight the delusions later.

THE NEXT STEP

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington, D.C., Star of September 4, 1970, entitled "The Next Step."

That excellent editorial points out that the time has come for a national health insurance program.

The time is clearly here and indeed is past, for creation of a national program of contributory health insurance to assure that the highest quality medical care possible be available to all citizens.

The article follows:

THE NEXT STEP

The national health insurance bill, presented by Senator Kennedy on behalf of a bipartisan team of 14 senators, doesn't stand a chance of passage in this session of Congress. But cradle-to-the-grave health insurance is coming, possibly in the first half of this decade.

It is coming not because, to use the well-worn phrase, it is an idea whose time has come. National health insurance will be adopted because it is a necessity that can no longer be avoided.

Few Americans need to be convinced that medical care has priced itself out of the market. Almost no one, with a few gilded exceptions, can afford a serious illness. And the cost of private health insurance programs has increased to the point where they have become a necessity that few families can afford.

Americans know they are paying more. But less generally understood is the fact that they are getting considerably less for their

money than most citizens of technologically advanced nations. The United States ranks No. 1 in the total and per capita amount spent on health and medical care. But in return for the yearly investment of \$63 billion, or \$294 per person, America ranks 13th in infant survival, 13th in maternal survival, and 18th in male life expectancy. By contrast, Sweden, which ranks first in the field of national health, spends \$45 a year less per person than does the United States.

Not all of the medical problems of this country will be solved by a national health insurance program. Too hasty a plunge could worsen the problem by increasing the load on the already overburdened system.

The move must be made carefully. But it must be made. In the long deliberations that lie ahead, the debate should concern itself not with whether a program of national health insurance should be undertaken, but how best to make it work. Invaluable lessons can be learned from the countries that have preceded us into the field, and the lawmakers and the medical profession would be well advised to spend their time sifting the best from the experience of the pioneers.

The time for opposition is past.

FREEDOM IS INDIVISIBLE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, August 21 marked the second anniversary of a day of infamy, a day of Soviet shame when Russian tanks came rumbling into Czechoslovakia to "liberate" them from their new-found freedoms.

Czechoslovakia was the most democratic country in Eastern Europe when it was briefly independent after World War II. This independence was shortlived. The Czechs, Slovaks, and Subcarpatho-Ruthenians had been subjugated by the Nazis and then the Communists, two sides of the same coin.

Under Premier Dubeck, the people of Czechoslovakia began to enjoy the new liberalization with human dignity. But alas, the Russians came up with the Brezhnev doctrine and invaded Czechoslovakia with an army to suppress the invasion of ideas and ideals. By this action, the Russians demonstrated once again that they respected no laws nor that of common human decency.

The Czechoslovakian people may be temporarily muted, but they serve to remind us that the quest for freedom and liberty will continue until they are masters of their own fate.

I should like to place in the RECORD today a statement issued by the Czechoslovak National Council of America to "commemorate" the second anniversary of the invasion of Czechoslovakia.

Mr. Speaker, the statement follows:

FREEDOM IS INDIVISIBLE

On this sad occasion of the second anniversary of the brutal Soviet-led invasion and occupation of peaceful and freedom-loving Czechoslovakia, we American citizens of Czech, Slovak and Subcarpatho-Ruthenian descent, again remind the entire world of this Soviet violation of key principles of international law incorporated into the Charter of the United Nations:

The brutal Soviet aggression and occupation:

(1) violated the sovereignty of a member state of the United Nations (Article 2, Section 1);

(2) was carried out in violation of Article 2, Section 4, which prohibits the use of military force in the relations between individual members of the United Nations;

(3) violated the principle of self-determination of peoples (Article 1, Section 2);

(4) was in conflict with Article 2, Section 7, which prohibits outside intervention in matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state;

(5) was in conflict with a number of resolutions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, particularly, with Resolution 2131 (XXI) adopted at the meeting of December 21, 1965, upon the Soviet Union's own motion, prohibiting any intervention in the domestic affairs of any state and guaranteeing its independence and sovereignty.

The continued Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia is another crime against the right of a small country to determine its own destiny and aspirations. The invasion was an intervention by the forces of reactionary communism to prevent the Czechs and Slovaks from establishing their own social order that did not endanger anyone and sought to contribute to the building of bridges across the discords of a divided world and to lend aid to a better understanding and cooperation among all nations on the basis of true progress and humanity.

The people of Czechoslovakia have not resigned themselves to these aggressive plans of Moscow. The day of August 21st is being commemorated in Czechoslovakia as a *Day of Soviet Shame* in a mighty and disciplined resistance against Soviet pressure. We are joining our friends in Czechoslovakia in asking the entire civilized world to support the people of Czechoslovakia in their effort to achieve the sole aim of their resistance:

"The withdrawal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia."

August 21, 1970

Czechoslovak National Council of America, Chicago, Illinois.

BIGGEST CITY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow our House Subcommittee on Census and Statistics begins hearings on the accuracy of the 1970 census. One of the witnesses will be the mayor of New York, a city which boasts of the size of its population. Radio station WBBM—78—Chicago, in the following very objective editorial on Saturday, September 5, discusses the attitude of New York and its census statistics:

Subject: Biggest City.

Broadcast: September 5, 1970.

The preliminary census reports are in, accompanied by the anguished howls of mayors who believe their communities were slighted in the tally. Our own mayor feels that way, and the issue is important, in that various funds are allocated to the cities on the basis of population.

Most people look at the census reports merely to see who's the biggest or smallest, and who is growing the fastest. Chicago, in case anybody had any doubt, is still the nation's second largest city, and after a recent visit to New York City, we certainly have no desire to be first. The price is too high. First of all, there's people, and New York is wall to wall people. Where there's not people,

there's garbage. The subway now seems to have a built in crash schedule, and the dominant color is grime.

Fun city has become surly city, as the scowl seems to be the prevailing expression in New York. This is not to deny that Chicago has its faults, but at least we can examine our faults with some degree of privacy, and discuss them without choking on soot.

Many pompous New Yorkers will still look with disdain upon anything west of the Hudson, and gloat about their size. That is now growing increasingly difficult, for the New Yorkers are beginning to realize the high price of being first in the census.

CONGRESSIONAL REPORT SENT TO NINTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS, AUGUST 17, 1970

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report:

CONGRESSIONAL REPORT

The murder of former Richmond Police Chief Dan A. Mitrione in Uruguay was a shocking demonstration of politics by terror. While this senseless crime apparently was carried out in the name of advancing political change, it revealed the Uruguayan militants as a criminal force, not a political force.

The slaying of Mr. Mitrione, who was in the Uruguayan capital as an adviser to the police department, is one of the tragic series of kidnapping incidents which have occurred in South America in recent years. U.S. Ambassador John Gordon Mein was killed in August, 1968, in an abortive kidnapping attempt in Guatemala City. Last March, West German Ambassador Count Karl Van Spretti was slain, also in Guatemala.

U.S. Ambassador to Brazil C. Burke Elbrick, and West Germany's Ambassador to Brazil Ehrenfried von Hollenben, also were kidnapped and released. A number of embassy personnel from the United States, Japan, Paraguay and Uruguay also have been victimized by other kidnapping attempts.

These incidents, staged to bring about domestic changes, create serious international problems. The militants have been demanding the release of fellow terrorists, jailed by the government in power, in return for their victims. In cases where the demands have been met, the terrorists have been given asylum in other Latin American countries.

The host government is faced with a difficult dilemma. It can (1) comply with the demands of the terrorists, showing its own weakness, and giving weight to the terrorists' claim of being an active political force, or (2) refuse to give in, allow the terrorists to kill the victims, and risk the strong disfavor of the countries whose diplomats are victimized.

In dealing with this technique of the terrorists, the United States faces the problem of how to provide protection for its diplomats without shutting them off from contact with the local people.

Diplomacy, by its very nature, requires freedom of movement and mingling with a wide variety of people in the host country. The diplomat's efficiency is restricted when his movements are restricted. As one diplomat in Washington said recently, "You can't have diplomacy in a tank."

The United States provides some measure of security for its diplomatic personnel by

maintaining a 1,000-member Marine guard force for about 100 overseas posts. But with more than 6,000 U.S. foreign service officers overseas, complete protection is virtually impossible.

The State Department has requested an additional \$1.9 million for fiscal year 1971 to strengthen overseas protective security. Foreign service officers have been advised to vary their daily routines, to avoid late hours, and to travel in pairs whenever possible. These are precautions, however, and in no way a solution to the growing problem.

The United States favors an international convention to combat political terrorism. Since such incidents have been concentrated in Latin America, our efforts have been focused on the Organization of American States (OAS). A resolution, condemning terrorists tactics, was adopted at a special session of the OAS General Assembly in Washington last month, and the Inter-American Judicial Committee of the organization is to present its recommendations to the OAS Permanent Council in the near future.

While the kidnapping issue is a major concern of the OAS, the Organization has yet to present a unified Latin American front on the question. It has been suggested that the right of asylum be curtailed for political prisoners ransomed for the lives of diplomats. The issue also is seen as an item for discussion by the United Nations.

At present, the United States' approach to these problems is marked by flexibility, a case by case approach, rejecting both a no tribute under any circumstance policy as well as threats to the host government to solve the problem forthwith or suffer a severing of diplomatic relations.

For the U.S. the solution to this difficult problem of terrorist kidnapping lies in a combination of efforts in international organizations and with host countries, urging them to take every possible step to protect diplomats, and, at the same time, to increase the security for them.

LATIN AMERICA—BETWEEN TWO DECADES

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Felipe Herrera, president of the Inter-American Development Bank, discussed the problems and progress of Latin America in the 1960's and the outlook for the 1970's in a September 3 meeting of the Milwaukee World Trade Club in Milwaukee, Wis.

Mr. Herrera's address, "Latin America—Between Two Decades," follows:

LATIN AMERICA—BETWEEN TWO DECADES

Your invitation to come to Milwaukee to address you is particularly welcome to me, since it has given me for the first time an opportunity to visit a city which I find to be among the most interesting and dynamic in this country. Milwaukee is of the heartland of America. And for us who come from abroad and whose principal acquaintanceship with the United States is with the Eastern Seaboard or with the West Coast it is always refreshing to visit this great heartland. One tends to have a different outlook and to view the world in a different perspective in this heartland.

Although this is my first visit here, I am not totally unfamiliar with Wisconsin and Milwaukee, since one of your Congressmen, my good friend Henry Reuss, the Chairman of the International Finance Subcommittee

of the House Banking and Currency Committee keeps the activities of the Bank under scrutiny, particularly when additional resources for the institution are being sought, and another of your Congressmen, Clement Zablocki, is the ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and thus is intimately concerned with the problems which affect Latin America and our Bank. Over the years we at the Bank have learned to know and value these members of Congress and they in turn have constantly kept us informed on the wishes of their constituencies—in other words with your needs.

On the trade side, of course Latin America and our borrowers are quite familiar with the extraordinary number of products manufactured in this city and state—Allis Chalmers, A. O. Smith, J. I. Case, Bucyrus-Erie, Harnischfeger, Koehring, Briggs and Stratton to name but a few, are familiar names in our countries. These and other Wisconsin names frequently appear in letters of credit guaranteed by the Inter-American Bank for purchases made by our borrowers on Bank-financed projects. In addition we maintain close relationships with some of your principal banking institutions, especially the First Wisconsin National Bank.

The subject I have chosen today, "Latin America Between Two Decades," was prompted by the deliberations of the 11th Annual Meeting of the Board of Governors of the Inter-American Bank which took place in April of this year at Punta del Este, Uruguay. At that Meeting we had the opportunity of reviewing with leading government officials of the Hemisphere and with business leaders and experts in Latin America the progress made by our countries during the Decade of the 60s, the main problems affecting Latin America's economic and social development at present and the prospects which may be in store for our region during the decade ahead.

It is especially fitting that these remarks should be addressed to a Mid-Western audience because Latin America has always felt the need for a wider exposure not only of its problems but also of its progress. As the region reaches with ever increasing vigor an accelerated rate of development and growth, it will inevitably acquire a greater stake in economic stability and thereby reach toward a greater role in world affairs.

I. OBSERVATIONS ON LATIN AMERICA'S PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS IN THE 1960s

Significant progress has been made in many of our countries during the past ten years. In that period, our region achieved a rate of growth of its aggregate gross domestic product of about 5 per cent annually, a rate that was exceeded in 1968 and 1969 when the region's domestic product grew by about 5.7 per cent annually. Especially significant in recent years has been the economic recovery of Argentina and Brazil, whose economies had stagnated in the early years of the decade. Both attained high growth rates in 1968 and 1969. In fact, Brazil's preliminary estimates for 1969 indicate an impressive 9 per cent growth performance and Argentina's was 7 per cent. It is also significant that Mexico's gross domestic product has been growing at a rate of between 6.5 and 7 per cent throughout the decade. Thus, the three largest countries in the region, which account for nearly two-thirds of the region's population and two-thirds of the gross domestic product, were rapidly expanding in the latter part of the 1960s. Some of the smaller Latin American countries also experienced high growth rates. The Central American countries all exceeded the regional average growth level of the 1960s, as did Bolivia and Trinidad and Tobago. It should be remembered that the region's growth rate during the 1960s exceeds the rate attained by most industrialized countries at a similar stage in their own development and that it equals the rate postulated by the United Nations as

the goal for developing countries during the first development decade. In reference to domestic growth, I should like to stress the important role played during this period by the industrial, electric power and construction sectors. Manufacturing expanded by 5.4 per cent annually between 1961 and 1968, electric power expanded by 8.7 per cent, and construction by 5.7 per cent. The industrial progress achieved by the largest countries—Argentina, Brazil and Mexico—particularly in the past two years, was especially significant.

Even agriculture, which experienced a comparatively slow expansion of 3 per cent annually during the decade, reveals some bright spots. Food production increased by 4 per cent, expanding at a faster rate than did total agricultural production, and production in several countries exceeded these rates. Mexico, the Central American countries and Venezuela stand out in this respect. Data on fertilizer usage and crop yields of the UN Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) indicate that substantial progress is being made in modernizing agricultural techniques. The so-called "green revolution"—the development in Mexico of the new high-yield varieties of wheat and corn—promises further substantial progress in increasing yield. Of considerable importance in these achievements has been a gradual transformation in the overall institutional setting, including improved access of farmers to adequate credit and to technical assistance, and, in several countries, structural changes in the farm sector. At the same time, improved agricultural policies have played a major role.

Success has also been noted in reducing balance of payments problems in many of our countries. Much of this can be attributed to some relatively favorable exports trends during the past years, supported by the worldwide trade expansion during that period. But national policies have also been influential in this regard. For example, there is no doubt that improved exchange rate policies and export promotion efforts have aided in this achievement. This has been particularly relevant in Colombia, Mexico, Argentina and Brazil. An example of the region's effort in this respect was the creation of the Inter-American Center for Export Promotion, designed to bring about a coordinated effort to regain Latin America's traditional share of world trade. These policies have permitted the region to relax import restriction that acted as a brake on development and moderately to increase foreign exchange reserves.

Significant achievements have been made in many of our countries in controlling inflation. In large measure this success is attributable to the strengthening of public sector finances. Tax collection has exceeded the rate of growth of the region's domestic product, central government deficits have been reduced and governments have been able to finance a growing share of public investments with resources collected through the tax system. This improvement has resulted from efforts made by our governments to improve tax structures, to increase the efficiency of the collection process, as well as through increasing the productivity of the expenditures made.

Despite the many setbacks, and despite the distrust and doubts with which many in the affected sectors have viewed them, the region has experienced a decade of economic integration efforts. Actually, the decade of the 1960s could be referred to as the "Decade of Latin American Integration." Many problems involved with integrating countries at different levels of development have been attacked and institutions for which increasingly specific goals have been agreed upon at the highest level of our governments were created and strengthened. The decade has thus not only witnessed the strengthening

of the Central American Common Market and the Latin American Free Trade Association but also the creation of new sub-regional groupings such as the Andean Group and the Caribbean Free Trade Association. Because our Bank has made an early and firm commitment to foster economic integration in Latin America, we have frequently been called the Bank for Integration.

An indication of progress achieved in integration in Latin America can be obtained from the fact that intraregional exports have grown at a faster pace than total exports during the 1960s. For the region as a whole, intraregional exports increased by 12.2 per cent annually between 1961 and 1968 while total exports increased by 5.3 per cent.

Considerable advances have also been made in many of our countries in coping with social problems. Latin America in the past decade considerably increased and improved its educational services. The increase in enrollment at all levels of education during the decade is estimated at 6.6 per cent annually, more than double the population growth of the region. At elementary levels, the enrollment increased from about 25 million children in 1960 to some 45 million in 1970. Even higher rates of increase were recorded at the secondary and higher education levels. These strides are of course a direct result of the higher proportions of budgetary resources which Latin America is devoting to educational investments: fully 18 of the countries of Latin America assign more than 20 per cent of their budgets to education, and nine of those surpass the 25 per cent mark.

Public Health and sanitation improvements during the decade can be credited with the substantial reduction in mortality rates, the improvement of life expectancy and the virtual elimination of malaria. Public housing which, prior to 1961, was assigned a low priority in many of our Latin American member countries, has begun to be developed, providing several of our expanding urban areas with increasing housing facilities. Innovations in self-help housing, in savings institutions and cooperatives for providing mortgages to low-income citizens are some of the many weapons developed. Here again, the Inter-American Bank has had many occasions to cooperate in these efforts, and our interest and participation in the task of helping urban development has been evidenced through the allocation of a considerable volume of our resources to this extremely important sector.

But, perhaps even more important than the economic and social achievements of the 1960s is the progress made in changing the basic sociological and cultural attitudes that are vital for economic development. Important in this regard is the increasing motivation associated with a desire for a higher standard of living, the greater willingness to face and adapt to changes in the way of life and social organization that an industrial society requires, and the establishment of institutions whose existence and efficiency are essential to the promotion and achievement of development goals.

To sum up: We believe that the lessons learned and the experiences gained have made us far better equipped to face the problems of the Decade of the 70s than we were ten years ago in facing the problems of the 60s.

II. SOME PROSPECTS FOR THE REGION IN THE 1970s

In spite of the many successes attained in the past decade, there are still many problems facing our nations. Let me begin by expressing my conviction that the possibility for sustained growth in the developing countries in general, including Latin America, is limited if we do not, within a reasonable period of time, lay the bases for more equitable and more rational trade relations between the industrialized countries and the

nations presently basically exporting food and raw materials. We need not repeat evaluations and solutions proposed in terms of the so-called "trade gap." These have been fully covered by the intensive discussions and deliberations of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), at its Geneva and New Delhi meetings in 1964 and 1968. As has been set forth, Latin America can point to a great many constructive experiences at both the national and regional levels aimed at overcoming the limitations of its underdevelopment. Yet, it continues to be seriously affected by external constraints which have gravely stifled the advances made in its economic, social and political growth.

Protectionist policies of the developed world that place obstacles to our exports of foodstuffs, raw materials and manufactured goods are examples. Short-run policies of industrialized countries, to reduce their balance-of-payments deficit by restrictions on foreign investment, drastically affect our economies. Problems of export instability, of non-tariff barriers to trade, and of declining terms of trade, will continue to hinder our development until some solutions are agreed upon between the industrial and the developing nations. One such policy that has been widely discussed in recent months, is the scheme to give "tariff preferences" to the manufacturers of developing countries. We heartily endorse this measure as a positive contribution toward correcting the vicious circle of external limitations in which many of our countries are trapped.

But we also feel that our countries can and should do more to aid their export performance. The need to reduce costs by appropriate economic policies and by attaining economies of scale through integration must rank in the forefront of the problems faced by Latin America's exports of manufactures. The acid test of our countries' dedication to development will come in the next 15 years, at the end of which they have pledged themselves to form a "Latin American Common Market." We at the Bank feel that our contribution to this goal will be enhanced by two instruments, beyond our present activities: the first to deal specifically with a more direct support of the industrial sector through the creation of an institution designed to facilitate industrial investment; the second will be a substantial expansion of a program initiated earlier to finance Latin American exports of capital goods. Internally Latin America still has many problems. Most of our countries are faced with a population growth of nearly 3 per cent which substantially diminishes the effect of our development efforts. We are tending toward rapid urbanization without being able to offer city dwellers the job opportunities and the community services needed. In this decade, Latin America must adopt an in-depth approach to the challenges of a changing society in which unstable urban conditions are aggravated by lack of adequate employment. This is the problem which Dr. Raúl Prebisch, in his recent report to our Board of Governors' meeting has labeled "Urbanization without Industrialization," which calls for an enormous investment effort.

This brings up another problem confronting us: our urgent need to improve savings and investments levels. By comparison with other developing regions of the world, Latin America shows a high contribution of domestic savings to the formation of overall investment. Although this participation can be estimated at 93 per cent for the decade just ended, the ratio of savings to gross domestic product has not improved over the last decade. In the future, further improvements in tax and fiscal systems, in capital markets, and greater monetary and political stability to prevent the flight of domestic capital, will be needed. Presently, the ratio

of investment to domestic product can be estimated at 17 per cent. This percentage is insufficient from the standpoint of development, demographic growth and new community demands. According to the "Prebisch Report" the region should undertake a dynamic increase in its rates of investment which during the next decade should amount to no less than 25 or 26 per cent of the Gross Domestic Product in order to achieve a postulated growth rate of 8 per cent a year: this is a figure needed to cope with unemployment and truly accelerate our development. The fact that the savings and investment ratio did not increase in the past decade while per capita income expanded at a rate of nearly 2 per cent annually demonstrates a further unrealized savings and investment potential. The increase in savings rates does not seem unattainable if we also remember that during the last decade public savings increased by nearly 50 per cent in real terms, largely through improved tax and fiscal mechanisms.

The acute differences in income levels among the various social groups in the region must also be viewed with concern. The poorest 40 per cent of our population still receives an average income equivalent to only one-tenth of the income received by the 20 per cent in the highest income group. In many of our countries, apparently satisfactory average figures on economic progress have limited significance, since development unfortunately has been concentrated within only certain groups and areas. This explains not only the inevitable social tensions, but is also a constraint on the dynamic capacity of our economies. Above all, the decade of the 1970s requires policies which stress not only better income distribution, but further social changes which will provide greater access for the large masses to the economic, political and cultural mainstream of the region as well. This is first, a social requirement; it is also an economic requirement for a dynamic and efficient industrialization process.

In spite of the challenges and obstacles just mentioned, we at the Inter-American Bank are decidedly optimistic about the economic and social development of Latin America in the present decade of the 70s. At current growth rates, Latin America, which in 1969 had a gross regional product of over \$110 billion, can achieve an aggregate gross product of about \$450 billion by the year 2000. Realistic calculations indicate that if we could gradually increase our current growth rate of 5 per cent annually to just 6.5 per cent over the next 30 years, we could attain an average per capita income for the region as a whole, or more than \$1,000. We should not forget that the current per capita income in Latin America is equivalent to that of Italy 20 years ago.

III. THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

A new factor in the past ten years has been the increasing role played by multilateral public financing. Our own organization has been an important channel for this new contribution having completed in 1970 its first decade of activities.

Currently, our Bank membership consists of 23 countries including ten countries in South America, the five Central American countries, Mexico, the United States, Panama, Haiti, the Dominican Republic and the three newest members of our group (Trinidad and Tobago, Barbados and Jamaica). During the ten years of our operations, with resources contributed by member and non-member countries, including the Latin American nations themselves, the Bank has been able to participate with loans totaling more than \$3.5 billion in the financing of 580 projects undertaken at a total cost of \$10 billion. This action has been oriented by national development and multinational investment priorities and by the need for mobilizing financial resources while our mem-

ber countries were establishing and modernizing institutions and improving their capacity to absorb external funds.

Nearly one-fourth of our loans (24 per cent) were channelled directly to the agricultural sector. About 29 per cent were made for economic infrastructure projects, divided almost evenly between transportation and communication projects and those in the electric power field. Another 17 per cent of our loans were made to the industrial sector, channelled through development agencies in our countries, in the form of direct financing, and through financing of exports of capital goods.

Before our organization was founded, external capital for social and urbanization projects was practically unavailable. Twenty-seven per cent of our operations have been directed to this area, for the provision of water and sewage services, for housing and urban development and for advanced education.

Included in this breakdown are substantial funds for technical assistance to our member countries and to support preinvestment activities.

The Bank has endeavored to be the "Bank for Latin American Economic Integration." We believe, as indicated in my previous remarks, that economic integration is absolutely essential if our nations are to attain the levels of industrial efficiency necessary to sustain development and to be vigorous in the world markets. No less than \$400 million of our loans have helped support the concept of Latin American integration.

All this activity has been possible only with the support given to us by member and non-member nations. In this respect, the decisions taken by the Board of Governors Meeting, in Punta del Este, earlier this year, recommending to the member countries a new increase in the Bank's capital resources have been very encouraging. The ordinary capital is to be increased by \$2 billion, out of which \$400 million is to be paid-in, and \$1.6 billion is to be callable capital. The latter serves as a guarantee for the Bank's bond issues in world capital markets. The resources of the Fund for Special Operations, which allow the Bank to extend financing under more lenient terms, would be increased by \$1.5 billion. When we began our operations in 1960, our total capitalization was \$1 billion. At the end of our first decade, we had reached some \$6 billion and when the resource increase just outlined materializes, our capitalization will amount to some \$9.5 billion. It is expected that these new resources will make it possible for the Bank to reach in the near future a level of lending about 50 per cent higher than the approximately \$630 million reached in 1969.

The United States has been the largest contributor to our capitalization. However, such non-member countries as Austria, Belgium, Canada, Finland, Germany, Israel, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the Vatican, have contributed a total amount of about \$500 million through purchases of bonds issued by our organization, through direct loans, through trust funds and through other arrangements.

Ladies and Gentlemen: The aims of Latin America to occupy its legitimate place among the nations of the world will require an even larger devotion to development as both a means and an end. They will furthermore call for the consolidation of what Raúl Prebisch calls a "development discipline,"—that is, a dedication to constructive change which might at times appear difficult to understand but which is unavoidable, for its has been the experience of every nation which is now enjoying high standards of living and prosperity. If Latin America is to eventually form part of the industrialized world community, it will continue to require co-

operation and, above all, understanding from the rest of the world community. This task, that of promoting understanding, is especially fitting for an association of public figures such as those present here today, for you have devoted your lives precisely to the work of understanding through communication. I can think of few more difficult but also of few more rewarding endeavors.

LET US BOTH CLEAN OUR HOUSES

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the House Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee has been conducting a most useful investigation of U.S. public safety assistance to South Vietnam. The inquiry, which has been a totally bipartisan effort, has focused U.S. national attention on conditions in South Vietnamese prisons that need immediate remedial action.

If America is to go before the court of world public opinion and demand more humane treatment for American prisoners now held by the North Vietnamese, our own hands must be clean. For many years, the U.S. foreign aid program and the U.S. military have given money, advisory services, and materials to South Vietnam with the stated objective of improving prison conditions and introducing more enlightened penal concepts in the treatment of inmates, whether they be political prisoners or prisoners of war. Our programs of assistance in this regard have clearly not been entirely successful. The subcommittee, a unit of the House Committee on Government Operations, is now asking why.

On July 26, 1970, the Sacramento Bee addressed itself to this question in the following editorial which I believe should be brought to the attention of all Members of Congress:

LET US BOTH CLEAN OUR HOUSES

Over a period of years the American taxpayer has put up more than \$110 million to improve South Vietnam's national police and penal system. So this government has every right to insist the prisons be managed humanely and efficiently rather than tolerating the bestial conditions congressional investigators found at Con Son.

Now there is reason to believe that other penal institutions where political opponents of the Saigon dictatorship are confined are as bad as Con Son which has been described as a Devil's Island.

A subcommittee headed by Rep. John E. Moss of the 3rd, Sacramento County, District heard testimony from Dr. Marjorie Nelson, a member of the American Friends Committee, about her experience as a physician at the province prison of Quang Nai.

She gave a shocking account of torture by electricity, the breaking of bones, severe beatings, of inmates being hanged by their legs upside down and of being forced to drink concoctions containing powdered lime.

What is especially reprehensible is that apparently United States officials had full knowledge of this brutality and yet did not move for reform.

When Dr. Nelson protested to American officials, she was told the South Vietnamese

were in charge and the number of people tortured had been reduced—not eliminated—just reduced.

Thomas Harkin, a congressional investigator who photographed the infamous "tiger cages" holding political prisoners, said Leo Dorsey, an American working in Vietnam, attempted to interest high United States officials about Con Son but they were indifferent.

Rep. Moss is right in bringing this whole ugly mess to the nation's attention.

He refuses to be deterred by those who claim that South Vietnam cruelties are justified in retaliation for conditions which exist in North Vietnam.

"Let us both clean our houses," he said, "and right whatever injustices that exist. One wrong does not justify another."

"Perhaps a concerted effort on both sides will lead to other understandings and eventually the return of all prisoners, whether they be political or military."

May the day be speeded.

GREEN REVOLUTION

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, two recent reports concerning possible unfavorable aspects of the Green Revolution have come to my attention. I place them in the RECORD because I know many colleagues are deeply interested in the development process and they may have missed these articles.

Nation building is a complex process. The reports which follow emphasize that complexity. We, as a nation, must do our share in solving the development mystery. To do less than our share increases the chances for worldwide disaster.

[From the Washington Star, Aug. 27, 1970]
WASHINGTON CLOSEUP—"GREEN REVOLUTION" COURTS DISASTER
(By Judith Randal)

Those who view the "Green Revolution" as an effective response to the threat of the population explosion should look about them at an agricultural calamity now under way in the United States, where an occasional crop failure can be endured without great discomfort.

Should the same thing happen in India or Pakistan, the result could be a human disaster unparalleled in history, with millions dead in its wake.

A fungus called *Helminthosporium maydis* is running riot through fields planted to a variety of hybrid corn especially bred for resistance to this blight. Much of this year's crop in the Midwest may be lost owing to a sudden mutation, or genetic shift, in the fungus, which is now able to attack plants which had previously been immune.

This unforeseeable but not entirely unexpected turn of events underscores a warning by agricultural consultant William C. Paddock in the current issue of *BioScience*, the journal of the American Institute of Biological Sciences. By putting too much reliance on gimmickry, Paddock says, underdeveloped countries—and the world as a whole—are courting disaster.

Since Paddock published a book entitled "Famine—1975!" three years ago, the danger of widespread starvation that seemed so clear and present then is generally regarded as having abated. Some optimists say that the Green Revolution now assures the human

race enough for its burgeoning billions to eat.

Not so, says Paddock; the gains made in the past three years through increased crop yields are illusory, caused far more by good weather than good husbandry. The "miracle grains" whose widespread use characterizes the Green Revolution are of lower nutritional quality than ordinary varieties, he says, and their resistance to disease may—in time, probably will—turn out to be a sometime thing.

Paddock quotes the following ominous passage from a Rockefeller Foundation report last year:

"All across Southern Asia . . . there has been a rush toward one dominant family of wheats prized for its yielding ability. . . . All of this wheat carries the same kind of rust resistance, which means that if a new race of rust to which it would be especially susceptible were suddenly to appear, much of the wheat crop of that whole vast stretch of the world could be devastated overnight."

Paddock says this is "not theory without precedent." He cites the destruction in 1946 of 30 million acres of oats bred to resist one disease but helpless before another unknown only four years earlier. The present emergence of a new strain of corn blight is another case in point.

Along with others, Paddock believes the world has been sold a dangerous bill of goods by the Green Revolutionaries—the more so because performance of the new seeds requires heavy doses of agricultural chemicals that threaten the environment.

He quotes Paul Ehrlich, the environmentalist, as saying, "Those clowns who are talking of feeding a big population in the year 2000 from make-believe 'green revolutions' . . . should learn some elementary biology, meteorology, agricultural economics and anthropology."

Paddock and other thoughtful scientists believe the only long-range defense against the threat of famine is population control. If crop yields increase at an annual rate of 2.5 percent while population increases at 3 percent, the result is not a green revolution but a human catastrophe.

In any event, the upturn in the last three years was less the doing of man than of nature, Paddock says. He notes that 1965-66 was a drought period in southern Asia and points out that "a drought followed by rain will cause a spurt in production with or without new technology." Production of other crops also increased after 1966 without new high-yield strains, he adds.

"When crops are poor," says Paddock, "governments blame it on the weather. When crops are good, governments take the credit."

There has been drought in South Asia before, and there will be drought again, and regardless of how the blame is laid, the next dry spell will see millions more mouths to feed. If a new strain of disease should come along coincidentally, the result could be too horrible to contemplate.

Paddock cites 19th century Ireland, where a "Green Revolution" introduced the potato to the Old Sod. When the potato crop failed in the 1840s through blight, one-fourth of the population starved, one-fourth emigrated and the rest "were left on the land in abject poverty."

Multiplied 50 or 100 times, this is what lies ahead for Asia, in Paddock's view, without what he calls a "population control revolution."

[From *BioScience*, Aug. 15, 1970]

HOW GREEN IS THE GREEN REVOLUTION?

(By William C. Paddock)

Adapted from address given at the symposium, "Man: His Environment, His Future," at North Carolina State University at Raleigh, 25 February 1970.

Three years ago, any agricultural specialist worth his salt was warning of impending

famine in the underdeveloped nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The less developed world, it was said, was losing the capacity to feed itself. Disaster lay as close as the year 1975.¹

Today the warnings are of a wholly different sort. The world has an overabundance of grain. Wheat stocks have reached the level of 60 million tons. If anything, the danger immediately ahead would seem to be oversupply and glut.

In three short years, a startling turnaround has apparently taken place in the agricultural output of several parts of the developing world. The Philippines report achieving self-sufficiency in rice for the first time in history this year. Malaysia and South Vietnam are predicting the same for 1971 and Indonesia for 1973. Pakistan says it will shortly be self-sufficient in all cereals, and India expressed a similar hope. Optimism, clearly, rides tall in the saddle this year.

The increases are laid to a "Green Revolution" which is based on the introduction and the rapidly spreading use of so-called "miracle grains" in the rice paddies and wheat stands of South Asia. These are new, high-yielding varieties of wheat researched in Mexico by the Rockefeller Foundation and rice developed at the International Rice Research Institute in the Philippines, co-sponsored by the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations.

Among many agriculturalists, there is euphoria about man's potential for feeding himself for years and even centuries ahead of a kind that has not been seen since the introduction of the potato into Ireland. Reams of prose are being written and conferences held on the potential of the new seeds. The general theme is that now, at last, the chance exists to eradicate hunger from our planet.

At the risk of offending some good friends who are writing so hopefully, I say . . . no. The revolution is green only because it is being viewed through green-colored glasses. (Remember the Emerald City in the Wizard of Oz? It could be seen only when you put on a pair of green glasses.) Take off the glasses, and the revolution proves to be an illusion—but devastating in the damage it can do to mankind's tardy efforts to limit the world's horrendous population growth. For optimism about man's ability to feed himself as today's rate of population growth continues is precisely what we do not need and cannot afford in the race with the population bomb.

The Green Revolution, in short, could do us all in—if it worked. The cruel joke is that it does not work.

To many, the Green Revolution is a turning point in man's long war against the biological limitations of the earth. On examination, however, "skirmish" seems a more accurate description. Because, win or lose this round, the final outcome of the war will not be altered.

Here is the "official" U.S. AID story of the Agricultural Revolution in South Asia: "What has happened in less than three years is revealed in a few statistics . . . overall food production has risen 14 percent in the period 1967-69. And, in South Asia alone—the crucial countries of India and Pakistan—the increase has been 27 percent. AID worked with foundations, universities and others in developing new farming methods, including the most efficient use of "miracle" wheat and rice seeds that have brought about the Green Revolution. (Tollefson, 1970)."

The statement is misleading for it places all the emphasis on new technology. Consider the following items.

¹The writer (a Washington, D.C.-based consultant in tropical agricultural development) speaks with experience. His book *Famine—1975!* was published 3 years ago.

WEATHER

1965 and 1966 were poor weather years for the farmer of South Asia, and the succeeding years have been good. A drought followed by rain will cause a spurt in production with or without new technology! In the last 3 years, India, for instance, has increased her production of barley, chickpeas, tea, jute, cotton, and tobacco by 20 to 30% and did so with no new high-yielding varieties.

Throughout Asia, agricultural yields on virtually all crops are up. Thus, rubber production in West Malaysia was 12% higher last year than the year before. Pakistan's peanut crop is double that of 4 years earlier. Even Red China, which has only recently been reported to have the new high-yielding grains, has been able to perform agriculturally as well as India and the rest of Asia. This has been possible although fertilizer shipments to China have been interrupted (because of the closed Suez Canal and the civil disturbances of the Cultural Revolution).

Far and away the most important factor for increased production is the improvement in weather. But weather seldom gets the credit it deserves. When crops are poor, governments blame it on the weather. When crops are good, governments take the credit for the foresight and wisdom of providing fertilizer and loans to the farmer and for the clairvoyance of having conducted the research needed to develop improved crop varieties.

Thus, AID, when asking Congress for this year's money, said: "India's current successes in agriculture are largely due to a reappraisal of its agricultural strategy . . . with the help of the United States, the World Bank and other interested agencies and countries, India developed a new strategy which placed top priority on investment in agriculture. . . ."

HIGH-YIELDING VARIETIES

Since the early 1950s, most of the developing world has been increasing its total agricultural production and yields per acre. This has been possible through greater use of fertilizer and irrigation, improved varieties, and the opening up of new agricultural land. The concern of most who study the problem is whether or not this increase can continue to keep pace with the growth in population.

Thus, India from 1951 to 1961 was able to increase agricultural production by 46%. This was done partially with new technology but primarily by putting new land into production. As new land became scarce, the increase tapered off. To simply maintain current per capita consumption levels, India must now increase cereal production by three million tons each year (Shertz, 1970). If the Green Revolution is to be a reality, production must now grow faster than it has in the past. Bernard Nossiter, whose book on India will be published this fall, has looked at India's grain production figures from 1965 to 1970 and says that the increase "is something less than 2.5 percent. In other words, the 'revolution' has not yet increased food supply at the same rate as the growth in population" (Nossiter, 1970).

This does not mean that the new high-yielding wheats in India and Pakistan have not increased production spectacularly. Where irrigated and fertilized, crops have flourished. The same has been true in southeast Asia with rice. But while there is a promise of other crops on which to base a Green Revolution, to date there are only the two: wheat and rice.

The development of the new wheat and rice varieties having high fertilizer response without lodging resulted from imaginative research justifiably meriting recognition. However, the press agent's "miracle" and

²Agency for International Development, Congressional Presentation, p. H-3, 29 May 1969.

"wonder" appellation given these cereals distorted out of proportion their impact on the world.

In India, where one-third of Asia's population lives, only the new wheats have made an impact. This is unfortunate since in India wheat is a far less important crop than is rice (the production of which is three times that of wheat). Actually, according to a recent study by economic forecaster Louis Bean, the trend in increased rice yields which began in the early 1960s as a result of new technology has leveled off and stagnated at the 1964-65 level. Thus, the "miracle" rice has produced no miracle in India or in East Pakistan, the traditional rice-growing area of that country, although it has done extremely well in West Pakistan, an area not normally recognized as a major rice producer.

In discussing the new rice varieties for India, a recent U.S. Department of Agriculture report ended by saying: "For the immediate future, modest increases in yield from local (i.e., not the "miracle" rice) varieties through improved fertilizer use offer the most promise" (Haviland, 1969).

Bean calls it the "Brown and Green Revolution" to underscore its sporadic influence. In India, for instance, a third of the wheat land has been affected, but only 3% of the rice production has been touched, with the rest of the crops escaping its influence.

IRRIGATION

Irrigation is the life blood of the new cereals. For those who are accustomed to seeing wheat grown only in the United States, where no wheat is irrigated, this point needs to be understood. Virtually all the new wheats in Mexico, India, Pakistan, and Turkey—the areas where they have made an impact—are grown under artificial irrigation. They are grown, then, on the very best land in the nation, the most expensive land, the land which receives the largest capital investment, and the land with the best farmers. In the United States, we consider wheat too low in value to put on irrigated land.

The new rice varieties also require carefully controlled irrigation. In the Philippines, where the new rice is grown under irrigation, harvests are reported as two to three times that of the traditional local varieties. However, on nonirrigated land, the new varieties do no better than the standard ones.

This is important to understand. Ford Foundation's Lowell S. Hardin says that if one looks at a map "the land where this new technology, this Green Revolution, applies is a postage stamp on the face of the earth" (Hardin, 1969). The major reason is that, unfortunately, there is very little irrigated land in this world. To expand the current Green Revolution, therefore, will require expanding the amount of irrigated land, an extremely expensive operation. Even with capital, the potential land for irrigation is limited by its location, slope, and availability of water.

The hungry nations have been and are hungry because they have a poor piece of real estate. The soils are too dry, too wet, too rocky, too thin, or too mountainous to fulfill adequately the agricultural needs of the country. A Green Revolution may minimize these disadvantages, but it can never do away with them.

SUBSIDIES

Green Revolution advocates ignore the cost at which wheat and rice production has been achieved in some countries. To understand the role of subsidies, the Department of Agriculture's Director of Economics Don Paarlberg says:

"This is the inescapable fact that a price artificially held above the competitive level will stimulate production, retard consumption and create a surplus. This will be true

even if the commodity was originally in deficit supply. Thus a surplus is the result of deliberate intervention in the market. It is the product of human institutions, not simply a consequence of rapid, technological advance. It may or may not be accompanied by a scientific revolution. We could create a surplus of diamonds or uranium or of avocados or rutabagas simply by setting the price above where the market would have it and foregoing cost production control. A surplus is not so much a result of technology as it is a result of intervention in the market."³

The much-heralded Philippine rice self-sufficiency is a classic example of how Paarlberg's statement applies to the developing world. In 1966, the Philippine Rice and Corn Administration initiated a self-sufficiency program. Within a year, it increased the price support paid for rice by 50%. The support price of corn was also raised but to a lesser degree than rice. Rice production went up. Corn became cheaper to eat than rice, thus more people ate corn—result: a "surplus" of rice in the Philippines. With much fanfare, it was publicized that the Philippines were now able to export rice. Yet this was done at a loss because the world market price for rice was less than the government paid the Philippine farmer. In the words of James Keefer of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Philippines have "administered self-sufficiency" because they have artificially defined the level of consumption in the country. The nation's people could consume more rice, but the people cannot buy more at the price at which the government pays for it.

While many of the Green Revolution countries not only subsidize in part the price of fertilizer, pesticides, and irrigation water, all subsidize the production of the new cereals. Thus, Mexico supports her wheat at \$1.99 a bushel or 33% above the world's market price for quality grain; Turkey, at 63%; India and Pakistan, at 100%. But since the quality of the grain from the new miracle cereals is low and they are sold at a discount, the subsidies are, in real terms, significantly higher.

Currently, there is fear of a glut in world cereal markets, but the fear "is largely attributable to expansion of production in the developed world" (Shertz, 1970) rather than to any Green Revolution in the hungry nations. The current glut is related to the support policies which all grain-producing nations follow (wheat supports range from \$1.40 a bushel in the United States to \$4.29 a bushel in Switzerland), policies which are often used as justification for similar subsidies in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It should be obvious, however, that what a developed nation may do with ease an undeveloped nation might find nearly impossible to do.

The United States will subsidize her farmers with a sum approaching \$4 billion this year, but this is in a nation where agriculture generates only 3% of the gross national product. India's agriculture accounts for 49% of her GNP; Pakistan's, for 47%; and the Philippines', for 33%. In these countries, there are not enough other sources of income to generate for long the money needed to subsidize the large agriculture segment of the economy.

It was interesting that the very day the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee was holding its recent symposium on the Green Revolution and repeatedly pointing out to all the attendees the self-sufficiency achieved in rice production by the Philippines, the Philippine Government asked the United States for an advance of \$100 million on its

1970 payments (due it for our use of military bases) in order to "stave off the emergency" arising from threatened bankruptcy.

Unfortunately, most of the developing world totters on the brink of bankruptcy with little hope of improving its situation. Within the next few years, the debt service of countries such as Indonesia, India, and Pakistan will equal nearly 50% of their export earnings.

Yet, the new varieties require irrigation water, fertilizer, and additional labor. All are expensive. For the farmer, this means financial risks. For him, risk is justified because of the support price. But, take that crutch away and fewer would take the risk.

With these high support prices, one of two things becomes obvious. Either the farmers are getting rich on the government subsidies or else the new technology is much more costly to use. There are reports of land prices skyrocketing in the area of the Green Revolution, of incipient social revolution with formerly absent landlords returning to farm their land and evicting their tenants. All of this may be true, but to what extent?

My guess is that the best farmers on the best land are profiting substantially from the Green Revolution. But the report that "hundreds of millions of rural people" (Borlaug et al., 1969) are benefiting is open to question.

In 1969, during the wheat harvest, this writer visited Sonora, Mexico, to see the experiment station where the new wheats were developed.

While there, a delegation of wheat farmers from this area left for Mexico City to ask the government to raise still higher their wheat subsidy. This may have been simply a ploy to keep pressure on the government and prevent it from lowering the subsidy. Yet the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Vernon Harness has studied the incomes of these farmers and concluded that the "man with average yields is not making much of a profit." In Sonora, the average wheat farmer made \$12.00 an acre while in adjacent Sinaloa, he lost \$12.00 (Harness, 1969).

The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Dana Dalrymple cites two surveys of farmers in the Philippines who decided to stop growing improved rice varieties. Over 50% gave as their reason the "low price or added expenses" while another 10 to 15% said the new rice involved too much additional labor. He also cites a Burmese village which reduced its acreage because of the poor consumer demand for the miracle rice on both the free and black markets. The Burmese wanted to raise the rice if the government would buy the production but not otherwise. Dalrymple says, "It has been widely assumed that the increased returns from growing the new variety have exceeded the cost. Incomes have probably generally been increased in the short run. Yet there is little solid evidence on this point" (Dalrymple, 1969).

The green revolution and the 1970s

In his book, *Seeds of Change*, Lester Brown has projected a highly hopeful agricultural future because of the Green Revolution. He reflects the opinions of many who feel that "thanks to the breakthrough in the cereal production, the problems of the seventies will be much more political and less technological than were those of the sixties. Their solutions lie more in the hands of politicians, less in the hands of scientists and farmers" (Brown, 1970).

Such a view would be correct if the new varieties were as good as the press often suggests. But to overcome the biological limitations imposed by the land on agricultural production will require greater technological breakthroughs in the 1970s than anything we have ever seen. "What we have accomplished so far in the Green Revolution is the easiest part," says Will Meyers, Vice-President of the Rockefeller Foundation (Horne, 1969).

The new wheat varieties are essentially a transfer of temperate zone technology to temperate zone areas in Mexico, India, Pakistan, and Turkey. Tropical rice has so far had only limited success. Corn is going to be a more difficult crop with which to work because of its inability to be moved from latitude to latitude.

The "wonder" wheats and "miracle" rice varieties have been quickly accepted in Asia partly because governments encouraged their acceptance. Farmers who grew them were the ones who found loans for fertilizer and pesticides available to them. Governments were encouraged to do this partially out of fright stemming from the crop failures of 1965 and 1966 and partially from the pressure and salesmanship of foreign scientists and aid givers. Already many fear the consequences of this action.

The U.N.'s Food and Agriculture Organization recently held a round-table discussion on the "genetic dangers in the Green Revolution" and concluded that progress in one direction "represents a calamitous loss in the other." Plant breeders unanimously agree that it is dangerous to produce over large areas varieties with similar disease-resistant characteristics. By eliminating the great number of genetically different types of wheat and rice and replacing them with substantially the same variety, there is a loss of variability from which to select resistance to new and still unknown diseases. Speaking of this, Dr. Jack R. Harlan, professor of Plant Genetics at the University of Illinois, says, "The food supply for the human race is seriously threatened by any loss of variability" (Anonymous, 1969).

The danger of a disastrous attack by either insect or disease is greatly enhanced when a region is planted to genetically similar varieties. The consequences of this are surely to be seen in the 1970s.

"All across southern Asia (not just India) there has been a rush toward one dominant family of wheats prized for its yielding ability. . . . All of this wheat carries the same kind of rust resistance, which means that if a new race of rust to which it would be especially susceptible were suddenly to appear, much of the wheat crop of that whole vast stretch of the world could be devastated almost overnight."⁴

This is not theory without precedent. In 1946, 30 million acres of U.S. land were planted to a new group of oats (two-thirds of the oat crop), all having what was called "Victoria type" resistance to rust. Within 2 years, these oats had virtually disappeared from the country's oat fields. The reason was the emergence of a new disease which had been unknown only 4 years earlier.

In 1950, there was probably no single phase of the plant sciences more highly developed than that related to the control of a disease on wheat known as "stem rust." A strain of that rust (called 15B) had been known and watched in the United States for 10 years. Nevertheless, 15B was able to build up to epidemic levels and, in 1953 and 1954, cause the almost total destruction of our durum-wheat crop. If this were to happen in India today, the results would be disastrous.

Yet a country like India is particularly vulnerable. She has too few technicians to keep track of what is going on in her wheat and rice fields as well as too few scientists to develop new disease-resistant varieties and have them ready when needed. Furthermore, her seed industry cannot quickly multiply a new variety and get it into the hands of the farmer if a crisis arises.

The recent epiphytotic of the developed world involved highly selected crop varieties derived from a narrow genetic base. The hungry world has had a degree of protection

⁴Streeter, Carroll P. 1969. A partnership to improve food production in India. A report from the Rockefeller Foundation.

³Don Paarlberg. Address before the 12th Annual Meeting of the Agricultural Research Institute, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., 18 October 1963.

against this because of the multiplicity of types found within its unselected crops. However, the sudden introduction and widespread use of the new Mexican wheats and Philippine rice into South Asia shows how quickly this can change.

If the 1970's is to see an agricultural revolution, another problem must be solved: the efficient use of fertilizer and water. Fertilizer is expensive; most countries lack the natural resources to produce it. What the subsidies now do is make it economically possible for the farmer to use the high-cost fertilizer and water required by the new cereals.

Where the Green Revolution is said to exist, it would die tomorrow without any one of its three legs: subsidies, irrigation, and fertilizer. The economies of the developing world make all three legs fragile supports.

Finally, for the Green Revolution to produce a revolution in this coming decade, some way must be found to bring it to the tropics where a majority of the free world's hungry live. Little technological progress has been made with the basic food crops of the tropics, and virtually no aspect of the Green Revolution has reached Africa south of the Sahara or Latin America south of Mexico.

The danger in the Green Revolution optimism

Many believe that the Green Revolution has bought time to solve the world's population problem.

To me this hope is premature at best and disastrous at worst.

The potential of the current Green Revolution is too limited to expect it to provide anywhere near adequate time in which to find a solution to the population problem. Bert Tollefson, Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development, recently told a campus group that "AID hopes to see a breakthrough similar to the Green Revolution in individual country efforts to control population growth" (Tollefson, 1970). Like a litany, our AID officials tell of Taiwan, Hong Kong, Singapore, and South Korea lowering their birth rate without adding that even these prize examples will double, on the average, their population size within 27 years—one year longer than the rest of the developing world!

The 1969 study of India's population by Emerson Foote puts the hungry world's population growth in true perspective. When India began her population control program 17 years ago, her population was growing at the rate of 6 million a year; today, it grows at an annual rate of 15 million. If things continue this way, Foote says, the population of India would be one billion in 2000. He continues: "Long before the one billion figure would be reached, the break point would occur. . . . It is entirely possible that in India and in other parts of the world for the next three years, five years or even a bit longer, the 'Green Revolution' will increase food production faster than population grows. But if this is the case, it will be a very temporary and misleading solace—only postponing the day of reckoning. . . . (The) growth will be slowed either by rational means or by indescribable catastrophe" (Foote, 1969).

Premature hope stemming from the Green Revolution contains two dangers. They are (1) the governments of the hungry nations will once again turn their thoughts away from the No. 1 problem of solving the agricultural and rural problems of their countries and resume their emphasis on pacifying the cities and worshipping the idol of industrialization; (2) of greater danger, however, is the likelihood of lessening concern over the exploding world population.

In 1968, at the Second International Conference on the War on Hunger, the Philippine "success" with the Green Revolution (although it was yet to be called the Green Revolution) was a major topic. In fact, the

Philippine Undersecretary for Agriculture, Dr. Dioscoro Lopez Umali, came to Washington and brought with him a Philippine farmer who had markedly increased his production through the use of the new "miracle" rice. Before a distinguished audience, Umali translated the farmer's story as he spoke. The farmer had 10 children and said that because of the new high-yielding variety, he and his neighbors would now have enough food for all, and all could enjoy seeing their women in the condition in which they were most beautiful—pregnant. This sudden switch from concern about food shortages to praise for pregnancy was a frightening specter to some of the audience. The Philippine farmer cannot be criticized for waxing poetic over the beauties of his pregnant wife. But some felt that the Undersecretary for Agriculture, with a Cornell University Ph. D. might have suggested the danger such beauties held for his country. The Philippines, which among the world's 15 largest nations has the fastest population growth rate, will double the number of her citizens in 20 years.

Some time earlier, the Rockefeller Foundation's Norman Borlaug, while discussing the impact of the high-yielding varieties said, "It seems likely that through a combination of improvements in conventional and non-conventional food production methods, man can feed the world's mushrooming human population for the next 100-200 years" (Borlaug, 1965). More recently, however, he shortened the time to "two or three decades" (Borlaug et al., 1969).

Green revolution not enough

Virtually all authorities accept the fact that if the developing world is to be fed, the purchasing power of its people must be raised. Yield per acre is only part of the equation. Cost of production is of equal importance. Even with its highly efficient agricultural productivity, the United States has 5 million citizens who are malnourished because they cannot afford to buy the food they need.

Jean Mayer, President Nixon's Advisor on Food and Nutrition, says that it would take \$3.5 billion more than is now being spent to solve the U.S. hunger problem. Much more than just food for the hungry is involved in Dr. Mayer's \$3.5 billion figure because food cannot be separated from other problems of poverty. Nevertheless, if such a figure is accurate, think what the cost will be to solve the food needs of the developing world.

In 1967, the President's Science Advisory Committee's report on the "World Food Problem" said that it is meaningless to consider a nation's demand for, and supply of, foodstuffs independently from overall economic growth. That report put a price tag for achieving the goal at approximately \$12 billion more a year in external investment than was then going into the hungry nations.

The report of the Commission on International Development to the World Bank (commonly known as the Pearson Report) stated in September, 1969 (when the Green Revolution was already a household phrase among development people) that in order to achieve the goals to which the Commission had addressed itself, foreign assistance must be increased by \$10 billion annually during the next 7 years.

The FAO's enormous new Indicative World Plan, which was 6 years in the making and was presented to the Second World Food Conference at The Hague in June, "indicates" what the hungry nations must do. By 1985, the plan says, food demand in developing countries will be nearly two and a half times the level of 1962 (two-thirds of the extra demand will be a consequence of population growth). The FAO plan to meet this food requirement calls for an expenditure of \$112 billion (\$37 billion alone is required for expanding irrigation!). In the

understatement of the decade, the plan says that the need for foreign aid will continue and "is likely to increase."

So, taking your pick among the authorities, you still need from \$7 to \$12 billion more a year for the developing world to feed its expanding population. Because that part of the world can barely handle its current \$3 billion annual debt servicing charges, this extra demand placed on the area's agriculture must come from the developed nations. But such aid to the developing countries is now at a low ebb with no upswing in sight. Without outside financing, the Green Revolution will never get out from behind the barricades.

The conclusion is clear: Current optimism that the world food problem is being solved is premature.

Production versus reproduction

Whether the Green Revolution is a fact or a myth, the consequences of an agricultural breakthrough without an accompanying breakthrough in population control are ominous.

To feed today's world population requires the use of agricultural chemicals, the pollutants of which will have a deleterious effect on our children and on their children. But we have seen nothing yet! By 1985, the demand for food in the hungry world will more than double. If the hungry world is to then feed itself, it must increase its use of fertilizers by 100% and pesticides by 600% (President's Science Advisory Committee 1967). Such an increase in the use of chemicals to feed the projected populations could wreck our environment.

Man has, through the use of his land, turned far more into desert than he has reclaimed through irrigation. Lord Richie Calder says that in the Indus Valley in West Pakistan the population grows at the rate of 10 more mouths to be fed every 5 minutes. In that same 5 minutes in that same place, an acre of land is being lost through water-logging and salinity.

Paul Ehrlich says, "Those clowns who are talking of feeding a big population in the year 2000 from make-believe 'green revolutions' . . . should learn some elementary biology, meteorology, agricultural economics and anthropology."

Today's accelerating rate of population growth is due primarily to the consequences of modern medicine which has lowered the world's death rate without an accompanying lowering of the birth rate.

Rereading the 1936 best seller, *An American Doctor's Odyssey*, is today a disturbing experience. The author, Victor Heiser, tells of activities when he headed the Asian section of the Rockefeller Foundation's International Health Division. In a chapter entitled, "Dividends from Philanthropy" he tells not only of the successful attack on hookworm and other diseases but of the "great progress" achieved by 1934 in upgrading the "backward public health situation of 1914 for which I rejoice to feel the Foundation is largely responsible (this progress) fairly staggers the imagination."

In retrospect, the highly motivated, well-intentioned staff of the Rockefeller Foundation and other similar good Samaritans might well have been advised to slow down the dissemination of modern medicine until Asia's resources could be developed, until educational facilities and agricultural technology could be expanded, and some way found to motivate man to limit his population. Herman Kahn, reflecting on the good and bad effects of prematurely bringing modern medicine to a nation says, perhaps only half facetiously, the United States was fortunate to develop her resources before the Rockefeller Foundation began its good works.

Agriculturalists (and this writer is one) too glibly damn modern medicine while striv-

ing to do exactly the same thing through improved agricultural technology. More food will certainly mean that more people will live. This will accelerate the population explosion still more. Obviously, without effective population control, an agricultural breakthrough resulting in increased yields might be as detrimental to some countries as was the use of DDT on the malaria-bearing anopheles mosquito.

Perhaps no one, with a clear conscience, can deny a hungry nation the technology for an agricultural revolution. Even if he wanted to, he could not. Today's transistor radio and the jet provide the means for the knowledge and the theft of the new seeds.

However, simultaneously with the release of improved food crop varieties to a hungry nation, an effort must be made to limit that nation's population growth. Not to do so is to ignore history, and he who ignores history, the axiom says, is condemned to relive it. In this case, to relive history is to endure still another spurt in population growth.

Should we then be disappointed that the Green Revolution is neither very green nor very revolutionary? Indeed, is the world ready for a Green Revolution?

Malthus' dismal theorem said, essentially, that if the only check on the growth of population is starvation and misery, then no matter how favorable the environment or how advanced the technology, the population will grow until it is miserable and starves. Kenneth Boulding has, however, what he calls the "Utterly Dismal Theorem." This is the proposition "that if the only check on growth of population is starvation and misery, then any technological improvement will have the ultimate effect of increasing the sum of human misery as it permits a larger proportion to live in precisely the same state of misery and starvation as before the change" (Boulding, 1956).

Boulding uses Ireland as an example of this "Utterly Dismal Theorem." In the 17th century, the population of Ireland had come into balance with the carrying capacity of her land. Two million Irish lived there destitute.

Then came the 18th Century truly Green Revolution. The Irish potato was introduced to the Emerald Isle from the Western Hemisphere. Agricultural production shot up. The carrying capacity of the land increased. The Irish multiplied accordingly. By 1835, eight million Irish lived where only two million had lived in the previous century.

Then arrived a totally new plant disease caused by the previously unknown fungus *Phytophthora infestans* and the potato crop was destroyed. In the resulting Irish famines of the 1840s, two million Irish starved to death, two million Irish emigrated, and four million Irish were left on the land in abject poverty.

When there is such a thing as a Green Revolution, its name will be disaster if it arrives ahead of a Population Control Revolution.

REFERENCES

Anonymous. 1969. Genetic dangers in the green revolution. *Ceres*, Sept.-Oct., 1969: 35-37.

Borlaug, Norman. 1965. Wheat, rust and people. *Phytopathology*, 55: 1088-1097.

Borlaug, Norman Ignacio Narvaez, Oddvar Aresvick, and R. Glenn Anderson. 1969. A green revolution yields a golden harvest. *Columbia J. World Bus.*, 4: 1019.

Boulding, Kenneth. 1956. *The Image*. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

Brown, Lester R. 1970. *Seeds of Change*. Published for the Overseas Development Council by Praeger Publishers.

Dalrymple, Dana. 1969. *Technological Change in Agriculture, Effects and Implica-*

CXVI—2011—Part 23

tions for the Developing Nations. Foreign Agriculture Service, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, p. 41.

Footo, Emerson. 1969. *Observations and Recommendations on Mass Communications in Family Planning*. Foreword by S. Chandrasekhar, Minister of State for Health and Family Planning, and Works, Housing and Urban Development. New Delhi, India.

Hardin, Lowell S. 1969. Symposium, Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments. House Committee on Foreign Affairs, 5 Dec. 1969.

Harness, Vernon L. 1969. Mexican cotton production—a 1969 closeup. *For. Agr.*, 28 July.

Haviland, Guy L. 1969. Rice in India, promising new varieties still face problems. *For. Agr.*, 22 Dec. p. 20-21.

Horne, A. D. 1969. *Washington Post*, 6 Dec. Nossiter, Bernard D. 1970. *Washington Post*, 17 February.

President's Science Advisory Committee. 1967. *The World Food Problem*, Vol. 1, p. 22.

Schertz, Lyle P. 1970. The Green Revolution: production and world trade. *Columbia J. World Bus.*, 5: 9-19.

Tollefson, Bert. 1970. Agency for International Development press release 24 Feb.

FRANK M. WHISTON

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was with a heavy heart that the people of Chicago learned of the death of Frank M. Whiston, president of the Chicago Board of Education.

The loss of his services as head of our school system in the city of Chicago is one that will be felt for a long time to come for indeed Mr. Whiston had a compassionate understanding of the problems that public education faces in urban communities, and he had worked tirelessly to find solutions.

The Chicago Tribune quite properly eulogized his enormous contribution to the people of Chicago, and I should like to include the Chicago Tribune editorial in my remarks today.

Mrs. Pucinski joins me in extending to the family of Frank M. Whiston our deepest condolences.

The Chicago Tribune editorial follows:

FRANK M. WHISTON

Frank M. Whiston was called upon to preside over the Chicago Board of Education during a period of endless troubles. Often he had good reasons to resign the job in disgust, especially in 1968 when Mayor Daley's Advisory Commission on School Board Nominations recommended that he be denied reappointment. The mayor had the good sense to reject the advice.

Throughout all the wrangling over school policies Mr. Whiston remained a courtly, old-fashioned gentleman. He kept his cool, as the young folks say, when the school system badly needed a conciliator, a conservative. In the hot dispute over the retirement of former Supt. Benjamin Willis, it was Mr. Whiston who engineered a reasonable compromise.

Chicago owes him thanks for his 23 years of service as an unpaid member of the school board and especially for the last 7 years when he was the president. Let us hope that the next president will be as levelheaded.

A TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM T. SCHMIDT

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, last week the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania was saddened by the untimely death of a splendid man, our Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable William T. Schmidt. It would not be possible for me to describe my own feeling of loss at the death of this man who was as close to me as any man could possibly be.

I campaigned at the side of Bill Schmidt when he first ran for public office, and I knew that his incredible energy would certainly lead to victory in the race for the mayoralty of Scranton, Pa. He was indeed elected and became, I believe, the outstanding mayor of Scranton in the 20th century. His working day began long before sunrise, and ended long after sunset. He brought a refreshing candor to the office, and the people of Scranton came to know their government as they had never known it before.

He left the office of mayor and went into private business, but his enormous commitment to public service would not permit him to refuse when another call came to him. He went to Harrisburg to become an assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, entrusted with overseeing the implementation of the Appalachian program in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. He was shortly named Executive Assistant to the Secretary, then, Secretary of Commerce in the Commonwealth.

Through all these years, Bill had been my friend. Too seldom were we able to get together; the obligations of public office kept both of us ceaselessly committed. But in the precious times we did meet, and in countless letters and telephone calls, I was able to watch the work he was doing to build, first a city, then the State of Pennsylvania.

The people of Pennsylvania, particularly the people of Scranton, mourn his passing. They have lost one of the outstanding public servants of this or any other century. For myself and my wife, Tess, it is also a deep personal loss. I know the grief that Bill's wife, Peg, and his two daughters, Gayle and Debra must feel at their great loss. We all share that grief. But we would ask them to be consoled by this one thought when they think of husband or father. In a time when many are content to be nameless and to do little, in a time when others seek distinction in destruction, Bill Schmidt made his own very personal mark upon history, and will be remembered by those who knew him as a giant among men, building whatever future divine providence may see fit to bestow upon us.

Mr. Speaker, I will append to these remarks two editorials from the Scranton Tribune and the Scranton Times, as well as an article from the Scranton Tribune of last Wednesday:

[From the Scranton Tribune, Sept. 7, 1970]

WILLIAM T. SCHMIDT

Within the short period of less than a week Scranton has lost two of its former mayors to death, Stanley J. Davis after the fullness of a life of 81 years, William T. Schmidt all too soon at age 46 and in the high flowering of an impressive career in public service.

Bill Schmidt's passing takes from Pennsylvania at large an able and conscientious official. For the past six months he was secretary of commerce in the cabinet of Governor Shafer, a post to which he was advanced after serving nearly a year as deputy secretary of the department.

But it is as Mayor Schmidt that Scrantonians and Scranton area residents think of the very personable young man who was the principal in a surprising election campaign in 1961 which will be prominent in the city's political history for years to come.

In his first contest for public office, Schmidt, then 38, defeated Mayor James T. Hanlon, who had been the city's chief executive 16 years. The victory of the Republican nominee over Mayor Hanlon, the city Democratic leader of a city-county Democratic organization partnership of Mayor Hanlon and County Commissioner Michael Lawler, returned the GOP to City Hall and loosened a grip the Democratic Party had held at virtually every point of elective office here.

Schmidt had assisted a year earlier in the memorable campaign of William W. Scranton for Congress and so was in the vanguard of a movement which broke up a political monopoly in the area and introduced an element of balance which still persists.

Bill Schmidt did things well. He was president and salutatorian of the Tech High School Class of 1941. He took a position with the Third National Bank and rose to the office of assistant cashier. He demonstrated as mayor administrative ability and had success in his aim of involving more people and interesting more people in city government and its problems. And with his natural friendliness, his genuine liking for and concern for people, he won the regard and affection of many who once resented his defeating Mayor Hanlon.

Losing a reelection bid to former Mayor Walsh, who sparked at least a temporary revival in the city of old Democratic voting patterns, Mayor Schmidt had executive positions in private business before going into service with the state to display a skill and dedication capped when the governor named him to head the commerce department.

Bill Schmidt's death is truly mourned and the sympathy of the community goes out to Mrs. Schmidt and the Schmidt daughters, Gayle and Debra.

[From the Scranton Times, Sept. 8, 1970]

WILLIAM T. SCHMIDT

From president and salutatorian of his high school class to mayor of his city and commerce secretary of his state were the outlines of the distinguished record compiled by William T. Schmidt before death halted his crowded career last Sunday at the age of 46.

His capacity for leadership and service was recognized in all of his endeavors, which included responsible positions in the private sector as well as in government. But it was in public affairs he became best known, although he first aspired to public office only nine brief years ago.

Mr. Schmidt's upset election as mayor in 1961 proved to be a turning point in his own career and in the political life of the city and county. A long Democratic hold on local government was broken. Republican party fortunes have been generally on the rise in the city and county ever since.

It fell to Mr. Schmidt while mayor to educate the citizenry to the depth of the prob-

lems facing local government. He had a flair for graphic portrayal of a situation and used all of the communications media in this effort, the first local public official to do so. He also involved hundreds of private citizens in governmental affairs by appointing them to newly established citizens advisory committees.

Solutions to municipal problems did not come easily and many are still being pursued. However, the grasp of local government gained by Mr. Schmidt during his four years as the city's chief executive stood him and the state in good stead when he was called upon by Gov. Shafer to serve the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

He was successively a deputy commerce secretary directing state and federal economic aid programs in Pennsylvania, Gov. Shafer's representative to the Appalachian Regional Commission and, since January, commerce secretary. In these roles he brought to bear his background to appreciate a community's needs which were beyond the resources of local government. He became instrumental in channeling federal and state grants to assist them. In all of these posts he did much to help relieve this region's unique land reclamation and surface support problems and to aid in the continuation of the expansion of its industrial base.

If one word were to sum up Mr. Schmidt's remarkable career, service probably does it best. We didn't always agree with him, nor he with us, during his days at City Hall. But we consistently admired his fulltime dedication to a challenging job and do now, not only in his service as mayor but in each of the assignments he took on to improve the everyday life of his fellow man.

Mr. Schmidt's death is a genuine loss to his native city and to the people of Pennsylvania. Our heartfelt sympathy goes to his wife and daughters whose grief is broadly shared.

[From the Scranton Tribune, Sept. 9, 1970]

SORROWFUL FAREWELL TO CITY'S 25TH MAYOR:
GRIEVING THROGS GIVE TRIBUTE TO BILL
SCHMIDT

(By Bob Reese)

The people of Scranton—young and old, rich and poor, known and unknown—said goodbye to Bill Schmidt on Tuesday.

Quietly and slowly, they moved in double lines into the Snowdon Funeral Home, 1810 Sanderson Ave., and passed the bier of the man who had been the 25th mayor of Scranton.

After leaving office William T. Schmidt rose to become Pennsylvania's Commerce Secretary, but he was still "Mayor" to the people standing quietly in small knots outside of the funeral home on Wednesday.

"It's been like this since 2 o'clock," Howard Snowdon observed.

A mile and one-half away, black bunting had been placed over the main entrance of City Hall and the flag at the corner of the building dropped limply at half-staff.

A reporter who had helped to "cover" the Bill Schmidt years in City Hall moved along in the slow line to the bier but his thoughts were down at the massive stone building at Mulberry Street and N. Washington Avenue.

The people in the line with him brought back the past years as if they were yesterday.

A familiar face there. It was that of a young man who back in 1961 had helped to guard the voting machines as the absentee ballots were counted, providing the new mayor with a slight edge over his opponent, the late Mayor James T. Hanlon.

Other faces were there, too. Those of present and former City Hall employes and those who had been Mayor Schmidt's political foes on City Council. Speaking quietly, the late admitted they had not always agreed with the mayor. But they added: "He was a good man."

It was perhaps the great numbers of "little

people" who were there on Tuesday that really told the tale. For Bill Schmidt was one of those "little people" who back in 1961 had electrified all of Scranton with his upset victory that broke a Democratic hold on the city which had lasted 16 years.

The thoughts went flying back to the summer months of that year. A young reporter was sitting with his father on a porch in West Scranton.

It was hot and Bill Schmidt remarked about the heat when he stepped onto the porch during one of his door-to-door safaris through the city, ceaselessly seeking votes. He put the small radio from the answering service to his ear as he talked. That was typical Bill Schmidt. Always trying to do two or more jobs at once.

And other things came to mind, too. How about the day the rain gutters at City hall clogged up with sand and the young mayor at his desk was deluged with water that came through the ceiling? He laughed at the picture and article that told of the "flood" in the following morning's Tribune.

There were the serious times. Like the time he debated the man who was to defeat him, Atty. James Walsh, at the Jewish Community Center. "How did it go," he earnestly asked reporters afterward.

There were many other memories. Those of the press conferences at City Hall and of the many and varied crises that daily confront a mayor.

Remembered, too, were the nights he came into The Tribune newsroom to give reporters details of late breaking stories.

But, back to reality. The line moves toward the bier and there is Peg Schmidt, the mayor's widow, her eyes red and sad. Her daughters, Gayle, 20, and Debra, 18, are beside her. A member of the Police Honor Guard stands at the head of the casket.

The line moves quickly and a reporter says "goodbye" to a mayor he knew and liked.

Bill Schmidt will be buried today in Camp Hill where his brother, Richard A. Schmidt, is interred. His brother was killed Feb. 25, 1969, in an automobile accident.

City Hall will be closed from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. as the funeral takes place from Trinity Evangelical Lutheran Church, Camp Hill. Burial will be in St. John's Cemetery, Camp Hill.

A detail of uniformed Scranton policemen will act as pallbearers and the city will be represented by various officials including Mayor Eugene Peters and Council President Anthony Cognetti.

TRIBUTE TO RUBEN SALAZAR

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a pall hangs over Los Angeles for all of us have lost a friend. Ruben Salazar, writer and reporter, who died needlessly during the recent riot in East Los Angeles, contributed much to our community.

Ruben Salazar was not a fence straddler, he was not a spectator in our society. He was committed to justice, and he was involved in the struggle of the Mexican Americans to secure their rights. He was committed to change—not by violent revolution—but by exposing the injustices that occur; and by appealing to the sense of fairness inherent in Americans.

This Chicano spoke for Chicanos; he spoke to them and, in addition, he re-

played their message to the part of America that has ignored their plight.

Ruben Salazar understood exploitation, deprivation, and discrimination. He knew that the housing for Chicanos was inadequate. He knew that the wages paid to the Mexican American were not sufficient to feed, clothe, and educate his family. Thus, he served as a major link between the Mexican American and the rest of the community.

Ruben Salazar will be missed—but he will be remembered. We must each attempt to become as dedicated and as committed to justice as was he. We must continue to work for a realization of the ideals he espoused so articulately, and so well.

DANGERS IN MILLS TRADE BILL SEEN BY HONOLULU ADVERTISER

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, one of the most controversial bills likely to be considered by the House before adjournment is the 1970 trade bill. If it is enacted in its present form, this bill might well trigger a regressive world trade war. It will most certainly mean higher prices for American consumers least able to afford them.

The entire garment industry in Hawaii, employing about 3,000 persons, is alarmed at the prospect of the bill's passage because of the harsh import quotas on textile products.

All of these unfortunate possibilities are spotlighted in a perceptive editorial which appeared recently in the Honolulu Advertiser, and which I offer for inclusion at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Aug. 28, 1970]

THE TRADE BILL

Sometime next month the House of Representatives will vote on the trade bill which has come out of the Ways and Means Committee.

For the sake of the consumer, for world trade harmony and for the principle of friendliness between nations, this bill should not pass. And, if it does pass both House and Senate, President Nixon should veto it.

The bill, now related to textiles, shoes and oil import quotas, has an immediate link with Hawaii.

Hawaii has a blossoming \$35 million a year garment industry that employs 3,000 persons. The local manufacturers import almost all of their textiles from Japan and Hong Kong.

The quota on textiles contained in the bill would, as Governor Burns says, seriously impair the Hawaii garment industry.

Rep. Spark Matsunaga has asked that Hawaii, Alaska and Puerto Rico be exempted from the textile import quota because they are non-contiguous areas.

Of course, the trade bill contains dangers that go beyond these local angles. It is feared that as the bill gains momentum in Congress, more and more articles will be added to the quota list.

The inevitable result would be retaliation by other nations. A trade war would be a distinct possibility.

The bill also may be, as a White House consumer affairs spokesman believes, "the

most significant anticonsumer legislation now in the Congress."

Import quotas mean higher prices. Special interests gain at the expense of the public interest.

THIS IS YOUR SON CALLING FROM VIETNAM

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of the House to the valuable services performed by amateur radio operators—"hams" as they are frequently called. Operating their own private radio stations, hams render emergency assistance in providing communications during disasters such as Hurricane Celia. We have all read accounts of such activities and are well aware of the invaluable help these volunteers provide. What is not so well known is the continuing assistance hams provide in alleviating a most human problem—the loneliness and suffering that comes from the separation and lack of communications between our servicemen and their families. Those of us who daily see our wives, children, and close friends forget that there are hundreds of thousands of young people whose contact with their families is limited to letters and occasional photographs. Like the concerned public servants they are, hams have stepped forward to lend their aid and provide radio communications facilities so that servicemen abroad can talk to their loved ones at home. Using "phone patch" equipment coupled directly to their own radio receivers and transmitters, hams call friends and parents of servicemen on the telephones and let them talk to their absent soldier in Vietnam who use military radio facilities over there. Acting as the vital link, the ham provides a much needed human contact between individuals separated by the war.

An excellent article detailing these phone patch activities recently appeared in Parade magazine. I take this opportunity to insert the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend it to the attention of all Members and other readers:

THIS IS YOUR SON CALLING FROM VIETNAM (By John G. Rogers)

MILLINGTON, N.J.—Without even leaving their peaceful mountaintop home in northern New Jersey, Mr. and Mrs. Alexander A. Yankaskas and their children are intimately and busily in touch with the Vietnam war nearly every day of the year.

Yank, as he is called, and his wife Helen are amateur ham radio operators and on some days their powerful short wave equipment installed in a den off the living room relays as many as 140 telephone calls to parents, wives and sweethearts from U.S. military men in Vietnam.

HOUSEWORK WAITS

"When reception is good and the calls are piling up," says attractive Helen, "the housework just doesn't get done. It has to wait for a break."

"Most of the conversations are happy ones, full of love, hope and emotion," says Yank, pilot for the private planes of the Ronson

Corp. "We know because we have to listen in order to flip the switch whenever one of the parties says, 'Over.' But sometimes you get a sad one. The other day this guy asked his wife, 'Why haven't you been writing me?' And she told him, 'You'll find out in a few days when the divorce papers arrive.'"

Yank's station—AFB2DBF—is one of 165 in the U.S. which take part in the program known as MARS—Military Affiliate Radio System. Most of the members are hams, like Yank and Helen with their receivers and transmitters right in the home. One of the most prominent of them is Sen. Barry Goldwater of Arizona, who operates from his hill-top residence in Phoenix. While the basic business of MARS is to provide a backup communications network in case of emergency, the MARS hams are principally occupied these days with the Vietnam phone calls.

"I've sat here at the set as long as five hours without even getting up," says Yank. "With all those phone calls waiting to be handled, you don't just tell Vietnam you're closing down. And I wouldn't want to, either. This is my way of being involved. There's a great kick in bringing a boy in touch with his mother from halfway around the world."

MARS has handled some 2 million calls from Vietnam since December, 1965. The procedure is this. The serviceman goes to one of the 76 MARS stations maintained by the military in Vietnam and waits in line. Meanwhile, he gives the MARS operator his name and the telephone number he wants to reach in the U.S. The MARS operator sends those names and numbers to a U.S. operator such as Helen Yankaskas. PARADE watched her at work the other day. She dialed the first phone number—it was Raleigh, N.C.—and when someone answered she explained who she was and asked whether the Raleigh number would accept a collect call from Millington, N.J., from Sgt. Billy Smith. The reply was an emotional affirmative. Helen told the Vietnam operator to put Sergeant Smith on and the conversation began—by short wave radio from Vietnam to the Yankaskas home and by commercial telephone on to Raleigh. The only cost was the phone bill.

"Sometimes," says Helen, "they're expecting the call and sometimes it's a complete surprise out of the blue. A mother or a wife may gasp and then become speechless. If that happens we sort of settle them down a bit so they can get started talking."

SHORTWAVE DRAMA

The variety of calls is as broad as life. A girl friend pleads, "When the next letter arrives, tear it up. I didn't mean those things." A soldier's wife in a maternity ward tells him he has a new son or daughter. Many young men call to reassure families that their wounds are slight. One call was from a sergeant who said that a young soldier was out of control and needed advice from his father. So dad got on and from Cleveland, U.S.A., spoke the few words to his son that straightened him out in a remote Vietnam military base. There have even been a few marriages performed over MARS.

Yank and Helen have placed phone calls to all 50 states and 12 foreign countries. The two oldest of their six children live away from home but Kurt, 18, is a skilled operator and pitches in to help. The contribution of Jean, 16, is to run the kitchen when her mother is tied up at the radio. Mary Christine, 9, and Alexander Jr., 7, like to hang around the den—"ham shack" is the correct term—and listen in on conversations. As they arrived home from school the other day, they watched their mother complete the 23,892d call handled by the Yankaskas station.

AROUND THE CLOCK

Senator Goldwater's station in Phoenix has a club of more than 25 operators which enables it to spread out the work and operate

24 hours a day. But the Yankaskas family operation ranges from 10 to 18 hours. When he isn't flying, Yank puts in a long schedule and Helen serves him many a meal at the set. He, in turn, is greatly appreciative of her help and understands that sometimes she may put radio ahead of housework. "Only dull people have immaculate houses," says Yank. Their ham togetherness extends even to their personal call letters. He's WA2DBF. She's one letter away at WA2DBG.

It's a long and arduous devotion the MARS operators contribute but they love it and feel fully rewarded by letters such as this one Yank and Helen received from a mother last December: "God bless you. Hearing his voice and knowing he is all right was the most wonderful Christmas present we could have had."

DIRECT ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Chicago Tribune carries a very effective and timely editorial on the constitutional amendment which is now before the other body. Many Members of the House I would trust have looked at the measure again with more practical thinking than they exhibited when the amendment was literally stamped through our body. I would hope that the Senate will reject this proposal in its present form which I believe would do a disservice to our political system. I direct the attention of the Members to the September 14 Tribune editorial which follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 14, 1970]

DIRECT ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

The Senate has opened debate on a constitutional amendment providing for direct election of the President and Vice President. A nationwide popular vote would prevail and the electoral college would be abolished. The proposed amendment provides that if no team of candidates receives 40 per cent of the popular vote, a runoff election would be held between the top two pairs.

We find no pressing reason for an amendment of this sort, which is another reflection of the itch for innovation merely for the sake of innovation. The specter has been raised that a shift of 42,000 votes in the 1968 Presidential election might have given George Wallace of Alabama, a third party candidate, the balance of power.

Direct popular election of President and Vice President would be the final blow to federalism, the principle on which the Union was founded. The sovereignty of the states has been enormously diminished by the centralization of power in Washington. A direct popular vote would remove them entirely from the electoral process.

There are other objections of almost equal force to the proposed amendment, which cleared the House a year ago by a vote of 339 to 70. A system depending on a nationwide head count would almost certainly weaken the two-party system by encouraging the rise of splinter parties, which have been the bane of European politics, especially in France and Italy.

As Rep. William Clay of Missouri said during House debate, "The likelihood of division and splinter parties would be encouraged by the direct popular vote. The factions of the present parties who do not compose the majority—but a large minority at their respec-

tive conventions—would likely feel compelled to strike out on their own to reap the sentiment which exists for their position and candidate.

"If it were unnecessary to win the individual states to win the Presidency, the mere possibility of winning by precluding another candidate's majority would prove too irresistible to pass up. After all, it takes \$20 million to finance such a campaign—and with direct popular vote, a candidate would not have to travel the 50 states or concentrate on the total United States populace when a section or a sector of it is sufficient to throw the election."

Mr. Clay predicted the appearance, under such a system, of black separatist, conservative and liberal parties, working outside the existing major parties. He said they were certain to take root when it becomes unnecessary for them to work within the major political parties. Public opinion would be radicalized and the rights of all minorities would be endangered by removing incentive for compromise.

A more practical objection to the proposed amendment is that it has little likelihood of being ratified by three-quarters of the states [38], as required by the Constitution, for 34 of them would be adversely affected. Sen. Carl Curtis of Nebraska, for example, said his state had 0.92 per cent of the present electoral vote for President and Vice President, whereas in the 1968 election it had only 0.73 per cent of the popular vote.

If any change in the present system is in order, it would be apportioning the electoral vote by congressional districts, with two additional electoral votes per state as a bonus to the state winner. That would be eminently fair, and it would preserve the present constitutional balance.

ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM: AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS COME

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, in an age when direct elections provide one important indicator of democracy, this Nation's method of electing a President stands out as markedly undemocratic in form. The system now in use—election by an electoral college—results in a President who is only indirectly elected by the people of this country.

A constitutional amendment is required to bring much-needed reform to our presidential elections. On September 19, 1969, the House of Representatives took the first step toward bringing about change in that system. On that date, the House adopted House Joint Resolution 681 providing for the abolition of the electoral college. The President would be elected by direct popular vote. More specifically, the candidate who received a plurality of the popular vote would be elected. In the event no candidate received 40 percent of the vote, a runoff election between the top two votegetters would be held.

Approval by two-thirds of the Senate and then by three-fourths of the State legislatures is required before House Joint Resolution 681 can become an amendment to the Constitution. I believe that the people of this country should press for direct popular election of the President. Virtually every other election in America is now decided by popular

vote. The glaring exception, of course, is the only true national official—the President.

Under the present system, each State is given a predetermined number of votes in the electoral college. This number is calculated by adding the number of Representatives a State has in the House of Representatives plus its two Senators. New York State, for example, having 41 Congressmen and two Senators, has 43 electoral votes.

The candidate who receives a plurality of the popular votes in a State receives all of that State's electoral votes. A majority of the votes in the electoral college is required for election to the Presidency. Should no candidate receive a majority of the electoral vote, the House of Representatives chooses the President from among the three top candidates. In the House, each State delegation casts one vote as a unit, and 26 votes are needed for election.

This system as it now stands could result in situations in which a candidate who receives a plurality of the electoral vote would actually lose that election. Should this occur, the will of the American people would not be reflected in the results.

In four of our presidential elections, in 1880, 1824, 1876, and 1888, the winner of the plurality of popular votes did not become President. In 1880 and 1824, the candidate with the largest percentage of the popular vote lost the election. In 1876, the votes of the electors proved indecisive, and a special panel had to be appointed to elect Hayes over Tilden. In 1888, Grover Cleveland lost to Benjamin Harrison in the electoral college, although he, too, had more popular votes than the final victor.

The following facts point out the need for reform:

First. New York State with a total population of 16,782,000 has 43 electoral votes. The States of Alaska, Nevada, New Hampshire, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, North Dakota, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, South Dakota, and Rhode Island have a combined population of 6,364,000. Yet they have a combined electoral vote of 43—the same as New York State.

Under this system, then Alaska's electoral votes—three—represent one vote for every 75,000 residents. In New York State electoral votes represent one for every 390,000 New Yorkers. This is clearly an inequity that should be corrected.

Second. Because a candidate needs only a plurality in 12 of the largest States to be elected President, a candidate can win a majority of the electoral vote with only one-fourth of the total popular vote. He could achieve this by winning the electoral votes of New York, California, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, Texas, Michigan, New Jersey, Florida, Massachusetts, Indiana, plus two additional electoral votes.

Third. If the election is thrown to the House of Representatives there is the possibility that the 26 smallest States with 36 percent of the votes could decide the election.

Thus the inequity of the present system is clear, and while direct election of the President is not a perfect system, it

is the best of the plans that have been proposed. Direct election is the only plan which will guarantee that the winner of the popular vote will also be the winner of the election.

The campaign in 1968 revealed still another drawback of the electoral college: The faithless elector. The faithless elector is the one who disregards the wishes of his constituents by not voting for the candidate to whom he was pledged. In 1968 an elector from North Carolina cast his electoral vote for George Wallace rather than for Richard Nixon, the candidate to whom he was pledged. This problem would be eliminated under the direct election system.

Still another undesirable feature of the electoral college is the unit rule. This rule permits the candidate receiving a plurality of the State's votes to receive all of that State's electoral votes, regardless of his marginal victory. One candidate may receive a plurality of 100 votes in one State, and another a plurality of 1,000,000 votes in a different State. Each candidate would then receive all the electoral votes in the particular State in which he was the victor—with no regard to his margin of victory.

The unit rule acts to disenfranchise those citizens voting for their State's loser. These votes can have no effect on the national election, regardless of how close the election is in their own State or in the Nation. Under direct popular election, the issues and problems created by the unit rule would be eliminated since all votes would be tabulated nationally. Each vote would count as much as any other vote.

The electoral college system discourages national campaigns. Small States are often ignored in presidential campaigns. Candidates concentrate their efforts on large swing States. Direct election would make every vote equal to every other, regardless of the State in which it was cast. This would then force candidates to run national campaigns in the true meaning of the term.

Direct popular election of the President is the only system which would eliminate all of these evils that I have tried to elaborate. It would extend the one-man, one-vote principle to the Presidential sphere.

The amendment which was adopted by the House provides that in the event that no candidate receives 40 percent of the total popular vote, a runoff election would be held between the two top vote-getters. Forty percent was chosen as the percentage because it was felt that 40 percent would be sufficient to provide a mandate for governing, and would be low enough to prevent frequent runoffs. It should be noted that 15 of our Presidents received less than 50 percent of the popular vote, and among them being Lincoln, Truman, Kennedy, and Nixon.

For many years, I have wholeheartedly supported the direct election of the President and have spoken out on this issue. According to recent polls 80 percent of the American people support the direct election of the President. The House has already acted affirmatively by passing this legislation. It is now time for the Senate to act. This measure

should be given priority by the Senate and then by the State legislatures. It should be ratified as our XXVI amendment, providing for the direct election of President, without delay.

MRS. JEAN RANDOLPH

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, death has claimed one of the great women of western Massachusetts this month and I would like to take a moment of this body's time to pay tribute to her. Many Members may have had the privilege of knowing Mrs. Jean Randolph, the widow of Jack Randolph, a former great reporter for the New York Times.

Mrs. Randolph was an activist, a warm and understanding activist in everything she did. She and her husband were known to thousands, not only in the small town of Colrain in Franklin County, Mass., where they made their home, but in New York City and many other areas where her late husband's work took them.

At the time of her death, Mrs. Randolph was still actively involved in many pursuits, not the least of which was running for local office in Franklin County.

I had the privilege of knowing this great lady and working with her throughout most of the 20 years of my public life. Western Massachusetts is diminished by her death, and I, personally, have lost a friend so unique that I know I shall not know her kind again.

The Greenfield Recorder, the daily newspaper published in Franklin County, recently ran two articles on Mrs. Randolph's death which I would insert in the RECORD at this time:

MRS. JEAN RANDOLPH 59, DIES

Mrs. Jean B. Randolph, 59, candidate for Republican nomination for Franklin County register of deeds and proprietor of The Vikings, collapsed at a political meeting in Shutesbury last evening and died.

She was attending a "meet the candidates" night at Shutesbury town hall and had just addressed about 40 persons. An ambulance took her to Cooley Dickinson Hospital in Northampton, but she was pronounced dead on arrival by Dr. Thomas Corriden, medical examiner.

She was born Jan. 6, 1911, the daughter of George S. and Emma (Adams) Belden. She attended Smith Academy in Hatfield and was graduated from the University of Vermont in 1931 with a bachelor of philosophy degree.

She had been a teacher at New Salem Academy from 1931 to 1934, at Powers Institute in Bernardston from 1943 to 1945 and in Greenfield, where she taught at the Junior High School from 1956 to 1958 and at the high school in 1961.

In December, 1961, Mrs. Randolph opened The Vikings, a shop at 96 Mohawk Trail which she operated until her death. She obtained her license as a real estate broker in 1964, and last year she became associated with Massamont Realty, Inc., of Shelburne Falls.

She was married to the late John W. Randolph of Crowley, La., in 1934. Randolph, field and stream editor of the New York Times, died in 1961. They had lived in Colrain more than 20 years.

As a Republican, Mrs. Randolph served as vice-president and program chairman of the Women's Republican Club of Franklin County from 1960 through 1968, and was Republican Town Chairman for Colrain from 1946 to 1954 and from 1960 through 1968. A member of the Franklin County Republican Club, she represented Colrain as a delegate to the state conventions of 1956, 1964, 1966 and 1968. She also served as the Franklin County campaign manager for Laurence Curtis in his 1964 bid for the Republican nomination to the United States Senate.

She was a member of the Congregational Church of Colrain.

She announced, on June 10, her candidacy for the Republican nomination as register of deeds for Franklin County.

Survivors include a son, John D. Randolph of Bennington, Vt., and Mrs. Belden Merims of New York City.

Arrangements are incomplete at this time, awaiting the arrival of Mrs. Merims.

JEAN RANDOLPH JOINS HER BELOVED JACK

(By Art Smith)

When death in 1961 ended the career of Big Jack Randolph, Colrain-based writing star of the sports staff of The New York Times, there was mourning all along the nation-wide trails trod by the vagabond journalists of his day.

Now Big Jack's beloved widow, Jean, is dead and once more the veterans of the country's top newspaper towns—New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, Washington, St. Louis and a host of others—will pause to recall the laughing, carefree pair who once lived and worked among them.

Because that's what they were—a pair—and all Colrain and Greenfield and Franklin County knew them. For 20 years they lived in the wonderful old house at the crest of Smead Hill, Jack commuting weekly in his last years to New York and Jean—when she was not travelling with him—bringing up their daughter and son, Belden and John, who were to give Jean four grandchildren before time ran out for her in Shutesbury Thursday night.

Now, at 59, she will join Jack in the Smead Hill earth, a couple of hundreds of yards from the old house, in a birch grove overlooking the enchanting Green River valley both of them loved.

Before cremation, there will be visiting hours at the McCarthy Funeral Home, 36 Bank Row, Sunday evening, 7-9. A funeral service will be conducted at the Colrain Congregational Church Monday at 2 p.m.

Belden, now Mrs. Robert Merims of New York City, and John, now a publisher of outdoor sports papers in Vermont, arrived Friday to take charge of arrangements.

Like her husband, Mrs. Randolph was a restless soul and she remained in character to the end. At Jack's death nine years ago, she opened The Vikings at 96 Mohawk Trail, specializing in imported Arabian dinnerware. She also was a real estate agent associated with Massamont Realty, Inc., of Shelburne Falls. Before and, periodically, after her marriage she was a schoolteacher in New Salem, Bernardston, Greenfield and in New Jersey. She was a graduate of the University of Vermont, where she took her philosophy degree, and did graduate work at the University of Massachusetts.

When a massive heart attack struck her down, Mrs. Randolph was running for the Republican nomination for county register of deeds. She had suffered a heart attack a year ago but undertook the campaign because she believed she had recovered her health. She had finished a campaign address in Shutesbury only a few moments before the fatal seizure. She was born in Hatfield and for years had been active in local and state Republican politics but it was her first bid for public office.

Perhaps few residents of Franklin County

were as widely known as Jean Randolph and her husband. Where Jack moved, Jean moved, and to such a degree did their warm and gay personalities complement each other that their acceptance in journalistic circles was immediate and lasting. Yet they would always return to Franklin County and to the wonderful old house atop Smead Hill where they entertained visitors from all over the nation.

It seems worthy of mention that young John Denson Randolph was named for John Denson, now a resident of Old Gullford, Vt., perhaps the last of the great editors of American journalism, a close personal friend of both and for many years an associate of Jack's.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE GREEK WAR FOR INDEPENDENCE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Greek Ambassador to the United States, the Honorable Basil Vitsaxis, delivered a speech on the significance of the Greek war for independence in 1821. He spoke at the Ahepa convention held in my district.

The struggle for freedom, liberty, and human dignity which culminated in a revolution for independence shocked the oppressors of the Greeks. It was dismaying to the heads of state of Europe and the Ottoman Empire that the Greeks would covet nationhood, and be willing to fight and die for an idea whose time had come.

Lord Byron, who was to die while fighting for Greek independence, wrote:

The Sword, the Banner, and the Field,
Glory and Greece, around me see!
The Spartan, borne upon his shield,
Was not more free.

Awake! (not Greece—she is awake!)
Awake, my spirit! Think through whom
Thy life-blood tracks its parent lake,
And then strike home!

With these words penned only 3 months before his death, the great English poet reminds us once more of the heritage which Greece has given to the world; namely, the conception of the existence of personal freedom and self-government.

But this last poem of Byron's reminds us of something more which is too often forgotten by many of us—that Greece in the opening years of the last century led the way among Europeans in the search for freedom and nationhood from the domination of the imperial powers which for several centuries had divided up and subjugated many peoples within the confines of a few powerful states.

With the sesquicentennial of Greek independence approaching, it is well to remind ourselves that the initiative of the Hellenes and their success in gaining freedom from the Turkish Ottoman Empire gave example to those in other lands who sought similar goals. When we think of these European nations which won independence and unification in the 19th

century, we turn at once to Italy and Germany, to be soon followed by Finland and Norway, Poland and the Balkan nations in the early years of our century, but how many of us remember that it was Greece which demonstrated to these other peoples that freedom from the domination of the great European empires was possible?

It is a valued source of pride to those of us in this country that we were the first in this hemisphere to oppose colonialism and to strive for freedom and self-determination so it is indeed fitting that we take this opportunity to acknowledge the debt owed by many to Greece, the first nation in Europe to rise up against colonialism and to seek goals similar to ours.

Perhaps in retrospect it is really not too surprising when one recalls that in former centuries these were the people who twice within the space of 16 years humiliated the greatest autocratic empire the world had known up to that time. The countrymen of Miltiades and Themistokles could have no other attitude toward the Ottoman Turks than that which their forbears had toward Darius and Xerxes.

With these things in mind, I am pleased to place in the RECORD today Ambassador Vitsaxis's excellent speech on the significance of Greece's struggle for independence, which was to eventually spark and change the character of the old world:

SPEECH BY AMBASSADOR VITSAXIS

Nations are judged by their acts, and history is their stern judge.

The Hellenes can stand before anyone with their heads held high and proud. They have never hesitated when confronted with the great responsibilities which history erected on the road they have followed for centuries. Their victories express the indomitable moral strength of the Hellenic nation, whose continuity is in itself proof, of the nation's unity.

The 25th of March, in this respect, is perhaps the brightest symbol of the eternal Hellenic Idea, because it embodies the unceasing Hellenic quest for human redemption from the ties of the mind and of the soul. For, the Greek revolution was not only a series of heroic and sacrifices, before which the entire human race stood awed; it was not only a phenomenon of collective courage, before which history bowed with respect; nor was it merely a revolt against the tyrants. It was, above all, a large ethical movement which had, at its base, the most beautiful, the most noble, the most worthwhile, that nests within the human heart.

"Freedom or death"—this was the oath of the enslaved, who tossed his head proudly, opened his soul to the message, sent from the depths of time by his ancestors, and carved, with the flame of his sword, the bright road of tomorrow.

Freedom and death, in their broadest meaning, were the worlds that confronted each other in Greece, in 1821.

Freedom or death. Is not the life of a slave, death? Is not the unredeemed soul of man, dead? Is not the darkness spread by the ignorance of the mind, a living grave?

The free thinking which illuminated the generations of Hellenes and led them to the bright, peaceful victories of the mind, flared and illuminated again the course of Greece and led it from the ethnic annunciation, through Calvary, towards the resurrection of the nation.

This very light dazzled our national poet as he envisions embattled Greece:

"A torch in the hand,
A flame at the feet,
And all around is light".

The unknown fighter of 1821, who stained the soil of Greece with his blood, had felt with the faultless sensitivity of his Hellenic soul the infinite greatness of his struggle. The whole Hellenic World became gigantic within him and the unworried voices of myriad heroes echoed in his breast.

How clearly the poet pictured this, when he wrote:

"I hear within my being, deep
Those thrice-great, mighty
Fathers of Hellas,
They spoke alone—those dreadful moments
The Immortals."

But what was the political climate of Europe when the uprising broke out? What were the frames within which the Hellenic movement was born and had swelled up? And, generally, what was its deeper meaning in history?

The wars which had ripped Europe in the beginning of the century, wars by ideals of human freedom, had resulted, with tragic irony, in the establishing of a dark alliance, the so-called Holy Alliance, which from 1815 controlled the political life of Europe and drowned every liberal movement.

The year 1820 marked several revolutionary movements in the Italian and Spanish peninsulas. Their roots were mainly political, their purposes stemmed from the French ideas which had shaken Europe toward the end of the 18th century. The dark alliance which cast its heavy shadow in Europe set immediately in movement its diplomatic machinery. Metternich spoke of this with the most bitter words: "It is a deadly poison", he said, "which endangers the body of society in its most sensitive areas; it is dangerous for the peace of Europe and a scandal in the eyes of the whole world". Marshal Richelieu wrote: "The Greeks could not have found a worse moment to revolt".

And indeed, they could not have chosen a worse time. In vain Kapodistrias, the political advisor of the Czar, tried to convince him that the Greek movement was not like those which aimed to shake thrones, like those which stem from political calculations, and which hide at times, impure intentions. We must confess that the confusion which Metternich intended to cause was an easy matter, for indeed a movement such as the Greek one had never broken out in Europe before.

The proclamation signed by the Czar, together with the Emperor of Austria and the King of Prussia, at the end of the conference of May 1821, was characteristic of the prevailing mentality.

"We shall ignore", stated the three monarchs, "every change that is made by force of arms in the interior state of the nation, and we shall take the necessary measures which these situations demand to confront the criminal events which have occurred in Eastern Europe."

In the eyes of powerful Europe, the movement of the Hellenic nation was, from its very beginning, the form of conspiracy and its aim was considered to be the shaking, by force of arms, of the interior security of the Sultan's empire.

Eighteen months after the first outburst, when the Greek soil was drenched in blood, the Conference at Epidaurus had stated with that admirable concise declaration of January 15, 1822, the true character of the struggle:

"The Hellenic nation," stated the declaration, "attests to heaven and earth that it exists".

And yet, the powerful ones of Europe, who had assembled in Verona, closed their ears

stubbornly to the cry of Greece who was struggling in vain to convince them that her fight was different and that its ideological basis was a completely distinct one.

It is worth mentioning here the contents of the mandate signed by Athanasios Kana-karis, then vice president of the legislative body—a message to the assembled monarchs of Europe in Verona. This message was brought by Andreas Metaxas, the Bishop Germanos of Paleon Patron, and the son of Petrobay Georgakis Mavromihalis. The message stated:

"Twice, from the beginning of the war, Greece raised her voice, requesting aid and understanding from Christian Kingdoms of Europe, or demanding, at least their neutrality in her present holy struggle.

"Rivers of blood have flowed to date, yet the flag of the lifegiving cross waves unfurled over the fortresses on all the mainland, in all parts of Epirus, Thessaly, in Crete and in the islands of the Aegean Sea. The temporary Greek Government hastens to announce by this declaration, that it shall never accept any treaty, no matter how beneficial it appears, unless proper audience is given to her lawfully dispatched ambassadors".

But those "lawfully dispatched ambassadors," as the declaration called them, never reached Verona. The mighty ones who conferred there—and they were not few: 2 emperors, 3 kings, a cardinal, 3 foreign ministers, 20 ambassadors, and 10 secretaries of state—blocked the road to those bringing the paper drenched in blood, which contained the great and glorious message from Greece.

Pope Pius the VII, to avoid displeasing the conference and fearing even for his own safety which he believed was threatened by the Hellenic movement and the ideas that it represented, stopped the Greeks at Ancona and forced them to turn back, unsuccessful, to Greece.

Back, also, turned the message which emanated from the inner depths of the pure Hellenic soul—a soul which naively believed that the European Monarch should see more clearly the justice which was as great as her 3,000 year history.

Three times the message spoke of the *Hellenic nation*; three times it asked for justice, liberty, equality, and independence, not for individuals, but for the nation; three times it formulated a *new idea* which was destined in a short while to shake all of Europe and to constitute an ideological lever to reshape the political camp of the Continent.

"The Hellenic nation attests by heaven and earth that it exists."

Vibrant nations may not, alone, create the historical moment. In fact, they may appear at times to contradict the course of history. And yet, whether it is obvious or not, in reality they express the tendencies of their time.

The Greek uprising of 1821 was from this point of view, a preamble to history. It was the morning song of the new concept of nationalities which resonated in the eastern basin of the Mediterranean and the Balkan area. It was the early expression of that which, by historical necessity was destined to become, shortly, common conviction, truth and law. For 3,000 years the sacred task of Greece was such: to precede, not to follow the search, never resting, never being satiated, never quenching its thirst from the fountainhead of life. Within her, unceasingly blow the winds of freedom and of creation, and her heart is flamed from the quest of a new idea.

In spite of her being enslaved and insignificant, she was the first to feel through the unerring sensorium of her aliveness, the deepest significance of the historical moment which was ripening in the 18th century.

The seed which flowered the spring of 1821 on Hellenic soil was a strange seed because it was sowed without being born from the same flower, because it was new—of the first origin—like the creation itself.

We said that vibrant nations perhaps do not mold the historical moments, but they express them. *This was the deeper meaning of 1821.*

The Hellenic revolution was not only a movement of a proud nation, a movement toward human freedoms, it was something more. *It was the expression of a new idea* which had not yet become a conviction, and which was soon to light fires on all European soil.

It was the sweet dawn of a new concept—the nation. This concept originated from the realization of the value of the common historical ties; it brought recognition of ethnic identity; it made possible the renewal of the political architecture resulting in reshaping the balance of powers before the new historical quests.

We said that it stemmed from the realization of the value of the common historical ties. Thus history was becoming the recollection of a nation and was transformed from a sterile teaching to a live thread which tied the generations together—which tied the present with the past and which made possible a new outlook on the future.

It also brought forth recognition of the concept of *ethnic identity* for this period which was seeking new political shapes and new philosophic and social foundations in view of the unraveling of the 18th century world. The idea of ethnic "identity," in broader meanings, became a valuable asset, which helped greatly, as we know, in the building of the new Europe and of the world to come.

In 1453, Byzantium, a state, was conquered and its people enslaved. In 1821 a nation rose in its place united as one body. A nation that leaped automatically, that became conscious of itself as from historical premonition and which sealed prophetically, with its blood, not only the boundaries of its own country, but the new map of Europe.

We can be proud of the Greek Revolution not only as *Hellenes* but in general, as *human beings*. For with her flame she melted the bonds which held prisoner, the anonymous units within the morally or historically unjustified state boundaries, and paved the way toward the validation of the moral unit which is the nation. And this was, for that era, progress and gain for the entire human race.

We can be proud of the Greek Revolution as human beings, because I believe that this is the measure by which we must judge the true value of historical events, since no conquests and no victories have any meaning or substance over the human being and beyond it.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

ACTION NEEDED TO PREVENT AIRCRAFT HIJACKING

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, we have all been shocked by the recent piracy and destruction of four planes in the Middle East last week. Fortunately, most of the passengers are now safe, but for a considerable time their lives were in jeopardy and the fate of the remaining 55 hostages is yet unknown. It is imperative that we take all feasible action to halt the senseless hijackings that are increasingly endangering air travel. I was heartened to note that the President has ordered sky marshals to travel on our international flights and the expanded use of antihijacking detection equipment at airports. These actions are similar to those I am recommending in legislation to be introduced this week. However, international action is essential to solve this problem, and I continue to urge that the President seek international agreements to impose sanctions against countries which shelter individuals or organizations that perpetrate armed attacks and seizures of aircraft. I was very pleased to note that the two fine daily newspapers in my home city of Newark, the Star-Ledger and the Newark Sunday News, both recently published editorials calling for strong action to meet the hijacking situation. For the information of my colleagues, I include the Star-Ledger editorial of September 12 and the Sunday News editorial of September 13 in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Star Ledger, Sept. 12, 1970]

SKY MARSHALS

The President's decision to have armed security guards on U.S. international flights is an unfortunate but necessary move. It is an action that has been forced by the wave of unspeakable aerial piracies by Arab terrorists who have seized 280 passengers and are holding them hostages.

The ordeal of the passengers on the four planes hijacked by Arab guerrillas underscores the urgency of taking counter-measures to forestall similar incidents in the future. The fanatical air pirates have been buoyed by their past successes; their criminal acts have demonstrated the political profitability of hijacking.

The latest hijackings have raised serious doubts that abject submission constitutes the most practical way of assuring safety of passengers. In the five hijackings pulled off the past week, the criminals were thwarted in only one instance, when the crew and security guards aboard an El Al Israel 707 resisted, killing one Arab commando and seizing another.

As it turned out, the passengers on the El Al plane fared much better than those on the other hijacked airliner because of the heroic action in fighting off the guerrillas.

Supine surrender no longer makes sense in these political aerial piracies; non-resistance was prudent in previous hijackings where planes were forced to land in countries governed by international law. They were permitted to depart with passengers and crew; this has not been the modus operandi in the four political hijackings pulled

off by Arab terrorists, who are using the hostages as pawns to barter for the release of guerrillas held by Israel.

The use of highly-trained "sky marshals" to protect American citizens and property in the airways is completely justified by the circumstances. It has been done by the Israeli government with considerable success, and there is no reason why the U.S. should not take these security measures. Unarmed planes on certain international flights are easy prey for terrorists; in fact, they encourage these fanatics to continue this political blackmail.

Sanctions also should be imposed against Arab nations, boycotting international flights to these countries until firm assurances have been given that these potentially murderous acts will be halted. These Palestinian extremists could not hijack airliners without the covert connivance of Arab governments, who are in a position to curb these incidents if they chose to act with firmness.

[From the Newark Sunday News, Sept. 13, 1970]

COMBATING PIRACY

President Nixon's decision to place armed guards on American planes is a welcome step toward combating the heinous air piracy that imperils the lives of innocent travelers and strikes at an important foundation of world order.

The presence of federal grants on international flights and some domestic runs will not of itself eliminate the threat of hijackings, whether by members of extremist groups or by demented individuals. But it will at least serve as a deterrent and as a means of thwarting hijacking attempts once under way.

While the potential dangers of a gun battle aboard an aircraft cannot be minimized, they clearly are outweighed by the risks of continuing to allow air pirates to operate unimpeded. Moreover, the White House has provided assurances that only "very sophisticated, highly trained, mature men" will be assigned security duty, thus reducing the chance of a midair disaster.

Nevertheless, apprehension of would-be hijackers before they are able to board planes remains the ideal course, and to this end President Nixon has ordered expanded use of electronic detection devices at airports. Both the Federal Aviation Administration and the Air Transport Association—the organization of the nation's scheduled carriers—contend that such equipment has contributed to a marked drop this year in the frequency of hijackings in the United States. In combination with extensive baggage checks and efforts to detect behavioral traits often exhibited by hijackers, the additional equipment should prove an important asset in the future.

Yet, for all the obvious advantages of armed guards and electronic surveillance, they are essentially national, and therefore limited, remedies for an international malady. Only when the nations of the world are prepared to band together in an air boycott of those countries that harbor and encourage terrorists will there be any chance of striking at the heart of the menace.

In recognition of this fact, the President has called for such a boycott and also has urged implementation of an international treaty providing for the punishment or extradition of hijackers.

This long-overdue measure, endorsed by the International Civil Aviation Organization last June but sidetracked by opposition from Arab countries, has the firm support of the Air Transport Association.

As events of the past week vividly have demonstrated, it is high time that it become

operative and that nations refusing to subscribe to it be ostracized from the international aviation community.

B. & W. PLANT TOWNS

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it has become increasingly apparent to me that the future of America lies neither in its cities nor on its farms, but in the imaginatively planned and financially secure communities located between them.

One such community is Rochester, Mich. I think Rochester will prove a model after which more and more of our suburbs will be patterned.

Generator magazine, a publication of Babcock and Wilcox Co., has included in their issue for July and August a fine description of Rochester. I insert at this point in the RECORD their excellent article.

TWELFTH IN A SERIES ON B&W PLANT TOWNS

To the men and women of our Automated Machine division's Detroit Broach & Machine unit, Rochester, Mich., is an exciting place to work and a pleasant place to live.

The people of Detroit Broach supply three principal products—broaches, broaching machines and tracer lathes—to many important industries, and our people feel it's satisfying to be part of the growing, dynamic machine tool industry.

The Rochester people boast that they live in an attractive residential community, close to two spheres of recreation—the sophisticated culture, music and theater of Detroit and the hunting, fishing and boating of the Upper Michigan Peninsula. Rochester, located on M-150 in the heart of the Bloomfield Hills, is only 45 minutes drive north of downtown Detroit, and several hours drive to the five-mile Mackinac suspension bridge across the Straits of Mackinac to the sportland of the Northern Peninsula. Closer to Rochester, in Oakland County, there are more than 200 lakes.

The first permanent settlement in Oakland County was made at the present site of Rochester in 1817. The first settler, James Graham, became familiar with the Indian language and often served as an interpreter. There were several families of Chippewa Indians in the area and they helped clear the land and worked the farm land for the white settlers.

Most of the settlers came from western New York state, and the settlement was named after Rochester, N.Y.

The village remained under the general government of the township of Avon until 1869 when it became an incorporated village. It became a city in 1967.

Several industries settled in Rochester around the mid-1800's, and the Detroit United Electric Railway was built through Rochester in 1898. The electric railroad gave fast passenger and freight service to Detroit. One of the railway's steam generators provided electricity for homes and stores in Rochester from 6 a.m. to 12 midnight on weekdays and until 1 a.m. on Saturdays and Sundays. This system was purchased by the Detroit Edison Company in 1922 and is still serving the area.

Although generally considered a residential community, Rochester has in its area

such industries as Parke-Davis Experimental Farms, National Twist Drill and Tool Company, the Detroit Broach and Machine unit of B&W and Control Data Corporation. And the nationally known home of the Leader Dogs for the Blind is in Rochester.

Gustav von Reis founded the Detroit Broach and Machine Company in 1934. The company became widely known in the machine tool industry, and was acquired by B&W in 1966. Together with W. F. & John Barnes of Rockford, Ill., and Century Detroit it forms the Automated Machine division.

The Rochester Community Schools comprise nine elementary schools, two junior and two senior high schools. More than 25 churches of various denominations serve the spiritual needs of the 7,000 residents.

VETERINARY MEDICINE'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO OUR HEALTH

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The United States today is undergoing a health services crisis. The present health care delivery systems are expensive and frequently inadequate. Too little is being done to prevent illness. A tremendous health manpower shortage is mounting with no visible end in sight, unless the Nation redirects its budgetary priorities.

Total shortages of allied health professionals, nurses, doctors, dentists, pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, and veterinarians have been estimated by the Public Health Service at a level of almost 500,000. The total budget request for health manpower for 1971 is \$242,234,000—approximately one-half of the congressional authorization of \$417,500,000.

It is estimated that the Nation presently needs 36,000 veterinarians. We have only 26,000—a shortage of at least 10,000 veterinarians in the United States.

The veterinary medical capability of the Nation must be expanded to meet current and near-future demands for services. Conservative estimates indicate the need for 40,000 to 45,000 veterinarians in the United States by 1980. Obtaining that number and maintaining it will require twice as many new veterinarians, each year, as are currently graduated.

Veterinary medicine, with its 26,000 professionally active veterinarians, is one of our major health professions. Its contributions to man's health and well-being include helping to assure an adequate supply of food of animal origin; evaluating and reducing the hazards of environmental pollution; assuring safe, wholesome food; developing of medical care techniques and methods; and controlling infectious diseases.

Veterinary medicine is a vital force in the maintenance and improvement of the health of man. To meet the future need for veterinarians, we will have to make marked increases in the enrollment in the present colleges of veteri-

nary medicine and establish several new ones. Continued Federal assistance to the colleges of veterinary medicine is important in assuring an adequate and effective health manpower capability.

Mr. Speaker, I now insert in the RECORD two letters from two distinguished leaders in the veterinarian profession, Dr. Erskine V. Morse, past dean of Purdue University School of Veterinary Science and Medicine and present professor of Veterinary Medicine and Environmental Health, and Dr. Frank A. Todd, Washington representative of the American Veterinary Medical Association. These gentlemen have done an excellent job in promoting the cause for veterinary medicine and in pointing out many of the scientific activities in which veterinarians are playing an important part. The letters are as follows:

AUGUST 27, 1970.

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS,
Rayburn Office Building,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROGERS: Your interest in, appreciation for and support of the veterinary profession are well recognized. Veterinarians are making contributions in two current nationally significant areas—environmental health and preventive medicine. Awareness of our impending environmental crisis is receiving worldwide attention and concern. Your own dedicated support in the Congress of environmental health and preventive medicine needs to the benefit of all of our people is a matter of record.

The re-emergence of cholera (Russia and the Middle East), diphtheria (Texas), and bubonic plague (New Mexico) presents grave problems. The resurgence of these disease antiquities stresses that we cannot be complacent where preventive medicine is concerned. In the past veterinary expertise has been involved with and contributed to public health knowledge involving these three scourges.

The Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (DVM or VMD) is a required and significant member of the health sciences team in teaching, research, and public service. By 1980 we anticipate a shortage of at least 6500 DVM's. Past experience and projected estimates indicate that the U.S. should have approximately 17.5 veterinarians per 100,000 population. We can meet this goal only if adequate federal support to veterinary medical education is continued. The assistance provided under "Title VII, Health Manpower Act of 1968" initiated many needed and beneficial programs. Since contributions of the profession have been acknowledged as a part of the total medical sciences effort, veterinary medicine should be included in forthcoming legislation relating to Medical Education Assistance.

I have taken the liberty of presenting documentation and statements delineating the past and possible future responsibilities and contributions of veterinarians in solving our nation's problems in environmental health and preventive medicine:

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

The current environmental crisis will not diminish nor "go away" due to wishful thinking. The situation is of man's own making and irresponsible past and continuing actions. A basic behavioral pattern practiced among the lower animals, and largely ignored by man, is expressed as an admonition in the old cliché: "Don't foul your own nest or den!" The total environment—land, streams, lakes, oceans, and air—represents the "den or nest" of the human race. We have approached the brink of pollution due to the world's population explosion with its

accompanying food shortage, consumer demands and trash surpluses. Worst of all, we do not know the true state and impact of all the implied and actual consequences which we read and hear about daily in all news media. The recent "nerve gas" fiasco emphasizes the extent of our utter confusion and widening credibility gap. Obviously, damage was done; but where? what? and how much? These questions will no doubt remain eternally unanswered. One fact is crystal clear: We cannot continue the past complacency nor afford the luxury of our questionable and irresponsible disposal systems in an already overburdened environment.

Environmental studies represent a great opportunity for a broad, truly interdisciplinary approach or meeting ground of medical, biological, agricultural and social scientists. Veterinary scientists are currently active in many key phases of animal waste disposal; air pollution; pesticide, herbicide, and drug toxicity; water pollution; noise abatement, and aquatic animal health. Veterinarians can play focal and pivotal roles in bridging gaps in comparative medicine, ecology and toxicology. The Doctor of Veterinary Medicine, by his educational background, training and experience, is qualified and skilled in tackling matters relating to both medicine and agriculture. The problems are not simple, for they may involve insect vectors, wildlife, livestock, pet animals, aquatic creatures as well as man. We have many challenges and opportunities to change or alter the course of our impending environmental crisis. Veterinary medicine is obtaining, and will continue to find, solutions while working individually and cooperatively with other scientists. The need is apparent and the challenges multiply each day!

Americans are meat eaters; our individual consumption averages 238 pounds per year. The total number of U.S. cattle has been increasing at about twice that of our human population. Livestock and poultry manure, once valued as fertilizers, now present a horrendous waste disposal problem of nearly 2 billion tons per year. The magnitude of this waste is clear when we consider that: wastes from 5 million feedlot cattle represent equivalents from 50 million people; 7 million dairy cattle equate to 105 million persons, 10 million hogs represent 10 million human beings, and 100 million laying hens produce wastes equal to that of 10 million people. One feed lot containing 50,000 cattle, and there are such operations, has a waste disposal problem equal to that of a city of 600,000 population. The gigantic 3000-8000 head feedlots and the million bird poultry production units accentuate the problem by concentration of manure wastes in extremely small areas. The resultant soil, water, and air pollution are no secret to even an urbanite. Re-cycling wastes, i.e., to cropland and pastures and refeeding are possible answers. Protein-rich poultry waste can be processed and fed to swine, cattle, and poultry. Any method must be checked and evaluated to protect human and animal health, control insect pests and vectors and to ascertain suitable ecological, physiological, nutritional, and toxicological parameters.

Therapeutic and growth stimulatory feed additives as well as herbicides or pesticides in forage may be passed in the feces and urine of livestock. Some of these chemicals or their metabolic degradation products may contaminate soil and potable water supplies. Proper treatment of animal or human wastes is imperative to prevent the spread of various enteric disease agents: enteric viruses, salmonella, leptospirae, hepatitis virus, etc.

Aquatic animal health is a developing area in veterinary medicine. Activities relate to the protection of human health, husbandry and care of water fauna, as well as the use of aquatic animals as models to study normal physiology, disease processes, behavioral

patterns and underwater communication. We are becoming ever dependent on the seas for protein-rich food; this reservoir will be tapped more and more to feed the hungry of the world. The aquatic environment must receive protection and not be rendered next to useless by man's pollution.

The monitoring of various environmental pollutants can be accomplished utilizing fish, birds, and animals. It has been found that city pigeons' feathers contain more lead than those of their rural cousins. Evidences of fluoride, lead, and arsenic poisonings are found in livestock near smelting operations. High concentrations of mercury and DDT have been found in fish and shellfishes raised in industrially and agriculturally contaminated waters. Dogs, cats, rats, mice, squirrels, sparrows and pigeons might well be studied as monitors for and predictors of many common urban pollutants. We can well utilize animals in our pollution surveillance systems in both the city and farm. A smog in Smithfield, England, in 1873 affected one-third of the cattle at a livestock exhibition. Many animals were slaughtered to salvage their meat. In 1952 a similar incident occurred at Smithfield. Fortunately, public health investigators looked into the occurrence and found the causal relationship between both the cattle deaths and the demise of over 4,000 people during that seven-day smog. In October 1958, the Donora, Pennsylvania, community suffered a smog episode. Fifteen percent of the dogs was affected and one-fourth of the group died. The role and value of the canary to coal miners in monitoring poisonous mine gases is classic. We do not know enough about the effects of air pollution on cancer, respiratory, circulatory or eye disease in man and animals.

Pollens, dust, fungal spores and other particulate matter are a part of the atmosphere we breathe. Allergic reactions in man are debilitating and costly to the sufferer. Agricultural and industrial activities contribute to this problem. Particulate fallout in cities may reach 50 to 100 tons per square mile monthly. Assessment of the long-term effects on human and animal health should be thoroughly investigated.

Understanding the many facets of ecology draw upon veterinary expertise. For example, during the growth of apparently innocuous molds and fungi on cereal grains, metabolite products are produced which are toxic to livestock and man. These are called mycotoxins, and they are quite heat resistant.

The current corn blight has destroyed a portion of our corn crop—estimates of 5-25 percent are reported. The 1969 grain crop, now in storage, will be used more extensively in human and animal foods. Improper grain storage may lead to extensive mold growth. Whether or not we will find more mycotoxicosis in livestock during 1970-71 due to this chain of ecologic events remains to be seen. Veterinary researchers have studied the mycotoxicoses extensively.

Sounds can be very pleasant or annoying as we well know. The quality, intensity, or interval of noise produces hormonal changes in animals. Performance, behavioral patterns and general health may be affected. We do not know the impact of sound on existing diseases or the role of noise as inciting factor for future maladies. Noise, as a stress, may influence the development or course of cancer, physiologic diseases, or even infectious processes. Studies involving livestock, wildlife, and pets which embrace the basic sciences of veterinary medicine may yield significant answers.

Many poisons have a cumulative or additive effect. The body tends to retain and build up concentrations of the compound. The toxic effect is, therefore, chronic. Consideration should be given to combinations of disease causes and environmental stresses and pollutants, i.e., mycotoxins and cancer or

vitamin deficiencies; air pollution and respiratory or circulatory ailments; acute and chronic infections combined with noise; sublethal levels of metal or organic poisonings and cancer or deficiency diseases, etc. The possible combinations are limitless; the paucity of knowledge is very apparent and must be of real concern.

Veterinarians are becoming active and are direly needed on the environmental health team. They have already made important contributions to our knowledge of toxicology, pathologic physiology, and the broad areas of public health. More veterinary manpower will be required in teaching, research and public service during the next decade. An interdisciplinary environmental health team approach, which will include veterinary expertise, is required if we are to solve the pressing problems confronting us in industry, agriculture and medicine.

PREVENTIVE MEDICINE

The health and well being of both man and food-producing animals during this and the next decade will be determined in a major degree by the judicious application and practice of the broad concepts of preventive medicine. There are nearly 25,000 veterinarians in the U.S. Over one third of these professionals are private practitioners who minister to and protect our \$34 billion livestock and poultry industries. The USDA has approximately 2500 veterinary employees, while state and local regulatory and disease control veterinarians number 1250. Their efforts are directed towards preventing diseases, which threaten our food supply. Yet with all the dedication of these disease prevention specialists we are still incurring a 15-20 percent loss in total livestock production due to disease. Preventive medicine is costly to the industry and the consumer. However, "living with a malady" is even more economically unsound and devastating should the infection flare up in epidemic proportions. Eradication or elimination of a given disease has proven the best long range course of action. Such has been well demonstrated and proven as in the cases of foot and mouth disease, bovine contagious pleuropneumonia, cattle tick fever, and vesicular exanthema in swine. Stringent national and state cooperative programs in regulatory veterinary medicine are moving towards eradication of bovine tuberculosis, brucellosis, hog cholera, screw worms of cattle, and pullorum disease in fowl. Regulatory veterinary medicine is in reality preventive medicine. The first aim is control, while the ultimate goal is elimination of disease.

As our livestock production units become larger (5,000 beef cattle or pigs on feedlots and up to 50,000 laying hens or broilers in a single house), infectious agents will have maximal opportunity to wipe out entire herds or flocks in days—not weeks. Even the most efficacious treatments will be of little immediate value in preventing the spread of an agent in populations numbering thousands. Recently, "bootlegged" turkey blood, contaminated with Newcastle disease virus, was used to "vaccinate" chickens for Marek's disease. Some 100,000 birds were directly involved with a potential threat to many more; death loss due to the contaminating virus was 100 percent. Properly regulated and controlled movement of vaccines and biologicals is a definite statutory responsibility of regulatory veterinary medicine.

Veterinary research is classically directed toward prevention of disease through studies involving accurate diagnosis, transmission patterns, common hosts, wild-life reservoirs as well as insect vectors. Immunization or vaccination to protect animals against a given agent receives special emphasis. If these basic facts are not known and established, treatment may be a superfluous, and even a bit late to control or prevent future outbreaks.

Prevention of the over 200 zoonoses, i.e., those animal diseases transmissible to man, is imperative. Livestock, companion animals, or pets as well as wildlife serve as reservoirs or infection sources. Rabies is well known to the layman. The role of the dog in the infection-chain is common knowledge; cattle and swine also make their contribution in the spread of the disease. Both insectivorous and frugivorous bats disseminate rabies to susceptible hosts via their urine. The most significant and uncontrollable reservoirs, however, are our wild animals—foxes, raccoons, skunks, etc. Tuberculosis, leptospirosis, brucellosis, fungal infections, tularemia, botulism, ornithosis, trichinosis, protozoan parasites and tapeworm infections all have received veterinary research attention to the benefit of preventing transmission to man.

The inspection of meat, dairy and poultry products by 2600 veterinarians of the USDA, FDA, U.S. Air Force, and U.S. Army is well documented, and yet sometimes overlooked as a contribution to preventive medicine. The application of veterinary knowledge through monitoring and inspection protects consumers' health against agents of disease, toxic materials, and noxious adulterants. This activity is purely and simply preventive medicine to the benefit of the American consumer.

Cornerstones in the history of preventive medicine are the result of the studies utilizing animals and their diseases as models. A few of the major contributions of the past have been:

Jenner's discovery in 1796, that attacks of "milkmaid's nodules" produced immunity to human small pox.

Zinkle's finding (1804) that sputum of rabid dogs transmitted rabies to susceptible hosts.

Koch's experiments (1876) with anthrax which established bacteria could cause disease.

Pasteur (1880) produced the first successful bacterial vaccine. It protected sheep against anthrax.

Bollinger's (1877) demonstration that fungi could be infectious agents; his studies with lumpy jaw of cattle established this fact.

Griffith Evans in 1880 demonstrated that protozoa were capable of infecting higher animals. Surra of horses and camels served as an example.

Veterinarians, through their own researchers and investigative efforts, have added materially to our progress in preventive medicine. A few examples are:

1. Benesch developed spinal anaesthesia.

2. Tabourin devised the hypodermic (needle) injection technique.

3. Ramon formulated immunizing techniques with his toxoids—particularly those of tetanus and diphtheria.

4. Chauveau catheterized the living horse's heart and paved the way for the successful use of the technique in human surgery.

5. Schofield recognized the anti-coagulant properties of dicumarol while studying "sweet clover disease of cattle." The discovery has prolonged life of heart disease patients and prevented heart attacks. Dicumarol is also the active ingredient in the "rat poison", WARFARIN.

6. K. F. Meyer was instrumental in solving many of the problems of botulism, a deadly poison, to the benefit and success of the American canning industry.

7. T. N. Spencer advanced the hypothesis that canine "black tongue" and human pellagra had the same cause. Elvehjem, a biochemist, proved him to be correct. The disease is due to a niacin deficiency and can be prevented.

8. Maurice Hall discovered the value of tetrachloroethylene in the treatment of canine hookworms. Other researchers found the drug efficacious in treating and controlling human hookworm.

9. Alfred E. Earl found that reserpine had tranquilizing effects in laboratory animals. He thus laid the basis of studies on tranquilizers in animals and man.

Over one half of the U.S. veterinary profession, either directly or indirectly contributes to human health and preventive medicine through their activities in livestock practice, regulatory disease control, food inspection, and research. We do not have enough veterinarians to staff adequately the current consumer protection programs.

Thank you, Congressman Rogers, for your assistance in the furtherance of modern veterinary medical education. The support and understanding which you and your congressional colleagues give our profession will also materially strengthen the nation's total endeavors and programs in environmental health and preventive medicine.

Sincerely yours,

ERSKINE V. MORSE, D.V.M., Ph.D.,
Dean, Purdue University School of
Veterinary Science and Medicine.

SEPTEMBER 8, 1970.

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: The following will provide information on the relationship and growing role of the veterinary medical scientists, teachers and professionals in the discovery and application of the facts of living processes in man's health and disease.

More and more, bits and pieces of information that together form the mosaic of our medical knowledge are being acquired from all forms of life, including plants, and all members of the animal kingdom, encompassing the simplest forms to the most complex. The lines of demarcation are once again dissolving into a single, continuous stream of one medicine, as was expressed by such medical greats as the pathologist Virchow, in the late 19th century. The M.D., who is trained in all of medicine concerning man, and the DVM-VMD, who is trained in all medicine involving animals other than man, together form a melding of the sciences and the practice of one medicine today. This is increasingly apparent through the participation and involvement of the veterinary-medically trained practitioners, scientists, and teachers in the human medical communities throughout this country.

Veterinary medical graduates are serving in judging the scientific validity of medical research proposals and training proposals supported by granting agencies of our government. They are collaborating as scientists and co-investigators with human physicians in the study of health and disease, as it relates to problems in man. They, further, are serving as faculty members, in teaching the comparative aspects of biology and medicine to students and graduates of human medicine, to broaden the base of the latter's experience and insight into life's processes.

Veterinary medical graduates are developing and collaborating in the development of clinical procedures, equally useful in the diagnosis of diseases in man, as well as other animals, and the development of instruments and devices (such as Stader splints), with direct applicability to man's service and well-being.

Because of their knowledge in comparative biomedicine (biology and medicine), the veterinary medical doctor is providing leadership and guidance to the growing number of medical scientists who are seeking to solve questions of vital importance to human medicine with animal subjects in laboratory surroundings. This is a logical and effective area of contribution wherever trained veterinary medical scientists can perform.

Dr. Dorland Davis, M.D., Director, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, has made the following statement:

"Recent experience has demonstrated that the basic qualifications and training of veterinarians equip them to assume broader roles in research administration, and in the management of broadly-based health activities. In the past, these functions usually have been discharged by physicians. In the future, the expected shortage of physicians available for research administration and public health practice will, probably, become more acute, and provide more opportunities for other individuals trained in the problems of veterinary disease.

"Veterinary training in microbiology and in pathology, for the scientific understanding of broad health problems and responsibilities for conduct of investigations. In recent years, more and more positions of scientific management are being occupied by veterinarians, and it is almost certain that this trend will accelerate. Veterinarians in the Department, therefore, should be oriented to biomedical investigations and their application on a broad scale to national health needs."

As you know, Congressman Rogers, this nation's veterinary schools were finally included, along with other medical schools, in Federal legislation to provide grants, first for construction and, in 1968, for educational improvement. This achievement represented the culmination of a long struggle to obtain appropriate treatment of veterinary medicine as a medical profession, with direct interest in, and concern for, human health. An obvious benefit for the public, from further supporting education and development of veterinary medicine, lies specifically in nutrition. An adequate diet is a basic factor in good health.

Undernourishment, in general, refers to an inadequate intake of energy, i.e., calories, while malnutrition may result from many and varied nutritional imbalances or deficiencies. The most important, by far, however, is protein malnutrition.

Protein deficiency particularly affects young children and pregnant and lactating mothers. An important consequence of protein deficiency is the impairment of the health, vigor, and efficiency of future generations.

The nutritive value of dietary protein depends as much on its quality as the total amount present. The prime sources of the best proteins, those having the highest biological values, are foods of animal origin, i.e., meat, milk and egg products. Animal products are, also, rich in other essential nutrients.

The veterinarian is an important protector of that portion of our food supply that comes from animals. While the United States has only 6% of the world's population, it consumes 29% of the world's meat. Many factors enter into the reason for this abundance of animal and poultry products.

One of its traditional and highly valued functions of veterinary medicine is its service to animal agricultural in protecting the health and productivity of food-producing herds and flocks, an over \$50 billion industry. The American housewife is provided with an abundant, wholesome and economical supply of meat, milk and eggs, probably unmatched by any other country in the world.

There is a shortage of veterinarians—not just for private practice—important though this is to the immediate health of our food-producing animals—but a shortage, also, in education, research, livestock disease control, and public health.

With the current great need for improved health services for the citizens of this country, it is necessary to utilize all of the health personnel available. It is recognized that there is a shortage of such personnel and that measures must be taken to increase our capability for the training of these individuals.

Trusting this information will be of assistance to you in your continued interest in the nation's health problems, I am

Sincerely,

FRANK A. TODD, D.V.M.,
Washington Representative, American
Veterinary Medical Association.

REFORMING THE REGULATORS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, on August 11, 1970 Philip Elman, Federal Trade Commissioner, gave the following paper before the American Bar Association, Antitrust Section, St. Louis, Mo. This paper entitled "The Regulatory Process: A Personal View," makes a very convincing case for the "radical structural reform," of our independent regulatory agencies.

Without a doubt, Mr. Elman states:

The theory underlying the independent regulatory commission was original and brilliant. . . . It is almost a century, however, since the Interstate Commerce Commission, the grandfather of the federal agencies, was created in 1887. We must now look to experience more than theory.

Elman attributes the chronic unresponsive and basic deficiencies in agency performance, to outmoded structure. This structure must be reformed, these agencies must be made more visible to the public, and more responsive to the public interest. It is time, he says, to examine these agencies, and adapt them to "changing social and economic conditions."

The points Commissioner Elman makes are well worth our consideration.

The text of the paper follows:

THE REGULATORY PROCESS: A PERSONAL VIEW
(By Philip Elman, Federal Trade
Commissioner)

I appreciate very much your invitation, as I leave government service after more than 31 years, to express a personal view of the regulatory process, particularly in relation to the agency I know best—the Federal Trade Commission.

I came to the Commission in 1961 with the strong encouragement of Justice Frankfurter, who during our long friendship had instilled in me his profound faith in the administrative process. Indeed, no one ever came to an agency more convinced that the independent regulatory commission had an essential and important place in government; that its theory and structure were basically sound; and that, while reforms were necessary, they could be achieved simply with better men and better management. I went to law school in the late 1930's, when the New Deal agencies were in full flower. I learned about administrative law from such men as James M. Landis and Calvert Magruder, as well as Felix Frankfurter. As a government career lawyer, my work brought me in close contact with the federal agencies. In the Solicitor General's Office, where I spent 16 years, I argued or briefed hundreds of cases defending government agencies before the Supreme Court.

Thus, it was not unnatural that the only "instructions" I should receive when I was appointed to the FTC were that President

Kennedy expected me to be "the lawyer" on the Commission. To others this might have seemed rather vague; but I knew precisely what was meant, and never forgot it. For, as I said in my first speech as a Commissioner, "Lawyers are supposed to be experts in the administration of law, experts in the art of getting things done and in ways that are fair and just. And lawyers in government, especially, become inescapably involved in that most challenging process: the attainment of justice through legal institutions administered by men."

I have burdened you with this long preface so that you will know that the view of the regulatory process which I express is that of a friendly critic-in-residence, whose perspective has perhaps been distorted by being too close to the scene.

Today, when all institutions of government are being found wanting, none has been more criticized and less responsive to such criticism—than the independent regulatory commission. With monotonous regularity, studies and reports appear in an unending procession, all saying essentially the same things. While the criticisms cover a very broad ground, the most fundamental deficiency has been found to be the agencies' chronic failure to fulfill their unique quasi-legislative function of developing and implementing regulatory policies responsive to public needs and the public interest. With each new study and report, there is the same ritual call for better appointments and improved administration. Yet the agencies go on essentially unchanged and seemingly undisturbed, with little evidence of basic improvement in performance.

Without a doubt, the theory underlying the independent regulatory commission was original and brilliant. It emphasized the agency's independence; its ability to bring expert judgment to bear upon technical and complex economic issues; its insulation from political partisan control; its capacity to provide both continuity and flexibility of policy; and its blending in a single tribunal of a wide range of powers and functions, from general rule-making to case-by-case adjudication, permitting the agency to exercise broad discretion in choosing the best tool for dealing with a particular problem.

It is almost a century, however, since the Interstate Commerce Commission, the grandfather of the federal agencies, was created in 1887. We must now look to experience more than theory. And, like Louis Hector and Newton Minow before me, I have come to the view that the chronic unresponsiveness and basic deficiencies in agency performance are largely rooted in its organic structure and will not be cured by minor or transient personnel or procedural improvements.

Experience shows, I believe, that the independent multimember regulatory commission suffers from the defects of its virtues. Independence, collective deliberation and decisionmaking, and fusion of powers and functions in a single agency, are all useful values in the administrative process; but we have pushed them too far, relying too much on the pure simplicities of the original theory and neglecting the lessons of actual experience. It is time for radical structural reform.

II.

At the outset, let me make a preliminary general observation. The public suffers from too much of the wrong kind of regulation. Broadly speaking, government regulation is necessary and justified only when it serves the public interest, not the special interests of private groups or industries. While the lines of demarcation are not always sharp and clear, we should recognize that preservation of the environment, and protection of the health and safety and other essential interests of the public, are proper objectives

of government regulation; shielding businessmen from the risks of competition and the marketplace is not. So-called "infant" industries may perhaps need a helping hand from government for a short time; but we should not go on sheltering and subsidizing them forever in the guise of protective regulation. The present transportation mess is an obvious example of what results from misguided regulation. Regulatory institutions should not be allowed to develop permanent lives of their own, impervious to changing conditions and needs. Existing and proposed regulatory programs should constantly be reexamined, and, to the maximum extent possible, competition should be established and maintained as our national economic policy—in fact as well as in rhetoric.

Another basic point which seems to have been disregarded is that the regulatory agencies were created in order to redress those injuries to the public which can best be remedied by administrative action. Where only private interests are aggrieved, the proper remedy is private action in the courts. A tort, whether the victim is a competitor or a consumer, is a private, not a public, wrong—and the place to seek relief is a court, not a regulatory agency. To be sure, there may be disadvantaged individuals or groups who will need—at least for a time—some kind of government help in securing effective access to the courts. But this does not justify the transformation of regulatory agencies into courts. Just as the administrative process should not be used to insulate businessmen from the rigors of a free-enterprise economy, it should not be used to relieve the courts of their duty to redress violations of private rights.

III.

Thus, there is much room for reducing the areas of agency regulation, thereby encouraging greater reliance on free competition and on private self-help through traditional legal methods. Inevitably, however, there will remain many areas in our economic life where administrative regulation is required to serve essential public needs, and where there will be continuing need for federal regulatory agencies.

In creating these agencies, Congress recognized its own inability, through self-enforcing legislation, to prescribe specific and detailed rules and regulations for dealing with complex and dynamic economic conditions. The agencies were established as continuing administrative bodies designed to keep pace with the evolution of a growing and ever-changing economy. Each of these "arms" of Congress was given—as its primary and principal assignment—the duty of developing and executing a body of subsidiary regulatory policies within the broad limits provided by the governing statute.

The agencies were designed to supplement, not to duplicate, the work of the courts. It was contemplated that an agency would sit, not like a court, as a passive and disinterested arbiter of cases or controversies brought fortuitously before it, but, rather, as the surrogate of Congress, exercising delegated legislative power to regulate commerce and affirmatively advancing basic national policies and objectives declared by statute. To that end, each agency was equipped with a broad array of flexible administrative tools, permitting a comprehensive approach to regulatory problems in their full dimensions.

According to the theory, the independence of the regulatory commission would be a source of institutional strength, insulating its members from partisan political pressures and enabling them to act creatively and boldly. Its multi-member structure would insure that agency decisions would be reached after group deliberation, providing both a barrier to hasty or arbitrary action and assurance of judicious and prudent policies. And its flexibility and fusion of powers

would assure that case-by-case adjudication would be used, not in the traditional manner of the courts for the purpose of applying established legal rules to particular cases, but rather for the primary administrative purpose of developing new, wise, and informed regulatory policies responsive to changing conditions and public needs.

In each of these basic respects, however, there is a wide gap between the theory and the fact of the regulatory process.

A.

In fact, independence and security of tenure for agency members have not achieved the intended result of insulating agencies from undesirable political pressures and special interest pleading. Of course, government regulators are—and should be—subjected to external pressures and influences. But we must distinguish between those that are improper or harmful to the public, and those that are not only legitimate but necessary and desirable. It is one thing for agency members to be responsive to narrow, partisan, political or special interests; it is quite another to be attentive to, and indeed welcome, the advocacy of consumer interests and public needs. Paradoxically, independence and security of tenure tend to encourage the former and to discourage the latter. In fact, they foster, on the one hand, agency passivity and a reluctance to "rock the boat" by antagonizing powerful special interest groups; and, on the other, an attitude of complacency and indifference to those larger public concerns for which there is as yet no effective "people's lobby".

Since agency members are appointed for long terms and cannot, for all practical purposes, be removed from office, the public cannot take effective action against the regulators directly. Nor, as matters stand now, does the public blame the President for poor agency appointments and continued agency failures. Despite such failures, the public can neither do anything to remedy the situation nor find anyone to hold accountable.

As long as I can remember, Presidents have said—and have been reminded by every new study and report—that revitalization of the agencies must begin by appointing better commissioners. Yet, as Kenneth Cox said the other day in commenting on the quality of agency appointments over the years, "I am appalled by the way Presidents generally have treated the agencies." While it is indeed appalling, it should not be surprising that this is the case, and will continue to be, no matter who is President.

So long as the agencies constitute a "fourth branch" of government for whose performance no one holds him accountable, a President is under little pressure either to seek out the best qualified men or to resist political influence. It would be instructive to compare the agency members appointed over, say, the last quarter of a century with the Assistant Secretaries (or Assistant Attorneys General) chosen during the same period. Both positions receive the same pay and, theoretically, enjoy the same status and prestige. In fact, however, the caliber of appointments to the two categories is vastly different, as are the criteria for selection.

A President knows that after an "independent" agency member is appointed, he is essentially on his own; and if he proves to be incompetent or unresponsive to the public interest, the President will usually not be held at fault. On the other hand, an incompetent Assistant Secretary reflects directly on the President, his Administration, and his standing with the public. Every President incurs political obligations. The "independence" of the regulatory agencies tempts a President to satisfy a political debt to a deserving friend or supporter by appointing him to a comfortable agency berth. It is no historical accident that President Roosevelt's decision to use the FTC, not as

an instrumentality for advancing his New Deal programs but primarily for political patronage purposes, coincided with the Supreme Court's ringing declaration of agency independence in the 1935 *Humphreys* case.

Contrary to the original theory, independence is a source of institutional weakness, not strength, and tends to discourage creative and courageous regulation in the public interest. Independence means that an agency lacks a constituency, a power base, and the backing of the President. Without these, the agency will stand naked and alone when it takes controversial action impinging on powerful private interests—as the Federal Trade Commission discovered when it promulgated its Cigarette Labeling Rule in 1964. Independence nourishes institutional timidity and fear of those who may use their political or economic influence to take reprisal action against the agency, reducing its powers or cutting its appropriations.

Another consequence of carrying the concept of independence too far is that it impedes the development of comprehensive and harmonious national policies in such broad areas, for example, as transportation, communications, and trade regulation, where a single agency's responsibility covers only part of the field. In these areas we should not let the abstract notion of agency independence interfere with the President's constitutional power and duty to take care that the laws enacted by Congress are faithfully executed; that the various agencies concerned do not neglect their statutory responsibilities; and that the specific regulatory policies followed by each of them are complementary and coordinated with basic national goals.

B.

Turning now to its multi-member structure, experience shows that this produces a dangerous depersonalization and invisibility of agency activity. When the public is only dimly aware of an agency as a distant and impersonal institutional entity, when one man cannot clearly be identified as responsible, who is there to hold accountable for the agency's shortcomings? Group deliberation and decision-making also engender unnecessary delay as well as indecisiveness, compromise, and the expedient of solving difficult and controversial problems by waiting for them to go away. As everyone with agency experience knows, its multi-member structure is a substantial and frustrating obstacle whenever swift and incisive regulatory action is required.

C.

Finally, as a device for developing regulatory policy, case-by-case adjudication of alleged violations of law has proved to be inefficient and ineffective, and, in many cases, unfair. Litigation is an excessively slow, expensive, clumsy, and inadequate process for resolving technical and complex economic issues. Yet, agencies like the Federal Trade Commission—staffed as they are by lawyers whose training and experience make them feel most comfortable with procedures drawn from the courts—continue to rely on adjudication as policy-making technique where other quasi-legislative methods, principally rule-making, are far more efficient, expeditious, and advantageous to the public.

On the basis of my own experience and observations, the strongest argument I would make against agency adjudication of alleged violations of law is that the blending of prosecutorial and adjudicative powers in a single tribunal imposes intolerable strains on fairness. The problem of avoiding prejudice, in appearance or in fact, constantly hovers over all agency activity, and is troublesome to agency members in almost every kind of action it takes. It can arise in the most subtle as well as obvious forms.

Consider, for example, the so-called test case where the agency issues a complaint in order to establish a new legal principle or

remedy—precisely the “Rule in Shelley’s Case” type of adjudication which agencies have been urged to undertake as an essential and proper method for developing new regulatory policies. Agency members frequently take an active part in the pre-complaint investigative and prosecutorial phases of these cases; and the complaint is usually issued with the knowledge that, because of the novelty and importance of the issue, it will be fully litigated and be back for adjudication on the record. When such a test case does come up on appeal to the agency members, while there is no bias or prejudgment of guilt in the classic sense, there is an inescapable predisposition in favor of the agency position, as set forth in the complaint. After all, the whole point of starting a test case is to let the case go forward into the reviewing courts, where the issues may be finally settled. To put it bluntly, once such a complaint is issued, one should ask for long odds before betting against issuance of a final order. While a test case may be and usually is vigorously contested, the result—at least in the agency phase—is likely to be a foregone conclusion.

Indeed, in such a case an agency member may vote for an order not because he is personally convinced that there is a violation of law but because he feels, perhaps in an excess of humility, that since it is a test case involving a doubtful or unsettled question of law, his duty is to find against the respondent so that the case may go on to the courts for definitive resolution. This Catch-22 process may reach full fruition when conscientious judges on the reviewing court affirm the agency ruling, whatever their own doubts about its merits, because they feel obliged to defer to the agency’s expert judgment and discretion.

There are other institutional factors that intrude upon fair and impartial agency adjudication. Theoretically, when an agency member sits as a judge, his freedom to decide is the same as if he were on a court. But the judicial process is designed to insure that the judge is both neutral and disinterested, and has no interest other than that of applying the law fairly and evenhandedly. An agency member, on the other hand, cannot be unconcerned with whether the outcome of the case is to advance or to retard an important agency program to which substantial resources have been committed. Even the most conscientious regulator cannot, when he acts as judge, ignore the effect which the decision will have on the agency’s regulatory policies and goals.

Moreover, an agency member cannot escape the implications of his leadership role in the agency. He may fear the effect on staff morale if he votes to dismiss the complaint or reject the agency position in an important case. He may prefer to see the onus of dismissal borne by a reviewing court. And an agency member, *qua* judge, may well be apprehensive that dismissal of a complaint will imply that he made an error in having voted, *qua* persecutor, to issue it.

In these respects and others I have not mentioned, the context of agency deliberation and decision-making differs markedly from court adjudication. But the solution is not to judicialize the administrative process further, or to seek the appointment of “better” commissioners who will make better agency judges. Agency members are not, and should not be selected for their judicial qualities; and the institutional environment in which they work does not nourish the development of such qualities. It should surprise no one that the agencies have not produced a Learned Hand or a Henry Friendly. Agency members should be chosen for their capacity to perform the essential regulatory task of developing policies that are wise, informed, enlightened, and in the public interest—and not for their judicial

detachment and learning, or ability to write a polished legal opinion.

In short, agency members will become better regulators if we no longer expect them to act as judges as well as administrators. We should not require conscientious agency members to shoulder the irreconcilable burdens of both vigorously prosecuting and fairly judging in the same case. Those suspected of violating the law should indeed be proceeded against with vigor and dispatch; but the agency should prosecute its cases in an impartial and disinterested judicial tribunal. We should relieve agency members of the impossible duty of determining whether the allegations of their own complaint have been proved by the evidence in the record of a proceeding in which the agency itself is an adversary party.

IV.

Thus, while I have long held to the opposite view, I am now convinced that we will lose nothing, and gain much, by eliminating from agencies like the Federal Trade Commission the function of case-by-case adjudication of alleged violations of law. This function should be transferred either to the district courts or, preferably, to a new Trade Court which is decentralized and holds hearings in every state, thus bringing the judicial phase of the regulatory process much closer to the people. The Trade Court could be given jurisdiction not only of complaints prosecuted by the agency, but also private class-action suits brought by consumers and competitors injured by the same alleged unfair trade practices. To permit full and comprehensive disposition of the case by a single tribunal, the Court should have authority not only to issue preliminary and final injunctions, but also, where appropriate, to award damages, civil penalties, and other equitable relief.

Relieved of its adjudicative responsibilities, the agency’s remaining functions should be vested in a single Commissioner serving at the pleasure of both the President and Congress, and removable by either (in the case of Congress, by a majority vote of both Houses). This would permit the public to hold both the President and Congress accountable for an agency’s continued failures or poor performance.

I do not offer this proposal as a panacea for all agency ills. Nor do I suggest that it is without risks and dangers. On the positive side, however, elimination of the adjudicative function will enable an agency to concentrate its resources on a single central objective: the development and enforcement of regulatory policies carrying out the statutory mandate. To that end, it would conduct investigations and studies, utilizing fully its powers to gather information on emerging regulatory problems; it would make expanded use of its rule-making authority (including issuance of guides and enforcement statements) as the primary method for formulating policies and standards; it would proceed in court against persons charged with engaging in unlawful acts or practices, including those prohibited by valid agency rules or regulations; and it would advise the Congress and the President on any need for new legislation. All of these essential administrative tasks, executive and quasi-legislative in nature, are better performed, more quickly and more incisively, by a single administrator than by a multi-member tribunal.

Centralizing full authority and responsibility for an agency’s activities in a single administrator will unquestionably facilitate the development and formulation of regulatory policy. It will also lighten the burden of fashioning comprehensive and coordinated national policies in those areas where other government agencies or departments have overlapping responsibilities.

Moreover, an agency should be no less independent, in the best sense of the term, because it is under the leadership of a single man. The agency should still be required to develop regulatory policies that are truly non-partisan and responsive to public and consumer needs, and not to those of special interest pleaders. By increasing its visibility and accountability to the public, the proposed change in structure should result in a far greater degree of agency responsiveness than now exists.

Admittedly, having only one man in charge may make it easier to exert political pressures on him, bad as well as good. I do not wish to overstate the case, but it seems clear that the present structure of the agencies has failed to insulate them from improper influences, while the proposed change at least offers the hope of increased responsiveness to consumer needs and the broad public interest. Nor do I see any reason why a policy-making government regulator should be appointed for a long term of years, and not be removable from office despite continued public dissatisfaction with his performance. Such a public official should be required to live dangerously in that respect. It cannot be repeated too often that visibility and accountability to the public are essential keys to good government. If Congress, the President, or the public is disappointed with an agency’s performance, there should be one man upon whom attention can focus and from whom immediate improvement can be sought. We cannot do that with the independent regulatory commissions today; and both they and the public suffer from it.

With a single man given full authority and responsibility for an agency’s activities, it should be easier to attract “better” men. A President will be more reluctant to appoint incompetent Commissioners, for their failure will be his failure; their incompetence will be his embarrassment; continuing them in office, despite poor performance, will be his responsibility.

We should make sure that an agency is not given more jobs than it can reasonably be expected to handle. If it is, we know from experience that the agency will concentrate on those which are easiest, least controversial, and yield the quickest results, putting aside those more difficult and complex tasks which may be more important to the public. Nor should we allow an agency to excuse its own failures by putting the blame on a parsimonious Congress. It makes no sense to assign a job to an agency and then withhold from it the necessary resources of money and manpower.

I think it would be a serious mistake to transfer the regulatory agencies to the large Executive Departments where they would disappear, like the Food and Drug Administration, submerged under massive layers of bureaucracy. Agencies should continue to be independent in that sense—so that they may be clearly visible, fully accountable, and unable to blame others for their own deficiencies.

I am not as fearful as I once was that transferring agency adjudication to the courts would create a competing organ of policy-making. If the proposed changes should result, as I believe they will, in far greater and more effective utilization by the agencies of their administrative powers—again I stress the tremendous potential of rulemaking as a practical and fair method for developing and articulating regulatory policy—, there will be little danger of judicial usurpation of the agencies’ authority. Experience shows that where an agency is alert to its responsibilities, and is demonstrably endeavoring to fulfill its statutory duties in the public interest, reviewing courts generally give its actions the benefit of a reasonable doubt.

v.

It is perhaps unnecessary to say, in conclusion, that no reforms in the structure of the regulatory agencies will succeed unless there also are radical changes in the climate of government and the political processes. As John W. Gardner has said, "Our political and governmental processes have grown so unresponsive, so ill-designed for contemporary purposes, that they waste the taxpayers' money, mangle good programs, and smother every good man who comes into the system. * * * Sooner or later, someone is going to have to tackle the central structures of our society or it isn't going to work." We must institutionalize the means whereby the public may be aware of, and participate in, political and governmental processes that affect the quality of all our lives. We must open wide the doors and windows of government agencies, so that the public may see for itself what is or is not being done, and demand an accounting from those in charge.

Every institution of government must be renewed and adapted to changing social and economic conditions. It is no criticism of the administrative process, and the creative scholars and statesmen who have nourished its growth, to find that it is no longer adequate to the needs of the present and the future. The current widespread dissatisfaction with the performance of the regulatory agencies offers an opportunity for genuine reform. I leave you with the hope that this opportunity will not once again be allowed to slip by, without meaningful change and improvement.

"HIJACKING" THREATS IN WASHINGTON

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, many remember that a little over a year ago presidential aspirant George Wallace promised that if elected, he would protect the inhabitants of Washington even if necessary to place armed marines on every corner of the city.

Judging from the events of the past several days, it appears that President Nixon will need to station armed guards at every public accommodation room in Washington.

Such is the plight of our "hijacked" Nation's Capital.

I include several news clippings, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Sept. 11, 1970]

HOLDUP IN THE MEN'S ROOM

(By Ned Scharff)

A man was seated in the sixth-floor men's room in a downtown office building yesterday when he heard a voice above him say, "Give me all of your money."

Morris C. Brinton, a 45-year-old patent draftsman, looked up and saw someone holding a pistol and peering at him from the space above the stall's partition, police said. When Brinton refused the gunman's demand, the man shot him in the left leg and fled without money, police said.

Brinton was treated at George Washington University Hospital for the wound and released.

The attempted restroom holdup was the second of its kind in two weeks in the American Railroad Building, 1920 L St. NW.

Joe W. Grotegut, a public relations executive for the American Association of Railroads, said he thinks yesterday's restroom would-be robber may have been the same person who accosted him two weeks ago.

"No doubt about it," Grotegut said, "this man's approach sounds almost identical to that of the one who robbed me."

Grotegut said he entered the fourth-floor men's room Aug. 28 in the early afternoon.

"As soon as I sat down, I heard a voice coming from above me and when I looked up I saw a gun pointed at my head. The guy must have been standing on top of the stool in the next cabinet.

"It was a nerve-wracking experience," Grotegut said. "But as soon as the man asked me for my money, my watch and my rings, I realized that all I had was \$14 and a watch.

"I'd read enough about these kinds of things to know that the simple, safe and wise thing to do was to give him everything I had. I guess if he'd asked me to write him a check I would have done that, too."

Herbert Blum, a partner of Swesnik and Blum, Inc., the firm which owns the building, placed much of the blame for the unique problem on his tenants.

"They haven't kept the bathroom doors locked, as they should have," he said, explaining that keys to the restrooms had been issued when the building opened in 1968. "But naturally the keys got lost and the people who work in the offices get lazy. The restrooms have almost never been locked."

Many people who work in the building were alarmed over yesterday's shooting and by the theft two weeks ago. Some have called for stepped-up security precautions, including full-time guards.

"This is becoming uncomfortable," said one. "Its getting so that you have to bend down and look under the doors for suspicious looking feet before you enter any of the johns."

The New York Times, whose Washington bureau occupies the building's top floor, is planning to change the locks on all its restrooms. In the meantime, however, many of the newspaper's employes joke nervously about the situation. One man told his secretary:

"I'm not afraid. I'm going to the bathroom, but if I'm not out in two minutes, send some one in after me."

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 12, 1970]

YOUTH ASSAULTS HILL SECRETARY

A congressional secretary was attacked and beaten in a women's restroom in the Rayburn House Office Building about 2:30 p.m. yesterday by a youth who climbed over a toilet stall, police said.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks, "Where is daddy?" A mother asks, "How is my son?" A wife asks, "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

WHO SPEAKS FOR THE AMERICAN STUDENT?

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the troublemakers on American campuses are a small minority. Most students want to get an education and get on with their basic responsibilities of earning a living, raising a family, and becoming a useful member of society.

In a situation where a vast majority of students do not want to have their education interrupted, especially by a truculent, often irrational, violent minority, two basic requirements exist. One is that the educational institutions themselves promptly expel those who wilfully disrupt their proper educational operations. The second is that in some way those students who believe they are in school to get an education and not to start a "revolution," must have a reasonable amount of leverage in dealing with their contemporaries who are "making things tough."

In this connection I commend reading of an editorial from the Indianapolis Sunday Star recently reprinted as a guest editorial in the Manchester, N.H., Union-Leader.

THE REVOLT OF THE PAMPERED

(Guest editorial from the Indianapolis Sunday Star)

Although less than 10 per cent of American youth has been participating in the violent, senseless protests about their own colleges and universities, there is a growing danger that the noisy, militant leaders of America's young revolutionaries will lure more and more students to their cause.

The vast majority of students are serious-minded young people striving to get an education. They have, so far, refused to enter into "the gory glee" of hell-raising on the campus. But no leadership among the silent majority of students has arisen to challenge the revolutionaries.

The president of the student body at a large state university was elected by a vote of 1,013 to 323. Only 1,300 of 23,000 students voted in that election. They simply weren't interested in the militant program of the radical leaders. However, the student who was elected president claims that he represents the entire student body and demands a voice in board of regents meetings despite the fact that 90 per cent of the students wanted no part of his program.

Unless the students who believe they go to college to get an education rather than to start a revolution begin very shortly to organize and challenge the revolutionaries on the campus, they may find they have waited in silence while their precious heritage of freedom and opportunity has gone down the drain in a blazing, destructive, senseless revolution led by leaders who don't know what they want or what they would do with it if all their demands were granted. They want a noisy voice in everything but beyond that they know not what they are shouting about.

A sober observation about America's youth recently came from England where the editor of the London Daily Telegraph declared that no generation of young people ever had as great a heritage of freedom and opportunity as today's American youth.

Under the caption "Revolt of the Pampered," the editor of the Telegraph wrote:

"America is a victim of its national myth. It entered history proclaiming the rights of man. Its Constitution is aimed at fostering freedom at all costs. Its young have been brought up largely on an educational theory which attaches supreme importance to self-expression. Is it odd that it should lead the world in rebellion or that its volunteer forces should sometimes lack the virtue of unrelenting discipline? Yet the marvel does defy explanation. Why should America's pampered and idolized student youth, living in a country that enjoys freedom and prosperity in unprecedented degrees, turn all its righteous anger not against the despotisms that rule most of the rest of the world, but against America itself?"

A PROPOSAL FOR PREVENTIVE CAMPUS ACTION

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, slowly but surely indications are appearing that public reaction to radical violence on campuses is resulting in various legitimate—and incidentally, peaceful and legal—proposals for corrective action. More and more school administrators have been putting themselves on record endorsing firmer approaches to cope with illegal actions against educational institutions. In addition, increasing emphasis is accentuating the rights of the offended, the serious students and others who have suffered losses due to this comparatively recent phenomenon of campus lawlessness. There appears in the September 9 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a position paper issued by Americans for Effective Law Enforcement which proposes the use of lawsuits for potential plaintiffs, the non-violent students, the taxpayers and the contributors of funds to the educational institutions.

The Wall Street Journal of September 10 carried a short but pertinent item stressing the same corrective theme proposed by the dean of the University of Wisconsin Law School and a noted insurance expert which has been introduced in the Wisconsin legislature. Centered around a student-supported insurance fund, the proposal is designed "to motivate responsible students to take control from undisciplined activists who lead them astray." I insert at this point the above-cited item from the Wall Street Journal entitled "Wisconsin Proposal Would Assess Student for Campus Disorder":

WISCONSIN PROPOSAL WOULD ASSESS STUDENT FOR CAMPUS DISORDER

THOSE ATTENDING STATE SCHOOLS WOULD PAY DEPOSIT TO COVER DAMAGE CAUSED BY DISRUPTION

(By a Wall Street Journal Staff Reporter)

MADISON.—College students in Wisconsin would be assessed as much as \$300 a year to pay for damages resulting from campus disruptions if a proposal made by a legislative study group becomes law.

The student-supported insurance fund—the first of its type in the country—was proposed "to motivate responsible students to take control from undisciplined activists who lead them astray," asserted its drafters, who include the dean of the University of Wisconsin Law School and a noted Pennsylvania insurance expert.

The proposal brought opposition from university officials. One declared it would "prevent some students from getting a college education in the state." The University of Wisconsin has been a center of campus protest and violence, capped by a recent bombing.

Under the plan, each of Wisconsin's 7,000 students at state universities and junior colleges, would pay a \$100 deposit each semester. Ninety percent of the deposit would go into a special account for a student's particular campus and be repaid to the student if there weren't any losses during the semester. The other 10% would be nonrefundable and would go into a general reinsurance account for all public institutions of higher education in the state. Students could be assessed as much as \$150 a semester if losses exceeded a campus' special account's fund.

The proposal would insure against property damages, cover death, disability and medical expenses for persons hurt in disorders, pay costs incurred by calling in National Guard troops or state police and, "within limits," compensate private property owners for losses resulting from student disorder.

The proposal is far from becoming law. It has been sent to members of Wisconsin's insurance laws revision committee, who must act upon it, as must members of the Wisconsin legislative council and the state legislature.

AMERICANS DISAGREED WITH PRESIDENT

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, although many Americans disagreed with President Nixon's decision earlier this year to send American troops into Cambodia, I am sure all held the hope that, once begun, this campaign and its costs in American lives and money would bring the War in Vietnam closer to an end and permit more immediate and greater Vietnamization of the War.

Even though this hope remained upon completion of the exercise, when statistics of captured and destroyed enemy bases and supplies clearly indicated short-range success of that operation, it was yet difficult to evaluate the long-range impact of this action on the war.

In the September 7, 1970, issue of U.S. News & World Report, Col. William C. Moore of the U.S. Air Force provided an appraisal of the situation in Southeast Asia 2 months after the Cambodian operation, which I found very interesting. I recommend it to the attention of the Members:

A MILITARY APPRAISAL—CAMBODIA PLUS 2 MONTHS

(By Col. William C. Moore, U.S. Air Force)

Four months have passed since U.S. forces moved into Cambodia to destroy Communist sanctuaries. Two months have passed since U.S. troops completed their mission and were withdrawn on June 30.

What are the military results at Cambodia-plus-two-months?

Sufficient time has not passed to permit a conclusive appraisal of the over-all strategic implications of the Cambodian operation. But sufficient time has passed to permit analysis of the tactical pluses and minuses that accrued during the operation and since.

On balance, the pluses far exceed the minuses. Most importantly, the Allied position in South Vietnam has improved far more than expected. And it was to improve the Allied position in South Vietnam that the Cambodian operation was undertaken.

The most significant failure of the Communists has been their slowness in re-establishing new base areas from which to conduct operations against South Vietnam. They are attempting to do this now in Southern Laos and Northeast Cambodia. Here the enemy has been forced to accept less efficient, more vulnerable alternatives than the sanctuaries he had in Cambodia.

Sanctuaries, assembly areas, bivouacs—call them what you wish—are extremely important to military operations. They permit combat troops to rest, regroup and plan new attacks. Most importantly, they permit combat units to assemble, to concentrate in force prior to commitment to battle.

Without base areas, concentration must be done independently by small units at the scene of battle.

Under the most favorable circumstances, this is a tricky, highly sophisticated military operation which military leaders try to avoid as extremely dangerous. To attempt such an operation—considering the climate and terrain of Southeast Asia—would be a cardinal tactical error.

The consequences to North Vietnamese commanders making such a decision would more often than not be disastrous. Commitment of forces would be piecemeal, with subsequent defeat in detail by Allied forces. The military commanders in Hanoi and in the field know this.

In order to comprehend fully what the loss of the base areas in Cambodia means to the enemy, the loss should be viewed in the perspective of history.

In 1967 the enemy base areas, known then as War Zone D, War Zone C and the Iron Triangle—and encompassing more than 1,500 square miles of area—were in South Vietnam. The Iron Triangle was only 25 miles from Saigon.

In late 1966 and early 1967 these areas were overrun and cleared out by the Allies during a series of operations, the principal one being "Junction City."

As a result, the enemy established new sanctuaries in Cambodia, principally in the areas called Fishhook and Parrot's Beak.

Now these have been disrupted by the Cambodian operation; the newest strongholds, it appears, will be in Northeast Cambodia and Southern Laos, approximately 275 miles from Saigon.

The geographical progress since 1967 in reducing the threat to Saigon, and indeed the whole of South Vietnam, is readily apparent.

This retrogression is a serious blow to the enemy. Vital areas of South Vietnam are now great distances from the new bases. Enemy troops will no longer have a short midnight jaunt to their targets. Infiltration routes will no longer be as free from danger as they once were. The new sanctuaries themselves will not be immune from attack, as were the old. The Allied air forces will see to this. There will be no rest and recuperation for the troops once they leave North Vietnam.

Enemy leaders will find that planning and conducting military operations under these conditions will be far more complicated and hazardous than before. Getting troops to vital targets will be at best a long-drawn-out operation. Supplying them for any form of

sustained attack will be even more difficult and time-consuming.

The dilemma facing the enemy planners will be nothing compared with that facing the individual soldier who will be operating continuously in an environment that will grow more hostile each mile he travels southward from North Vietnam. The trail south will not end in a large, well-stocked, secure rest area, as it once did. For many soldiers, apprehension and preoccupation with their own survival will make them less effective, less able to carry out the tasks assigned to them.

Before and after Cambodia—How war in Vietnam has dropped off:

Two months before Cambodian operation, March–April, 1970, weekly average: 108 Americans killed in action.

During Cambodian operation, May–June, 1970, weekly average: 141 Americans killed in action.

Two months following Cambodia, July–August, 1970, weekly average: 70 Americans killed in action.

Thus, in the two months since the end of the Cambodian operation, U.S. combat deaths in South Vietnam have declined by 35 per cent from the two-month period immediately preceding the attack on Red sanctuaries.

OTHER INDICATORS IN VIETNAM

	Pre-Cambodia weekly average March–April 1970	Post-Cambodia weekly average July–August 1970	Down (percent)
Enemy terror and sabotage attacks.....	490	233	52
Enemy ground ambush attacks.....	40	6	85
Enemy attacks on population centers.....	7	4	43
Enemy battalion-level attacks.....	1	1	(0)
U.S. aircraft lost.....	40	17	58
South Vietnamese troops killed in action.....	300	267	11
Communist troops killed in action.....	2,561	1,558	39

¹ No change.

Source: Vietnam field reports through Aug. 25.

Under these conditions, it is doubtful whether the enemy ever again will be able to mount a large-scale operation in the Mekong Delta or, for that matter, in the southern half of South Vietnam. If he does, it will be short-lived, suicidal and of no lasting significance. The report that the enemy will return to guerrilla warfare using extremely small units is undoubtedly true. But this decision is not a preferred choice by the leaders in Hanoi. The operation into Cambodia has given them no alternative.

Since the end of the Cambodian operation, the U.S. Department of Defense has monitored statistics in South Vietnam closely to determine trends. These statistics confirm the optimism engendered during the Cambodian operation. The tactical situation is better, not worse. The chart on page 32, prepared by "U.S. News & World Report," shows the dramatic improvement since the attack on the Cambodian sanctuaries. It is worth noting that the number of enemy killed has dropped. This is a plus, not a minus. It indicates an unwillingness to stand and fight—not better performance by the enemy.

The reductions take on added significance when you consider that the statistics shown prior to the Cambodian operation are themselves a dramatic reduction from the statistics for 1969. In American lives lost, for example, the post-Cambodian figures represent a 35 per cent reduction from the pre-Cambodian figure, as shown on the chart, but

this is a 60 per cent reduction below 1969 figures.

Recent reports indicate that infiltration of enemy troops into South Vietnam, based on monthly averages for the first half of 1970, has been one half the 1969 monthly average—from 12,000 to 6,000 per month. This is barely enough to replace losses.

These signs point to significant progress in the tactical military sense. This in turn portends progress in the broader strategic sense. It means progress in Vietnamization. Asian forces are assuming more and more of the burden. The number of combat operations in which absolutely no U.S. forces are involved increases daily. U.S. forces are being withdrawn on schedule. Draft quotas at home, as one result, are the lowest since 1964.

The optimism contained in this report does not mean that the U.S., South Vietnam or Cambodia itself is out of the woods. Things could change, governments could fall, the end of the monsoons could signal new initiatives on the part of North Vietnam. Targets in South Vietnam opposite the new Communist base areas are sure to come under more and more fire—as indeed some already have. The figures on the chart may rise; they may approach the pre-Cambodian figures. But at present, this seems unlikely.

The U.S. will continue to monitor closely enemy activity to determine Communist intentions. Their activity in Cambodia and Laos will be of particular interest. The leaders in Hanoi, having suffered a crippling blow to their ability to attack South Vietnam, may now attempt to redress the situation at the expense of these two countries. The odds at present, however, do not favor early success in such a venture.

THE UNITED NATIONS IS 25 YEARS OLD—SO WHAT?

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, this morning's newspaper carried a story indicating that a Presidential commission reports that the United Nations must undergo a number of needed reforms if it is to become the effective instrument that we had originally hoped it would become.

The urgency of this need was spelled out in May of this year by Secretary General U Thant, who stated:

The Members of the United Nations have perhaps 10 years left in which to launch a global partnership to curb the arms race, to improve the human environment, to defuse the population explosion, and to supply the required momentum to world development efforts. If such a partnership were not developed within this decade, these problems might reach such staggering proportions that they would be beyond our capacity to control.

A former colleague, Jerry Voorhis, agrees with the contention that changes are needed in the U.N., stating in the July-August 1970 issue of World Federalist magazine that:

The United Nations should be given original authority to stop or prevent wars. It should be able to tell any single nation that it cannot interfere by force in the affairs of any other nation. Czechoslovakia or Vietnam, for example.

The United Nations should be strong

enough to enforce a disarmament treaty so all nations could trust its effectiveness.

If need be, the Charter should be amended to make all this possible.

Mr. Voorhis goes on to point out that taking steps like these:

To save mankind from nuclear death would be a worthy way to observe the 25th anniversary of the United Nations.

He indicates, and I agree, that the United States policy toward the U.N. will have to be drastically altered if these steps are ever going to be undertaken. I am sure that our colleagues will find this article to be most worthwhile, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point:

THE UNITED NATIONS IS 25 YEARS OLD—SO WHAT?

(By Jerry Voorhis)

(Mr. Voorhis is a former US Congressman, educator and author. A world federalist from the early days of the movement, he attended while still a Congressman conferences which led to the formation of the United World Federalists (changed to World Federalists, USA, in 1969). Jerry Voorhis continues to provide active support to the federalist movement in the USA).

Nineteen seventy marks the 25th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations.

On the back pages of newspapers for Wednesday, May 6, 1970, appeared an article which told of a call by the Secretary-General of the United Nations for a conference of "all interested parties to settle the tragic wars raging in Southeast Asia".

It is certainly logical for the Secretary-General to make this proposal in the 25th anniversary year of the founding of the United Nations in 1945.

But tragically enough there is no assurance that the "interested parties" will respond positively to the Secretary-General's appeal.

For Americans the question is what response the United States will give to it.

Surely if the United States government really wants to bring the wars to an end and bring its soldiers home it will immediately accept the proposal of U Thant and challenge other "interested parties" to do likewise.

But there is no assurance that this will happen.

Nor is there assurance of vigorous "all-out" support from the USA for the proposal of 11 Asian UN member nations for a conference to settle the Indo-China wars.

For in recent times the United States has shown far less respect for the United Nations than should have been the case.

Nor have the so-called "great powers" done much better.

Why?

Because the United Nations was created in the first place, and has been, ever since, an institution very different from what the people of the world hoped and believed it was going to be. They hoped and believed that the UN would be an agency of peace, an agency speaking for mankind, a world-wide institution able to stop wars, effect disarmament and keep the peace.

But the "great powers" saw to it that the UN would be no such thing. Instead they hedged it round with all manner of disabilities, only a few of which have been overcome as time has passed.

The United Nations has no original authority of its own. Only that which its members give to it. Its World Court, thus far at least, has only those cases brought before it which both parties to the dispute are willing to submit. The Court has only the jurisdiction which its litigants will give it. It is

like a policeman who would have to get a criminal's permission before he could arrest him.

The United Nations can enter, with teams of observers, or peace-keeping forces, or conciliators, only those countries which consent to let it come. And those countries can tell the UN to get out whenever they please.

The UN cannot raise a dime except what its members voluntarily contribute. It cannot raise a soldier except by appeal to its member nations to supply contingents. United States soldiers are still dying and killing in Southeast Asia for one principal reason: because their country, and others, have refused to make the United Nations strong enough so it could bring about and enforce peace in Southeast Asia or the Middle East or anywhere else in the world.

And yet, despite all its handicaps and weaknesses, the United Nations has accomplished remarkable things in its 25 years of existence.

It has brought literacy, better health, and more efficient food production to millions of people. It has enabled dozens of countries to obtain their independence. In a few cases where the "powers" allowed it to act, it has brought peace to troubled areas. It has provided a world forum where the crimes of nations could be—and are being—exposed to the light of world opinion. It has begun to establish a principle of accountability of nations to the judgment of mankind.

There are urgent problems with which the UN is currently trying to deal.

One of these is chemical and biological weapons—the most diabolical kind of weapons yet devised. So diabolical in fact that even Hitler never used them.

An overwhelming majority of the members of the United Nations are seeking to implement the Protocol of Geneva, agreed to in 1925, which prohibits the use of chemical and biological weapons, and which every major nation on earth has ratified—except the United States. Almost all the member nations of the UN want a strong treaty that would ban the production or use of both chemical and biological weapons.

They had reason for encouragement when, some time ago, Mr. Nixon made a speech renouncing the first use of such weapons by our country.

But the United States now refuses to include chemical weapons. It wants the prohibition to be against biological weapons only. Because we are using chemical weapons all over the place in Southeast Asia. When a resolution was presented in the UN to ban CBWs completely, the United States voted against it. Only Portugal and Australia voted with us.

The 24th General Assembly of the United Nations voted 82 to 0 to ask the United States and Russia to stop the testing and deployment of any more frightful nuclear weapons. Neither of them has done so. On the contrary the United States is going right ahead with full development of the MIRV—the multiple warhead missile that can hit many cities at once.

Most of mankind wants to prevent the beds of the seas from being used for the installation of nuclear weapons. Most of mankind wants to declare the seabeds as the "common heritage of all mankind". The great wealth which lies beneath the seas could then be used to provide desperately needed income for the United Nations and its peace-keeping efforts. Belgium, Norway, Sweden, Ecuador and the Cameroons have proposed such a treaty. The United States has opposed it.

There were eight votes in the last session of the United Nations General Assembly which would have advanced the cause of peace. India, Pakistan, and Ceylon voted

YES on all these eight proposals. Russia supported only three of them. The United States supported only two.

Americans who care about the future of mankind—or about the lives of their own sons—have "homework" to do.

The United Nations should be given original authority to stop or prevent wars. It should be able to tell any single nation that it cannot interfere by force in the affairs of any other nation. Czechoslovakia or Vietnam, for example.

The United Nations should be strong enough to enforce a disarmament treaty so all nations could trust its effectiveness.

If need be, the Charter should be amended to make all this possible.

Taking steps like these, to save mankind from nuclear death would be a worthy way to observe the 25th anniversary of the United Nations.

But if any such steps are to be taken the policy of our own country toward the United Nations will have to undergo something like a complete turn-around. We have to start really seeking peace instead of military dominance.

There is one piece of as yet uncertain evidence that gives a ray of hope.

Life Magazine in its excellent editorial about the 25th anniversary exposes that ray in these words:

A new initiative is also needed to establish peace-keeping machinery on a permanent basis . . .

With big-power agreement—and there are signs the US and Russia seek accommodation in a number of areas—a small UN stand-by force in the next year is attainable. It would be a worthwhile improvement for a world organization which, liabilities notwithstanding, has proved itself consistently useful—and occasionally vital—in its first 25 years, and is well worth sticking with and strengthening now.

ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT TO CONSTITUENTS—PART II

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated last May, it has been my policy since I was first elected to Congress in 1966, send to my constituents in Michigan's 7th District an annual progress report explaining my activities as their Congressman. On May 14, I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD part I of my 1970 progress report.

Having just completed part II of the 1970 progress report, I would like to insert it into the RECORD at this point, so that it will be available to the general public:

YOUR ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT FROM CONGRESSMAN DON RIEGLE, 1969-70, PART II

DEAR FRIEND: This is the second portion of a two-part Annual Report dealing with our work in Congress over the last year—on the issues and problems facing our country. Its purpose—together with Part I which you received several weeks ago—is to provide you with up-to-date information on work done, and on the problems that remain ahead.

As always, this Congressional job belongs to all of us—and I need your help. I work for you, and I need and welcome your comments and suggestions.

Please let me know if I can ever be of help to you or your family.

Sincerely,

DON RIEGLE.

BUILDING A BETTER RELATIONSHIP WITH FRANCE

Since the retirement of Charles DeGaulle and the emergence of the Pompidou Administration, there has been a new opportunity to build a better working relationship between the U.S.A. and France—our oldest ally. Some months ago, Congressman Riegle and Congressman Ottinger (D-NY) co-hosted a group of young French Congressmen who visited Washington and several Congressional districts across the country. The two groups of Congressmen met to discuss common problems facing the two countries—particularly foreign policies concerning S.E. Asia and the Middle East.

These French legislators came to America to compare ideas for making representative government work better—and to develop closer ties with their legislative counterparts in the United States. Ms. Terrenoire, Congressman Riegle's guest, felt the most useful part of his visit was spent in Flint—meeting with local citizens—beginning at 6 a.m. at the Buick Plant gates. Ms. Terrenoire invited the U.S. Congressmen to France for a similar visit, which had the dual purpose of evaluating the Paris Peace Talks on the Vietnam situation.

PARIS PEACE TALKS

A few weeks ago, I was privileged to head a 9 man official bipartisan congressional delegation to France. One important part of our work was a lengthy private session with Ambassador Habib who at that time was the head of the American negotiating team at the Vietnam Peace Talks in Paris. I knew Ambassador Habib before he was asked to head the Peace Talks and his lengthy off-the-record briefing was candid and thorough.

Although I cannot reveal the substance of his remarks, I can relate my own impression of where the "Peace Talks" stand today: The outlook for a negotiated settlement is grim. After some two years at the conference table, virtually no progress has been made. During that period, 20,346 American men have been killed in Vietnam.

It appears that any negotiated settlement would require the formation of a coalition government in South Vietnam—a mixed government that would share power among all major religious, regional, ethnic and political groups in Vietnam. The Thieu/Ky regime, now in power in South Vietnam, refuses to consider sharing power through a negotiated settlement, and the U.S. Government has said it will not force the Thieu/Ky regime to compromise. Meanwhile the war continues, with 2,830 Americans killed during the first 6 months of this year.

While the appointment of a new Ambassador, Mr. David Bruce, is a hopeful sign, the fundamental negotiating positions of the two sides have not changed, and the near-term prospects for a significant breakthrough in the talks are regrettably not good.

KOREA AN IMPORTANT LESSON

As a representative of the Appropriations Committee, Congressman Riegle visited Vietnam and South Korea to evaluate the continuing American military and economic efforts in those countries. A previous study we made of postwar Korea showed that Korea really got on its feet, and became independently strong, only when the U.S. stopped carrying the load.

Based on his briefings and observations in Korea—and along the Korean DMZ—Congressman Riegle formally recommended to the Administration and the Appropriations Foreign Operations Subcommittee, that the remaining American troop level in Korea be

reduced—and finally phased out. It's important to remember that the Korean War ended 17 years ago, and the population of South Korea is about twice as large as that of North Korea.

In a recent statement, the Secretary of Defense announced that an official decision has been reached to finally begin the phased withdrawal of American troops from Korea. Congressman Riegel said: "I am encouraged to see this shift of military responsibility to the South Koreans where it belongs. This is an important breakthrough."

OUR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENT

WORKING TO CUT GOVERNMENT SPENDING—AND CHANGE OUR PRIORITIES

One way to attack the rising cost of living problem is to cut wasteful and unnecessary government spending. Serving on the Appropriations Committee, I share the responsibility for reviewing the entire 200 billion dollar national budget. Thus far this year we have been able to cut over \$7,000,000,000 from the Administration's budget requests. Of course, our job is not just to cut spending but to see that \$'s are properly used where they will do the most good. Clearly the Congress must do a better job in this area.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

This year we continued to seriously question the value and effectiveness of the U.S. Foreign Aid program and took action to cut it back by \$1,175,304,000—the largest reduction in history. My firsthand inspection of AID projects in Thailand, Vietnam, Korea, India, etc. provided convincing evidence that we must reallocate our direct foreign aid assistance to countries on the basis of our strategic security interests. We also have to put more emphasis on helping people help themselves. We are now beginning to move more in this direction.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUBCOMMITTEE

Many of the problems of Washington, D.C. stem from the fact that the citizens of D.C. are denied local self-government. This is wrong and must be changed. To help get at D.C.'s problems, I recently took the unprecedented step of forming a 25 person advisory council of D.C. citizens and professional experts to help me do a better job of representing the citizens of the District of Columbia. This group helped me prepare for our subcommittee budget hearings by providing me a direct grassroots understanding of the District's problems. Many important problems were brought to light—and I intend to continue this practice. Hopefully this effort will provide at least one small bridge toward self-government, while helping to solve the urban problems here in our nation's capital.

YOUR CONGRESSIONAL OFFICE AT WORK 1969-70

WORK WITH INDIVIDUAL CITIZENS

3,411 individual case problems solved.
11,800 letters received and answered.
16,000 special information letters, and individual responses to petition signers.
4 newsletters to each family.

WORK IN THE COMMUNITY

75 local federal aid projects monitored.
1,050 congressional office inquiries and follow-up on local federal programs.
22 working trips back to Genesee and Leeper counties by the Congressman, 86 meetings with local groups, regular neighborhood "office hours" held in area shopping centers, thousands of personal conversations.
190 statements and discussions on issues through local and national press media.

YOUR DISTRICT CONGRESSIONAL OFFICE

34,000+ phone calls received from local citizens.
2,000+ citizens visit to the office with questions or problems.

384 community meetings attended by Congressman's staff.

135 unpaid volunteers pitching in to help bring good congressional service to our community. (if you'd like to help call 239-5705).

ACTION IN CONGRESS

353 votes on legislation.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENT

86 committee meetings.
7 billion dollars + saved by cutting unnecessary spending.

VETERANS

As the daughter of a deceased veteran, I have missed a semester of college because I have been unable to get financial aid from the Veterans Administration. Can you help me?

A quick phone call showed that her application was 8 weeks behind schedule. As a result of this inquiry she received the scholarship in time for the next semester.

INTERNAL REVENUE

I am a minor who was left holding the bag for back taxes on my deceased father's business. It doesn't seem right that I should have to pay all the family debts when I'm not even 21 years old.

The IRS decided he was not a true partner in the firm and therefore not responsible for its debts. All money he had paid in back taxes was reimbursed.

SOCIAL SECURITY

I am totally disabled, losing my sight and struggling to maintain my family, yet Blue Shield contends I am not entitled to additional benefits. I don't want sympathy, only my rightful allotment.

After a brief investigation he received his rightful allotment—an extra \$210.

I don't think my Medicare reimbursement claim will ever come through. I am trying to find out why the delay and am getting nothing but the run-around.

Our intervention forced the immediate correction of the bureaucratic delay and the check was in the mail.

IMMIGRATION

We have 300 children in our congregation school, but no teacher. The man we hired to run the school is in Canada, unable to obtain a visa to enter the U.S. Without a teacher we may have to cancel everything—and school is scheduled to start in 3 days.

Our inquiries showed no legal hang-ups—just thoroughly mixed-up communications. By dealing directly with top federal officials, we were able to bring this man to Flint in time to begin classes on schedule.

MILITARY

I'm home on emergency leave. My wife is ill and hospitalized, facing the possibility of losing our unborn child. My leave expires in 2 days and the Army still has not acted on my request for a hardship discharge.

Extension of leave was granted immediately—shortly thereafter he received a hardship discharge.

TEACHER CORPS

I applied to the Teacher Corps in January; it's now April and still no word. I graduate from college in June and would like to make future plans. Can you please help me?

We found that many Teacher Corps centers were in need of volunteers. The young man is now teaching in Minneapolis.

HANDICAPPED STUDENT

My daughter lost her arms and legs in a car accident but—thank God—has now worked her way back to where she can be a student at Wayne State. The Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, having assured us she would receive money for tuition, room and board, now tells us she can only have half of this aid. Are there any federal programs that could help our daughter?

Upon reexamination, the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation decided the seriousness

of the case—and the girl's valiant personal efforts—merited full financial aid. Funds were allotted and the girl is now in college—and making great progress.

WASHINGTON'S COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM EXPANDS—WITH FLINT'S HELP

A most satisfying accomplishment this year on the D.C. Appropriations Subcommittee was to help in expanding Washington's two "pilot" community schools to a total of 13 community schools for this coming year. In 1967-68, the Mott Foundation and the Flint schools helped start the first two "pilots." Here's what's happened since:

The first two schools showed good results—community involvement of all age groups, increased pride, higher scores in reading and arithmetic, lower rate of vandalism, etc.

We made a formal presentation to former HEW Secretary Finch, who, along with HUD Secretary Romney, has provided Administration interest.

D.C. schools scraped up federal and city money to get four more community schools going.

Based on good results of these first schools, we persuaded Senate and House Appropriations Committee members to fund two more new schools this year.

To help carry on these initiatives, the Mott Foundation agreed to fund five more schools for a full range of community activities—bringing the grand total at this time to 13 schools.

Only by this kind of citizen-government and public-private cooperation can we offer full and equal opportunity for all the citizens of our nation's capital and set an example for other cities across the country.

FENTON HIGH SCHOOL DEDICATION—MARCH 22, 1970

(What follows is a portion of the dedication remarks of Congressman Riegle) . . . "these buildings—this new school—represents an investment in our young people and in the world they will build.

This school was built because this generation believes in the next generation—it is why we tax ourselves today to raise the money necessary to provide the working tools our country needs to build a good tomorrow. This school was built to provide a place where people can learn—about themselves, and about the challenges and opportunities that confront us all.

It is not the outside of these buildings that we dedicate today, rather it's what happens inside these buildings that really counts—and that story is ours to write each day. For we will accomplish here, exactly what we require of ourselves. If we require excellence and do the things necessary to achieve excellence—then that can be one of our accomplishments. And this is true for teachers and students alike.

If we seek to make our students open—and striving—and honest—and loving—and sensitive to the needs of others—then we can accomplish this—perhaps we can form a student volunteer service here—a program where students could do part of their learning outside the school—and inside human and social problems in the community. Most of the young people I know want to be involved in the world around them—and want to participate—want to help—Let's let them do it—let's encourage their contributions of effort.

Why not let them work on the pollution problems here locally. Or, let them organize themselves to help our senior citizens and retirees. I think a young high school person helping an older person take down storm windows is one good way to bridge the generation gap.

AUTO SAFETY AND EMISSION CONTROL

Recently Congressman Riegle spent a day at the General Motors Technical Center, and the G.M. Proving Grounds, to better under-

stand and evaluate progress being made in improving auto safety and controlling automobile exhaust. After briefings by automotive experts and careful examination of the work being done and the results already achieved, Congressman Riegel said, "I was highly encouraged by the quality and quantity of determined effort, underway now for some years by the management and workers of G.M., to solve these two problems. Tremendous progress has been made in building safety features into cars—and I share the belief that we are rapidly approaching the point where further major reductions in traffic fatalities will have to come from improved highway design, driver performance, and by doing a better job of keeping unsafe drivers off the road."

"On control of auto exhaust, several experimental designs are being tested. Present exhaust systems have greatly reduced the amount of air pollution coming from new cars—the remaining challenge is (a) to eliminate all toxic fumes at a cost that will not drive the cost of cars up so far that people stop buying them, and (b) to develop ways for car owners to maintain and service their cars so that exhaust performance will not degenerate to unaccepted levels as the car gets older."

OUR ECONOMY IS IN TROUBLE

The cold facts are that every American family is being hurt by rising prices, rising unemployment, high interest rates, and ever-increasing taxes. Our present national economic policies are wrong and must be changed. I have fought these policies tooth and nail but they persist despite my opposition and the opposition of others.

We must take emergency action to:

Get our unemployed men and women back to work.

Stop the rising cost of living.

Bring interest rates down.

Stop spending tens of billions of dollars in Southeast Asia.

Today the Federal government is spending too much money on the wrong things—such as excessive farm subsidies, Vietnam, the supersonic transport airplane, the space program, the multi-billion dollar ABM white elephant, cost overruns on government contracts, etc. We've got to cut down this massive government spending by eliminating the waste and low priority items.

We must also face up to the continuing wage/price spiral—rising costs and prices which bear no relationship to product improvement and real productivity. We must insist on policies that begin to stabilize the price level—and which are fair to labor and management. More direct Presidential and Congressional action on prices and wages is long overdue.

As you know, last year I voted against the 10% surtax—and I will oppose any request for higher taxes now or in the months ahead, because I believe people are being taxed to death and I'm convinced much of any new tax revenue would be wasted on unnecessary budget items.

IS THERE A NATURAL GAS SHORTAGE?

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 15, 1970

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, many of us are concerned about the accelerating depletion of our energy resources. Some of us are also concerned about the adequacy and reliability of data upon

which Federal and State resource management decisions are based.

The shortage of information is especially crucial regarding the natural gas industry. Congress is partly to blame for this. It has not seen fit to pass the proposed Natural Gas Information Act, S. 3900. This proposed legislation has been recommended by the Federal Power Commission during the tenure of four Commission chairmen: Jerome Kuykendall, Joseph Swidler, Lee White, and John Nassikas. Nor has Congress chosen to act on the Utility Consumers' Information and Counsel Act (S. 607 and H.R. 4866), which would provide legislators, regulators, and the public with basic information that is closely guarded by gas, electric, and telephone companies.

So Congress is not blameless in the matter. On the other hand, the Federal Power Commission appears too ready, if not eager, to accept the gas industry's claims of shortages and requests for higher rates and special bonuses. Substantial testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly indicated that gas producers are not reporting discoveries; producers are collectively withholding gas from the market pending approval of increases which could boost gas costs by from 50 to 100 percent for consumers, utilities, and industrial users.

The distinguished senior Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), chairman of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, has asked the Federal Trade Commission to use its unique authority and determine the gas reserves which the Federal Power Commission is unable to determine. Ongoing events close at hand underscore the need and urgency of such a survey. These events, which involve the Virginia Electric & Power Co., also illustrate how precipitate action by utilities can lead to substantial increases in housing costs as well as utility bills, and decrease construction of needed new housing.

Vepco sells electricity throughout much of Virginia. In addition, Vepco also sells gas in the populous Tidewater area of Virginia. The company is currently spending thousands of dollars advertising the sale of natural gas in the Norfolk area. One would gather from the ads that the company is ready, willing, and able to fulfill its obligation as a public service corporation.

Therefore, I was amazed to learn that this same company which is advertising for increased sale of natural gas has preemptorily moved to discontinue the provision of gas service to new customers. Vepco's senior vice president said that the move was necessary because the company could not assure adequate supplies of gas to customers for the next two winters. This abrupt decision by Vepco could sharply increase utility bills, the housing shortage, and housing costs. Electric heat is conservatively estimated by Virginia architects to be approximately \$5 a month more expensive than gas heat. Furthermore, Federal Housing Administration underwriters have refused to permit the use of electric heat in projects under their jurisdiction because of

high operating costs. The unavailability of gas for new customers will jeopardize needed new housing projects.

In addition, the utility's effort to immediately halt service to new customers adds to the cost of housing designed for gas heating. Extra thousands of dollars will be required for the redrafting of plans. These extra costs will no doubt be passed on to new homeowners, who have already paid to have the housing plans drawn for the use of gas heat. They, the builders, and the architects had every reason to believe that Vepco would fulfill its utility responsibility and provide the gas, as advertised. In elaboration of this point, I shall place in the RECORD later in these remarks a letter from a Norfolk architectural firm which has 1,423 apartment units in various stages of completion, with 560 drawings, including mechanical design and layout, ready for construction, all designed for use of gas fuel, which the utility now says it will not supply.

The only party which stands to benefit from Vepco's refusal to serve will be Vepco. It has a monopoly on electricity, the principal alternative energy source, for the sale of which it obtained a substantial rate increase this year.

The Vepco case illustrates the need for the passage of S. 4013, which would require Vepco and the 77 other combination gas-electric utilities to divest themselves of either the gas or the electric department, in order to encourage competition and its benefits to the consuming public. More immediately, Vepco's actions—its advertising the sale of a fuel it suddenly refuses to supply—suggests that the company either advertises indiscriminately—at the customer's expense, of course—or else is extraordinarily uninformed regarding the availability of one of its principal products.

We must remember that the only information the public has on natural gas supply is what the industry chooses to report. Either industry information is unreliable or else the customers are paying for false and misleading advertising. Senator HART's proposed inquiry by the Federal Trade Commission is in order. The FTC should proceed with thoroughness and dispatch.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter previously referred to, from Irwin M. Kroskin, of the Norfolk architectural firm of Brundage, Cohn, Kroskin & Associates, to Virginia State Senator Henry Howell; Senator Howell's September 10 submission to the Virginia State Corporation Commission; and an article on the subject which was published in the Northern Virginia Sun of September 12, 1970.

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

BRUNDAGE, COHEN,
HOLTON & KROSKIN,
Norfolk, Va., August 17, 1970.

Senator HENRY E. HOWELL,
The State Capitol,
Richmond, Va.

DEAR SIR: The principals in this firm feel that it would be of interest to you in your continuing efforts to "Keep the Big Boys

Honest" to be apprised of one aspect of the recent move by the Virginia Electric and Power Company to discontinue the provision of gas service to new customers as of August 1, 1970.

Multi-family residences comprise approximately 50% of the work in this office and as a firm we are responsible for a large portion of the housing units constructed in Tidewater each year. Apartment projects insured under various Federal Housing Administration programs now account for a definite majority of living units built and many of these are for low-income groups. The increase in construction of these FHA projects, for whatever the reason, does seem to fulfill one of the oft-stated national goals; that of providing housing for the masses.

In recent years the FHA underwriters have refused to permit the use of electric heat in projects under their jurisdiction. Although the initial cost of installation is lower for this equipment than for equipment using any other fuel, the operating costs are so high as to be prohibitive. This fact has resulted in virtually a 100% use of gas-fired equipment for heating in multi-family buildings. This applies to both FHA work and conventionally financed projects. Thus, with all of the "kick-backs" or "advertising allowances", the Gold Medallion program has been unsuccessful in the apartment field. Gas demand continues to increase.

At the present time this office has working drawings for one thousand, four hundred and twenty-three (1,423) apartment units in various stages of completion. The drawings, including mechanical design and layout for five hundred and sixty (560) units, are 100% complete and ready for construction. The working drawings for the eight hundred and sixty-three (863) units are in preparation.

All of these units have been designed for the use of gas fuel which we, unfortunately, assumed was as available as any public utility can be expected to be. This is obviously not the case and in order to proceed with these apartments, the decision will have to be made to provide a mechanical system based on an alternate fuel and the necessary re-design and re-drafting accomplished. The work involved here is considerable and the costs are significant. Of immediate interest to us, and most architects and engineers, is the question of who shall be responsible for the cost incurred in re-doing this work. We, of course, do not feel that the architect or engineer should absorb this cost. The various owners, apparently, are justified in believing that they have paid to have the work done once. Who, then, pays?

The basic point which we wish to emphasize and bring to your attention is that we believe it to be of questionable legality for a public utility to make such an announcement on the same date that it becomes effective. This seems especially true when the policy concerned effects the construction of buildings for which planning and financial arrangements are made far in advance of the actual construction.

As stated before, this is one small aspect of a problem which we believe effects the entire construction industry and probably the entire economy of this part of the state. If we can be of assistance in providing any additional information, do not hesitate to call upon us.

Very truly yours,

IRWIN M. KROSKIN, A.I.A.

PETITION IN OPPOSITION TO THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT FILED BY VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH IT WILL FURNISH GAS TO CUSTOMERS WITHIN ITS TERRITORY

Now comes Henry E. Howell, Jr., in his capacity as a State Senator to the Senate of the General Assembly of Virginia, and intervenes in the above captioned hearing be-

ing held on the application of Virginia Electric and Power Company as above captioned, and petitions this Honorable Commission to deny the application of Virginia Electric and Power Company and to grant other alternative relief as hereinafter set out, for the following reasons, among others to be adduced at the hearing on said application:

First: The City of Norfolk, Virginia, and the State of Virginia, are faced with a critical shortage of low income housing. In particular, the City of Norfolk is a central city which is prevented from expanding its boundary lines by reason of its being adjacent to the Cities of Chesapeake and Virginia Beach. The land area of Norfolk having been fixed, its population expansion and its energetic efforts to rehabilitate old and decadent dwelling units, requires the replacement of these units by low income housing units within the confines of the city. Most of this type of housing is insured under various Federal Housing Administration programs, which in recent years has refused to permit the use of electric heat in projects under its jurisdiction because of the disproportionate high cost of heating and cooling with electricity as compared to gas.

Second: Virginia Electric and Power Company is a utility which enjoys a monopoly in the City of Norfolk and in other areas of Virginia with respect to the supplying of both electricity and the competing fuel, gas. Recently the Virginia Electric and Power Company has secured a sharp and inflationary increase in its electrical rates and it is to its advantage to have new dwelling units built to be heated and cooled exclusively by electricity rather than by the more economical and more efficient gas energy.

Third: If Virginia Electric and Power Company is permitted to amend its schedule so as not to provide gas to new dwellings after August 1, 1970, the tenants who will occupy any new units built will have saddled upon them the high cost of electricity for the life of the new units, estimated at fifty (50) years and, therefore, tenants will be irreparably harmed for half a century or more if Virginia Electric and Power Company is permitted to create a condition where electricity will be the only source of energy available for the next year or longer.

Fourth: In addition, every citizen who builds his own private residence during the coming year will find that heating and cooling with gas is much more economical than with electricity and if Virginia Electric and Power Company be permitted to refuse to furnish gas to these citizens, they will be saddled with the high cost of electricity for the life of the home.

Fifth: At the same time that Virginia Electric and Power Company is petitioning not to furnish gas to new dwellings after August 1, 1970, it is spending thousands upon thousands of dollars in billboard and bus-side advertising, advertising gas as a fuel to be used in the Norfolk area. Such conflicting corporate action constitutes fiscal irresponsibility and results in the cost of the irrelevant and immaterial advertising promoting the use of gas to be fed into its cost of doing business and to be ultimately reflected in the rates charged to consumers.

Sixth: Utilities that exclusively furnish gas, without furnishing the conflicting competing product of electricity, are not seeking to cut off new gas customers.

Seventh: Portsmouth Gas Company, which furnishes gas to Portsmouth, Virginia, is seeking no such limitation as that sought by Virginia Electric and Power Company.

Eighth: Washington Gas Light Company, which furnishes gas to the populous, booming area of Northern Virginia, has requested no limitation that will affect residential construction, either low cost or high cost. Washington Gas Light Company has found it necessary to limit new customers to 300,000 cubic feet per day, which would limit to some

extent large industrial users, but would in no way limit residential construction.

Ninth: The Federal Power Commission is currently holding hearings regarding natural gas supplies and Virginia Electric and Power Company should not be permitted to cease furnishing natural gas for residential purposes during the pendency of these hearings.

Tenth: Admittedly, there is a potential shortage in the future for large industrial users of natural gas by reason of the fact that 83% of proven gas reserves are controlled by twenty of the United States' largest petroleum companies, who are seeking to force a price increase of up to 60% from the Federal Power Commission by conspiring to cut off normal gas supplies to local distributors, but this illegal price fixing anti-trust action on the part of these large petroleum companies is not affecting the ability of other gas distributors in Virginia to furnish the needs for new residential dwellings during the coming year.

Eleventh: To permit the Virginia Electric and Power Company to refuse to furnish gas for new residential units after August 1, 1970, while other areas of the state would have available natural gas for new dwelling units would constitute a discriminatory and unconstitutional practice within the State of Virginia.

Wherefore, your petitioner prays:

(1) That the application of Virginia Electric and Power Company be denied;

(2) That Virginia Electric and Power Company be required to intervene before the Federal Power Commission and present a case to insure that it receives adequate natural gas supplies for its territory at reasonable prices;

(3) That if Commonwealth Natural Gas Corporation cannot furnish Virginia Electric and Power Company with adequate resources of natural gas for new residential units after August 1, 1970, Virginia Electric and Power Company be required to seek other sources of natural gas;

(4) That if Virginia Electric and Power Company cannot obtain adequate sources of natural gas to supply its territories, including the territories of Norfolk and Newport News, that it be required to divest itself of its exclusive franchise license and permit to distribute both electrical energy and its competitive source, gas.

Respectfully submitted,

HENRY E. HOWELL, JR. (Pro se and on behalf of his constituents in the City of Norfolk, Virginia.)

State of Virginia, City of Norfolk, to-wit:

This day personally appeared before me, Catherine J. Crane, a Notary Public of and for the City aforesaid in the State of Virginia, Henry E. Howell, Jr., who after being by me first duly sworn, deposed and said as follows:

That he is the petitioner in the foregoing petition; that he has read the foregoing petition and that the facts contained therein are true to the best of his information, knowledge and belief; that the basis for his information and belief is conversations he has had with officials of the Portsmouth Gas Company, Washington Light Power Company and with architects familiar with the material related herein.

And further this deponent saith not.

HENRY E. HOWELL, JR.

Given under my hand this 10th day of September, 1970.

CATHERINE J. CRANE,

Notary Public.

My commission expires November 11, 1973.

[From the Northern Virginia Sun, Sept. 12, 1970]

VEPCO ASKS PERMISSION TO REFUSE NEW TIDEWATER NATURAL GAS SERVICE

(By Jeffrey C. Reynolds)

RICHMOND.—The Virginia Electric and Power Co. yesterday asked the State Corpo-

ration Commission for permission to refuse natural gas service to new customers in the Tidewater area. The SCC took the request under advisement.

E. B. Crutchfield, VEPCO's senior vice president, said the move was necessary because the utility's supplier is unable to provide sufficient additional amounts to guarantee adequate service for the next two winters.

State Sen. Henry E. Howell, D-Norfolk, intervened in opposition to the VEPCO petition.

Crutchfield said VEPCO's supplier, Commonwealth Gas Co., notified him last May that it could supply only about 50 percent of VEPCO's request for additional natural gas for the 1970-71 heating season and could not guarantee that the situation would improve by 1971-72.

The executive said rather than curtail supplies for existing consumers in the Tidewater area, there was "no alternative" but to deny service to commitments made after last Aug. 1. He said the policy would not apply to single-family homes on existing pipelines.

Crutchfield said VEPCO began supplying natural gas in the Tidewater area in 1951 and pumped out 9.6 million cubic feet daily. By 1967, he said, the figure had risen to 131 million.

The federal power commission has been asked to approve a 60 percent increase in natural gas rates.

"There are reliable reports that the petroleum industry . . . is participating in a concerted action to produce a critical shortage of natural gas in an effort to coerce" the FPC into granting the increase, Howell said.

Howell wonder why VEPCO's supplier is short of gas when the Washington Gas Light Co., which serves Northern Virginia, reports it has "plenty of gas."

The senator said while the embargo is only for two years, apartments installing electricity—with VEPCO also provides—would "be forced to heat and cool by electricity and the people forced to pay the higher rates not only this year, but for the next 50 years," the estimated life of the dwelling.

Howell produced a Norfolk architect, Irwin Kroskin, who testified that natural gas "provides the lowest operating costs of all fuels available." Kroskin said the VEPCO proposal would affect about 7,500 Tidewater units, many of them for low-income persons.

He said the Federal Housing Administration generally will not approve low-cost housing loans which feature electrical heat unless there is no other source available. He said natural gas, while a more expensive installation, is 25 to 50 percent cheaper to use than electricity.

Crutchfield said by 1971-72 VEPCO expects to have enough storage facilities and the means to convert liquid propane gas to natural gas to alleviate the shortage.

Howell said the SCC should either deny VEPCO's request, compel VEPCO to appear before the FPC and demand additional gas supplies, postpone the hearing until the FPC rules or "order VEPCO to divest itself" of its natural gas interests and concentrate on electricity.

CAN A BLACK MAN GET A FAIR TRIAL IN THIS COUNTRY?

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1970

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following item from the New York Times Magazine of July 12, 1970:

CAN A BLACK MAN GET A FAIR TRIAL IN THIS COUNTRY?

(By Haywood Burns)

"I am appalled and ashamed that things should have come to such a pass that I am skeptical of the ability of black revolutionaries to achieve a fair trial anywhere in the United States.

"In large part the atmosphere has been created by police actions and prosecutions against the Panthers in many parts of the country. It is also one more inheritance from centuries of racial discrimination and oppression."

When Yale president Kingman Brewster recently expressed these doubts about the possibility of a black revolutionary receiving a fair trial in the United States today, there was an immediate outcry. The judge in the New Haven Black Panther trial took Brewster to task for his statement, and the Vice President of the United States had some rather unkind comments for the Yale president. There are, however, more and more persons who not only share Brewster's doubts as they apply to revolutionaries but also wonder whether any black man in America can receive a fair trial.

Given the special relationship blacks have had to the law since they were brought to this country, such doubts are more than reasonable. Whereas white Americans are accustomed to viewing the law as an historic vehicle through which liberties have been progressively expanded, black Americans have experienced law in quite another fashion. From the very first, American law has been the handmaiden of American racism. It has been the means by which the generalized racism in the society has been made specific and converted into the particularized policies and standards of social control.

So many of the milestones in the early history of liberty in this country are emblazoned with the exception: "But not for blacks." Thus, black people cannot view the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution or Jacksonian democracy in the same lofty manner as many who see them as triumphs of liberty; for the early Americans who sought freedom so assiduously for themselves, at the same time so cruelly denied it to others in their midst.

For so much of the past, the law rather than being a tool for expanding liberty, has been an implement for constricting, downgrading and narrowing the possibilities for blacks. It was the law which institutionalized American chattel slavery (by making black bondage life-long and later hereditary). It was the law which provided the onerous slave codes to govern in oppressive detail the lives of millions of blacks until their emancipation, and which returned to perform the same function through the notorious Black Codes after emancipation. It was with the law that the architects of segregation built a Jim Crow society which is still intact a decade and a half after Brown v. Board of Education and more than a century after the Emancipation Proclamation.

For long stretches of American history in many parts of the country, black people lacked any legal personality whatsoever. By law they were excluded from bringing lawsuits to protect their rights. There was no legal recourse for injury to themselves or their property. They were not even allowed to take the witness stand to testify in cases where the interests of white persons were involved. Nor were they permitted to serve on juries. In the criminal area—it is the criminal case that I shall concentrate on in this article—the penalties the law prescribed for blacks were often different from those prescribed for whites for the same offense.

Perhaps the most striking example of the latter disparity is the way in which certain

jurisdictions reserved the penalty of sexual mutilation for blacks and Indians accused of interracial sex crimes. A reading of the statutes provides insights into the psychosocial pathology of white America—of its fear of letting black men be men; of its need to deprive them of their manhood; of its artfulness in employing the law in this base service. As recently as the mid-nineteenth century, white men sat in the Kansas Legislature and introduced, debated and passed legislation which provided that the penalty for any black convicted of attempting to compel a white woman to marry should be castration "by some skillful person," the cost of such a procedure to be charged to the convicted person. The penalty for corresponding acts by white persons was "confinement and hard labor not less than five years."

The Agnews and the present-day guardians of the American judicial system often have little patience with such discussions of the past. References to past legal unpleasantness, at best, are seen as irrelevant diversions from the present point, and at worst, as inflammatory devices which hinder a cool, contemporary and pragmatic approach to the closing of what are seen as minor gaps in the legal system. The fact that the explicit racial distinctions have for the most part been removed from the statute books, and that, in a formal sense, race has ceased to be an articulated ground for judicial decision, is for many sufficient proof that our avowedly neutral system of justice is both neutral and just.

This impatience with history would be justified if America had, in fact, somehow accomplished the impossible task of severing the past and completely exorcising the demons of old. However, in truth, the past of the American legal system is inextricably bound up with its present. Many of the same forces which kept blacks out of the courts or imposed harsher penalties on them in the past are at work today, militating against any black man receiving full justice in an American court.

The barriers to fairness are basically of two kinds: (1) personal—those related to the racial views and attitudes of persons responsible for the day-to-day administration of justice; and (2) structural—those related to the nature of our legal system itself, its procedural rules and substantive doctrines. Sometimes the barriers are a hybrid combination of both.

The manifestations of racism in the legal system today may be more subtle than many of those of the past, but they are not necessarily less pernicious. As their cases make their way through the courts, black lawyers and litigants must still often sustain personal indignities from biased judges and other court personnel. Despite United States Supreme Court disapproval of the practice, it is still not uncommon to find judges and prosecutors who fail to use the courtesy titles "Mr.," "Mrs.," or "Miss" when addressing black defendants, and in some cases when addressing black lawyers. Similarly, normally expected courtesies often fall away when court attendants, clerks, bailiffs and marshals find themselves dealing with blacks.

Recently, I appeared with two other black lawyers before a Federal judge in the South, challenging employment discrimination against our black clients. Early in the legal proceedings, much to his consternation, we had taken exception to the judge referring to our clients as "nigras." At the very beginning of the trial itself, the judge told us in no uncertain terms that "nigra" was listed in his dictionary as a regional pronunciation for "Negro" (he did not point out that it is a white "regional pronunciation"), and that for the balance of the proceedings he and anyone else in the courtroom could use the term. By instant judicial decree we then had become nigra lawyers pressing the claims of

nigra clients in a white man's court. A corollary of the judge's pronouncement was that we were not to use the term "black" in referring to our clients and the racial community from which they came, since it was not the term traditionally used in "our jurisprudence."

This is by no means to suggest that what we are contending with is exclusively a Southern phenomenon. Daily, in courts throughout the country, black and poor defendants suffer the humiliations of a legal system which refuses to accord them full recognition of their dignity as human beings. In February of this year, Judge John M. Murtagh, presiding at the New York Panther conspiracy trial, ordered the pretrial hearings recessed and the defendants remanded to jail until all of them gave him a promise that they would deport themselves at the hearings in a manner in keeping with his standards of "good conduct."

A group of lawyers from the National Conference of Black Lawyers challenged the constitutionality of Judge Murtagh's action by petitioning for a writ of *habeas corpus* in the Supreme Court of Queens County, the area where the defendants were being held. When the defendants refused to comply with Judge Murtagh's demand, it appeared that they would be jailed indefinitely, awaiting trial. The *habeas corpus* action of the black lawyers on their behalf was something of a psychological victory for the Panther defendants because it enabled them to get back into court—in another jurisdiction—to carry on their struggle without having had to comply with the demands of the New York County trial judge.

However, when the 11 defendants were led into the courtroom for the argument on the petition they found that no chairs had been provided for them next to the counsel table. They were told to sit on the floor. They did so slowly, reluctantly; only the tensing of their bodies and their facial expressions betrayed their controlled fury. All this was demeaning for the proud young black men, but no less so for "the dignity of the court." Eleven might be considerably more than the average number of defendants in a criminal case, but not so many more that the largesse of New York State was incapable of providing seats for them.

Outside courtrooms the clerk's office is an area where personal attitudes can impair fairness. Lower-level clerks are often extremely powerful persons in the bureaucratic machinery of justice and they can use this power in an obstructionist and hostile manner when they do not like the people or the issue involved. This is seldom blatant, but can be seen in differences in flexibility and cooperativeness, and in the way normally straightforward matters can suddenly become complicated—as, for example, with the simple act of incorporating an organization or group when that group happens to have the word "black" in its title.

Biased judges use procedural devices and their judicial discretion to avoid ruling in favor of blacks when the legal mandate in their favor is clear. This is true in a wide variety of areas, but perhaps most obviously with many Southern judges in civil-rights cases. In general, judicial or administrative discretion can be used to cloak racism in sentencing, parole and probation.

Unexpressed racial bias creeps in to pollute the process—North and South—without fear of being exposed or proved. While it may not always be possible to show the bias in an individual case, an examination of statistical patterns demonstrates the disparity in treatment received by black and white persons convicted of crime. It is impossible to determine to what extent disparities are related to individual bias and to what extent they flow from a built-in systemic inequity, but there can be no argument with the fact of the disparity.

Blacks usually receive longer prison sentences than whites for most criminal offenses. A study of persons convicted of burglary and auto theft in Los Angeles County, most of them first offenders and unskilled laborers, revealed that on the average whites were treated much less severely than blacks. Forty-five per cent of the whites and 27 per cent of the blacks were given sentences for these crimes of four months' imprisonment or less, or probation; 42 per cent of the whites and 47 per cent of the blacks received four to nine months; and 13 per cent of the whites and 27 per cent of the blacks got 10 to 20 months.

A 1951 study showed that the average number of months served before release in all the states was 25 for blacks and 20 for whites. The disparity was greatest in the West and the Northeast. Proportionately about 10 to 14 percent more whites than blacks are annually "released conditionally" or granted some kind of parole. This racial disparity in the granting of parole helps to keep the percentage of blacks in the prison population high. According to reports in National Prison Statistics, blacks comprise about one-third of all prisoners, though they make up only about 11 per cent of the general population.

Some of the most glaring disparities occur in sentences imposed for capital crimes. According to the Bureau of Prisons, 3,857 persons were executed in the United States between 1930 and 1966; 53.5 per cent of these were black, 45.4 per cent were white and 1.1 per cent were members of other minority groups. Not only is it less likely that a white person will be sentenced to the electric chair, gas chamber, gallows or firing squad, but the workings of executive and administrative discretion are such that, once condemned to die, a white person is more likely to have his sentence commuted to life imprisonment by a governmental executive board of pardons or similar agency. Marvin E. Wolfgang, the noted criminologist, reports that among those condemned to die, between 10 and 20 per cent more blacks than whites are actually executed.

White America still reserves special penalties for blacks convicted of sex crimes—especially interracial sex crimes. National Prison Statistics shows that of the 19 jurisdictions that have executed men for rape since 1930, almost one-third of them—six states—have executed only blacks. There have been some years in which everyone who was executed for rape in this country was black. Detailed state-by-state analysis has shown that the discrepancy in death sentences for rape is related to the race of the victim.

Blacks raping blacks is apparently less serious than whites raping whites, and certainly less serious than whites raping blacks. But the black man today convicted of raping a white woman can be as certain of receiving the harshest treatment as was a Kansas black convicted of an interracial sex crime in 1855. For example, in Florida between 1960 and 1964, of the 125 white males who raped white females, six—or about 5 per cent—received death sentences (four of these involved attacks on children). Of the 68 black males in the same period who were convicted in Florida of raping black females, three—or about 4 per cent—received death sentences; and this when in two cases the victims were children. However, of the 84 blacks (same period, same state) convicted of raping white women, 45—or 54 per cent—received the death sentence; only one of these cases involved an attack on a juvenile. None of the eight white men who raped black women was sentenced to death.

Although there have not been sufficient detailed statistical analyses, available evidence indicates that black youths are more likely to be condemned to death and exec-

uted than the children of white parents. One study has shown that between 1950 and 1953, nine teen-agers were executed in the United States—seven black, two white. In 1954, 10 teen-agers were executed—seven in Georgia, two in New York, and one in Florida. All were black.

Just as with their elders, black youths can expect a difference in what the system of justice metes out to them and to others. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice found that almost all youths committed acts for which they could be arrested and taken to court. However, the commission also found that the likelihood of a youth being arrested and taken to court varied according to where he lived. Juveniles from the nation's ghettos were much more likely to be arrested as delinquents than youths from white suburbia.

Of course, a good deal of the difference may be attributed to the cold sociological fact that certain kinds of condition of economic deprivation breed more so-called "antisocial" acts. But it must also be attributed to the differences in the way the police and the courts perform. If a suburban youth is arrested, it is more likely that some disposition will be worked out which will not involve incarceration. A ghetto youth will seldom find a policeman cautious about making an arrest merely because the youth is the son of a community leader, any more than in court will his parents be able to provide private counsel, private psychiatrists or to make an impression with personal prestige of their own as their child's fate is weighed in the balance.

Black people distrust the judicial system not only because of what happens to them when they are caught up in its machinery, but because of the failings of the legal system they witness when blacks are the victims. Black people wonder why no arrest was made last winter in Indiana when guards at the Pendleton Reformatory systematically shot unarmed black prisoners engaging in a sit-down demonstration. Black people wonder why there were no arrests in Brooklyn recently when a group of off-duty policemen fell upon and savagely beat Black Panther party members in the halls of the courthouse. Black people wonder why in Chicago—particularly after the Federal grand jury report—no one was arrested for the murderous late-night submachine-gun assault upon nine young Black Panthers. Black people wonder why in Mississippi there was never a murder prosecution of the men charged with snuffing out the lives of James Chaney, Andrew Goodman and Michael Schwerner (the Federal prosecution for violating the civil rights of the three was hardly a sufficient response for so heinous a crime).

Black people wonder why in November 1969, white radicals charged with bombing several New York buildings could have their bail reduced by 80 per cent to a reasonable amount in two days, while Black Panthers have languished in jail under unreasonable bail for 15 months for allegedly plotting to blow up the Botanical Garden.

Black people wonder why white men's juries in Michigan or Mississippi cannot find it in the evidence—or perhaps, even with the evidence, in their hearts—to convict white men for killing unknown blacks in the Algiers Motel in Detroit, or Medgar Evers in front of his home in Jackson. Black people wonder.

Blacks are no longer barred, because they are black, from bringing lawsuits or giving testimony in American courts. They have the legal capacity to give testimony no matter whose rights are involved. However, the weight that testimony is accorded is another matter. British barrister Anthony Lester conducted a study of state courts in the Deep South in 1964 and reported in his

"Justice in the American South" that "whenever there was a conflict of evidence between Negro and white, the judge appeared automatically to believe the white man. On no occasion was a policeman's evidence challenged."

Though this situation may have changed somewhat since Lester made his study, it is the general experience of lawyers who represent blacks—North, South, East and West—that judges and juries seldom accord the testimony of nonwhites the same weight as that of whites. When the issue is one of credibility, one white witness on one side of a lawsuit often cancels out several non-white witnesses on the other.

I recently represented some young black defendants who had been stopped by the police in the Bronx, allegedly for an infraction of the traffic laws. Prompted by a racial remark from one of the officers, a verbal duel between the young men and the officers ensued, in which the officers were outwitted. The result was that the young men were jailed on a long string of charges, including resisting arrest and inciting to riot. The defendants, though disturbed by the treatment they received, were not overly concerned about their trial since there had been so many people at the site of the incident who had seen that the most that had occurred was an argument between the police and the defendants.

By way of defense, I put on a large group of these witnesses—all black or Puerto Rican—most of whom did not know the defendants and who had no personal interest in testifying. Despite the disinterestedness of our witnesses and their number, the court chose to believe the policemen, on all but the most serious of the charges, and convicted the defendants. The impact of this lesson in credibility was strong, both on the defendants and on some of the spectators.

One of the defendants indicated to me that some of his worst notions about the workings of American justice had been confirmed and that the lesson he took away from the experience was in the future to resist unwarranted police action directed at himself, since he would probably be charged with doing so anyway. One boy of 11 or 12 who had seen the arrest and been at the trial blurted out to me at its conclusion, "Wow, if that's what happens to you in courts, I ain't gonna stop if a cop ever tells me to stop. I'm gonna run. Those guys didn't do nuthin'!"

It has long been the law that systematic exclusion of blacks from grand and petit juries is unconstitutional. In 1880 in *Strauder v. West Virginia*, the Supreme Court overturned a state statute which explicitly limited jury service to whites. Nonetheless, jury selection procedures are still such that it is difficult for blacks to obtain juries on which members of their race are fairly represented. Jury-qualification rules, the discretion left to jury commissioners and the lists selected as the source of prospective jurors have resulted in gross underrepresentation of the young, the black and the poor. Legal scholar Michael O. Finkelstein has recently documented the fact of racial exclusion in several Northern communities. His analysis of venire records of persons selected for grand juries in Manhattan, the Bronx and Westchester revealed that Harlem districts with heavy black populations contributed less than 1 per cent of the Manhattan veniremen, although they comprised 11 per cent of the voting population.

If there had been a random selection of jurors, it would have been virtually impossible for discrepancies this large to occur. According to Wolfgang and Cohen in their study "Crime and Race," the mathematical probability that the Manhattan grand jury venires in 1967 would have had the racial composition they did have through chance was smaller than the probability of being

dealt 24 consecutive royal flushes in an honest game of five-card draw poker. Finkelstein also showed that in Westchester towns with large black populations—Mount Vernon, New Rochelle and Yonkers—blacks were represented almost not at all on the jury rolls.

It is not enough, however, to get blacks on the rolls as prospective jurors, for there still remains means of assuring that they do not serve. Throughout the country in cases involving black defendants, prosecutors use their allotted peremptory strikes to make sure that, so far as possible, the outcome will be determined by a white jury. Thus, legions of black men must still have their fates decided by juries from which members of their own race have been systematically excluded. A prosecutor is not required to give any reason when he uses his peremptory strikes to remove prospective jurors from the jury panel. The Supreme Court, while continuing to hold explicit exclusion invalid, in *Swain v. Alabama* (1965) has sustained this use of the peremptory strike.

Some of the greatest barriers to blacks receiving fair treatment in the courts today rise not so much from direct racial antipathies as from the structure of the law itself. It is here that the link from the past to the present is most clearly revealed. Historically, the men who made the laws were for the most part explicitly hostile to the interests of the poor and the nonwhite, or at least ignored them. This historic hostility and neglect have brought about a structural inequality through which the law, by its substantive doctrines and procedural rules, works invidious discriminations against the poor and the nonwhite.

Intent is not necessary. Institutionalized bias need never make reference to race or class to remain in its operation and impact highly discriminatory. The structural inequality represents a confluence of caste and class bias in the law in which poor whites are deeply affected, too.

On its face, the structural inequality relates largely to differences in the economic status of individuals, but it has a peculiarly racial dimension since such a widely disproportionate number of the poor in this country is non-white. Even without bad motives on the part of those who administer the system of justice, the continued application of the legal system in this way is racist because of the way in which it perpetuates past racial wrongs. It batters upon blacks' depressed condition, for which racial injustices were largely responsible in the first place.

A prime example of the structural inequality in the law, and one which results in massive systemic unfairness to the typical nonwhite brought before the courts, is the operation of the money-bail system. Two accused persons can be in otherwise comparable situations—length of time in the community, length of time steadily employed, number of dependents and family obligations—except that one has money and the other does not. Upon arraignment on a criminal charge, one will walk free until the time of trial, the other will be locked up—though both are equally presumed innocent.

The city jails across the country are filled to overcrowding with the poor and nonwhite who must serve weeks, months, and sometimes more than a year in jail before coming to trial. In many cases the amount of bail is nominal—but even \$25 is a considerable sum if you have not got it.

Statistically, the jailed defendant has much less chance of being acquitted than the bailed defendant. The defendant who comes to trial from the streets will have had greater access to his lawyer in preparing his defense, and having been at liberty will be able to arrive in court with a demeanor that will not cause those trying him to associate him readily with criminal-

ity. Jail in lieu of fines for indigents, creditor-biased consumer law, landlord-biased tenant law, lack of due process before administrative agencies which deal with the poor are but a few further examples of the law's structural inequality.

Many of the revolutionaries of whom Kingman Brewster spoke have identified some or all of these impediments to fairness endemic to the present legal system. They have no expectation of an acquittal when charged with crimes in connection with their political activity, for they know that they face not only the institutional bias against black defendants, but the political animus as well that is reserved for those that are perceived as a serious threat to things as they are.

As far as the legal system is concerned, the question becomes, as it did with Debs and with Sacco and Vanzetti and other unpopular defendants, not so much whether the defendants are guilty or innocent, in the sense of having committed or not committed certain acts, but whether in the present political climate such a determination can be made fairly.

Brewster and persons both in and outside the legal community admit to skepticism on this point. Many black revolutionaries have answered the question firmly in the negative. Having made this assessment of the legal system and their chances within it, many revolutionary defendants have ceased to look upon the courtroom as an arena in which a contest for and against their exoneration is waged, but rather as a platform to expose the failings of the legal system, to educate and politicize a larger public—to indict the system. What has so often been characterized as disruption is often less a calculated attempt to impede the progress of their trial than it is a refusal to sit silent when being subjected to personal affronts.

If such defendants believe someone is lying about them, they say so. If they believe their constitutional rights are being abridged, they say so. If they believe the judge is behaving in a racist fashion, they say so—and in their own terms. This refusal to accept the rules of the judicial game stems from a judgment on their part that the game is fixed.

In their minds there is no reason to sit passively by or to participate cooperatively in a process that is designed for their own destruction. As revolutionaries they believe it is their obligation to behave as revolutionaries wherever they find themselves—in the streets, in the courtroom, in jail. If this conduct is calculated at all, it is calculated to make manifest the latent bias which these defendants believe is rife in the legal system, to bring to the surface the vicious antipathies that would otherwise be masked by the niceties of legal rules.

This approach sometimes results in something of a self-fulfilling prophecy. It has, in fact, often provoked extreme judicial responses which were subversive of the rights of the defendants and in violation of the accepted legal standards of a fair trial.

What is the role of the black lawyer in this whole process? If there is structural inequality in the machinery of justice in this country, is not the lawyer guilty of complicity when he participates in this process? Is he not, in fact, an agent of the system?

The answer has to be that of course he is, but as one activist black lawyer recently said, "The lawyer must be a double agent." He participates in the process, but he can do so in such a way as to maximize the protection and the gains that are possible for oppressed persons under the existing order. He can use the rules of the very system that many of the oppressed are challenging to insulate them so that the can continue to go about the business of challenge.

The legal system has so far proved unable to eradicate racism from American society,

in large part because it is itself so severely tainted with racism. But the law is much too valuable a weapon in the struggle for major social change to be discarded for this reason. Not only can it serve as an insulator of the activist, but experience has shown that through test case litigation it is possible to correct at least some of its structural inequality.

It is unrealistic, however, to speak of major structural change and fairness to blacks in the legal system without examining the social context in which law operates. In many ways, the law merely reflects the larger society. It is unreasonable to think that in a racist society the law, or any institution, can completely transcend that racism. Changing the law involves changing America. In a nation of inverted priorities, misallocated resources and inhumane, materialistic values, it is too much to expect that the law will provide the fairness and justice to the poor and the nonwhite that is being denied them in every other sector of society.

There will not be institutional fairness for blacks in the courts until there is fairness for blacks in America. This relates not only to the structure of the law in terms of its procedural and substantive rules, but to the personal level as well. It is folly to say that ours is a government of laws, not men. Laws are made, interpreted and applied by men—and in America's case by men in a racist society. Ultimately, there is the simple and obvious truth that the judicial system is run by people, mostly by white people and that most white people are racially biased.

The likelihood of the legal process being entirely uncontaminated by bias in any given case is small. Individual blacks can and do win civil suits and individual blacks can and are acquitted of criminal charges, but in an institutional sense in almost all instances the law functions in a discriminatory and unfair manner when blacks (and poor people) are involved.

Can a black man get a fair trial in the United States? If by fair one means free of bias, the answer has to be generally "no."

LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS NEED "TOOLS" TO WORK WITH

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1970

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested that the administration is somehow to blame for the lack of new anticrime laws. Any such suggestion is merely an attempt to shift the blame from where it belongs. Since the beginning of the 91st Congress, over 20 major proposals have been advanced by President Nixon to combat crime in this country. Yet, as of this moment, only one of these has been enacted into law, and that one applies only to the District of Columbia. Other legislation has been submitted which comprehensively covers measures against organized crime, terror bombing, drug peddlers, pornography, and provides for increased controls of parole and probation procedures as well as increased assistance to State and local enforcement agencies. No final action has been taken on any of these vital measures. Why?

During the 1960's the crime rate increased seven times faster than the population, with felonies doubling the 1960

rate. The problem is real and is upon us. But law enforcement officials are still not being given tools by the Congress. It is time we acted. It is time we provided the legislation necessary to increase the law and order capabilities of our Nation's enforcement agencies.

SENATOR SCOTT'S POSITION ON CONSERVATION

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 15, 1970

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, on Sunday, September 13, candidates for the U.S. Congress were asked to answer questions submitted by members of the northeast division of the Pennsylvania Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, John Anderson, president of the northeast division of the federation, presided and asked a number of questions from the chair. These questions and Senator Scott's answers develop a number of environmental issues of considerable importance to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Nation. I ask unanimous consent to have these questions and answers printed in the Record.

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

QUESTIONS FROM THE CHAIR TO OUR U.S. LEGISLATORS AND CANDIDATES

Are you in favor of and will you vote for:

1. Uneven flow of cold water from the Cannonsville and Delhi Dams in the Delaware River causing adverse affects on spawning of fish and the use of the water for recreation.

Answer. I have been in touch with the Delaware River Basin Commission to try and find some solution to the uneven water flow and temperature variances resulting from the lack of a uniform water release policy at the Cannonsville and Delhi Dams. These dams are under the administration of the City of New York. Several years ago, Congressman McDade and I were successful in working out an informal uniform flow agreement. Recent fish spawning problems indicate that the City of New York is no longer abiding by this agreement. If the Delaware River Basin cannot stop these uneven releases, I will introduce legislation to correct the problem. I do not intend to permit further harm to the recreation and sport-fishing potential of the upper Delaware.

2. Proposed sale of federal lands by the present administration.

Answer. Sale of surplus Federal land may be authorized by an Executive Order by the President. This order need not be ratified by Congress. Under an Executive Order recently signed by President Nixon, each Federal Department and agency head was asked to designate the surplus lands under his control. I contacted Secretary Hickel and received an assurance from him that no National Parks, National Forests, nor Wildlife refuges would be considered surplus. Our wildlife refuges are an important part of our national heritage. I will fight any attempt to sell even one square foot of refuge land.

3. Use of chemical defoliants on our highways, power lines, gas lines, railroads, etc.

Answer. The need for more effective legislation in this area is underlined by my recent experience in the Clavarrack Electric Company matter. After receiving a copy of a

letter from North East Federation President John Anderson complaining that the Electric Company was spraying valuable game land adjacent to its power lines with lethal chemical defoliants, I contacted Secretary Maurice Goddard of the Commonwealth Department of Forests and Waters, and Secretary Leland Bull of the Commonwealth Department of Agriculture. Neither of these gentlemen had the authority to take specific administrative action to stop the spraying.

In February, 1969, I was the first national legislator to call attention to the threat posed by insecticide, pesticide and herbicide use. High concentrations of DDT and other lethal chemical agents were discovered in coho salmon catches. My warning and subsequent call for Senate hearings produced action. The Senate Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources and the Environment held hearings on this danger. The response has been gratifying. Secretary of Agriculture Hardin banned many pesticides and herbicides with a high DDT content. I am working to secure passage of tough new legislation before the end of the Ninety-first Congress. Next year, Federal officials will have the authority to stop dangerous spraying.

4. Atomic reactor plants—in particular the one proposed at Meshoppen, Pennsylvania, on the Susquehanna River.

Answer. I have opposed and will continue to oppose nuclear power plants that pose a threat to the health and living environment of our Commonwealth's citizens. On September 1, in a letter to Glenn Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, I expressed my opposition to the construction of the Meshoppen fast breeder reactor as long as regulatory officials felt there was the slightest danger to the public health and safety. I also solicited assurances from the AEC that environmental considerations would be given great weight during the application process—even to the extent of denying the required licenses. Our power generating capacity must be expanded to meet our growing needs but not at the expense of the health and environmental rights of Commonwealth citizens.

5. Make available surplus grain to sportsmen's clubs raising game that is released on land open to public hunting.

Answer. I am in favor of and will vote for any legislation to make surplus grain available to sportsmen's clubs raising game for release on lands open to public hunting. A precedent for this action already exists under Public Law 87-152. On February 11, 1970, I used this legislation as the basis for my request to Secretary of the Interior Hickel that surplus grain be flown in to prevent starvation kills of deer and wild turkeys due to the heavy snow cover over much of the Commonwealth last winter. This is another example of positive action designed to benefit Pennsylvania sportsmen.

6. Strip clear cutting of more of our federal forests to provide food and cover for game.

Answer. On August 12, I wrote to Secretary of Agriculture Clifford Hardin stressing the need for greater recreational concern in the management of our National Forest lands. Too much emphasis has been placed on timber growth and not nearly enough attention has been given to the need for adequate food and cover for deer, wild turkey, and ruffed grouse. Secretary Hardin has directed the Forest Service to plan additional strip clear cutting on Federal Forest lands.

7. More strict water and air pollution laws on a national level.

Answer. Since my election to the Senate in 1958, I have supported tough air and water pollution control legislation. In this Session of Congress, I have introduced air pollution control legislation which would encourage the rapid development of pollution-free vehicles and provide fines of up to \$10,000 per day for violators of stationary source

pollution regulations (S. 3466). My water pollution control bill would also provide \$10,000 per day fines for violators (S. 3471). This tough legislation hits polluters where it hurts—in the pocket book. I am still waiting for the Democrats to bring these bills before the Senate for a vote.

8. Make the Delaware and Susequehanna Rivers Wild Rivers.

Answer. The National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act divides designated rivers into two classes. Those in the first class are immediately listed as wild and scenic rivers. Rivers in the second class are to be studied for possible future "wild river" designation. Although several Pennsylvania rivers are in the second class, the settled nature of their river basins makes large scale Federal land acquisition both difficult and costly. The natural beauty of the Delaware and Susequehanna Rivers can best be preserved through interstate compacts and the creation of river basin commissions with the power to terminate pollution and provide for recreational development.

9. Susquehanna River Compact and on the (W) amendment.

Answer. As its primary sponsor in the U.S. Senate, I favor the enactment of the Susquehanna River Basin Compact and the coordinated, comprehensive planning for the preservation and enhancement of the Susquehanna, which this Compact would make possible. One fact is unmistakable; further development on the Susequehanna River is unavoidable. All of the forces needed are present to bring it about. What the Susquehanna Compact offers is the mechanism—a Susquehanna River Basin Commission representing equally the three Basin States and the Federal Government—to facilitate Federal-State intergovernmental and interagency cooperation to ensure that the best rewards of coordinated development are realized.

Significantly, the Compact recognizes that the powers which it would grant to the Commission are broad. Accordingly, commensurate public safeguards—including especially the requirement and opportunity for public hearings throughout—are provided by the Compact. As introduced, the Susquehanna Compact legislation makes no mention of any specific project; nor, would its enactment imply any such endorsement.

In cases of potential conflict with other regulatory agencies, I believe it is imperative that the Susequehanna River Basin Commission must retain final authority over water use and quality if the Commission is to carry out in any meaningful way its mandate for comprehensive planning for the preservation of the Basin. Therefore, I favor, and intend to recommend the enactment of, additional language to Reservation "W" which would provide this assurance and protection.

THE 1971 BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT—SEPTEMBER 10, 1970

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1970

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the 10th in a series of periodic "budget scorekeeping" reports prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures was distributed to Members yesterday, September 14. This report reflects the cumulative actions of the Congress on the President's budget requests—as originally submitted and as revised by him—through September 10.

CVXI—2012—Part 23

The report reflects all the actions of Congress—beginning with the actions of each committee as a bill is reported—on regular appropriation bills; on legislation containing so-called backdoor appropriations; on legislation providing for mandatory spending; inactions on legislative proposals to reduce budget authority and outlays—the negative spending proposals; and actions or inactions on revenue producing proposals.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE REPORT

The "scorekeeping" report is largely statistical and somewhat technical in nature and therefore not easily read. It is essentially for this reason that I am inserting in the RECORD certain factual highlights from the introductory section of the report together with certain summary information prepared specifically for this purpose from the more detailed tabulation contained in the report:

INTRODUCTION TO STAFF REPORT ON THE STATUS OF THE 1971 FISCAL YEAR FEDERAL BUDGET

HIGHLIGHTS AND CURRENT STATUS OF THE 1971 BUDGET

Presidential revisions in the budget

A. New budget authority for fiscal 1971 in the February 2 budget submission was estimated to be \$218,030,495,000. By budget amendments, legislative proposals and reestimates (May 19, 1970), the President has increased the estimates for new budget authority for 1971 by \$2,698,722,000 to a new total of \$220,729,217,000.

B. Budget outlays for fiscal 1971 in the February 2 budget submission were estimated to total \$200,771,129,000. By budget amendments, legislative proposals and reestimates (May 19, 1970), the President has increased the estimated budget outlays for fiscal 1971 by \$4,571,871,000 to a new total of \$205,343,000,000.

C. Budget receipts for fiscal 1971 in the February budget submission were estimated to total \$202,103,000,000, including \$1,522,000,000 for increased taxes proposed to the Congress. By additional revenue proposals for estate and gift taxes (\$1,500,000,000) and leaded gasoline tax (\$1,600,000,000) offset by some adjustments downward in his May 19, 1970 reestimates, the President has increased fiscal 1971 estimated receipts by a net of \$2,006,000,000 to a new total of \$204,109,000,000.

Congressional changes in the budget

A. Budget authority for fiscal 1971:

1. House actions to September 10, 1970 on all spending bills—appropriations and legislative—have increased the President's requests for fiscal 1971 budget authority by \$7,504,735,000.

2. Senate actions to September 10, 1970 on all spending bills—appropriations and legislative—have increased the President's budget authority requests for fiscal 1971 by \$3,260,324,000.

3. Enactments of spending bills—appropriations and legislative—to September 10, 1970 have added \$2,759,172,000 to the President's budget authority requests for fiscal 1971.

B. Budget outlays for fiscal 1971:

1. House actions to September 10, 1970 on all spending bills—appropriations and legislative—have added a net of \$3,222,083,000 to the President's total estimated outlays for fiscal 1971.

2. Senate actions to September 10, 1970 on all spending bills—appropriations and legislative—have added a net of \$2,754,629,000 to the President's total estimated outlays for fiscal 1971.

3. Enactments of spending bills—appropriations and legislative—to September 10, 1970 have added \$1,776,361,000 to the President's total estimated outlays for fiscal 1971.

C. Budget receipts requested by the President for fiscal 1971 requiring Congressional actions total \$4,622,000,000:

1. House actions to September 10 on revenue proposals total \$548,000,000 (including a net of \$13,000,000 not requested for fiscal 1971 by the President) leaving a balance of \$4,087,000,000 additional revenue increases required to meet the President's revised fiscal 1971 budget requests.

2. Senate actions to September 10 on revenue proposals total \$1,011,000,000 (including \$693,000,000 not requested for fiscal 1971 by the President) leaving a balance of \$4,304,000,000 additional revenue increases required to meet the President's revised fiscal 1971 budget requests.

3. Enactments of revenue proposals to September 10 total \$516,000,000 (including \$194 million not requested for fiscal 1971 by the President) leaving a balance of \$4,300,000,000 additional revenue increases required to meet the President's revised fiscal 1971 budget requests.

Facts on the budget deficit

The budget for fiscal 1971 submitted to Congress February 2, 1970 reflected a unified budget surplus of \$1.3 billion, made up of an \$8.6 billion surplus from the trust funds and a \$7.3 billion deficit in the general Federal funds.

The budget for fiscal 1971 as revised by budget amendments, additional legislative proposals, and reestimates, exclusive of any separate direct congressional actions on the budget, as announced by the President on May 19, 1970, reflected a unified budget deficit of about \$1.2 billion. Including congressional actions, as announced by the President May 19, 1970, the unified budget deficit was estimated to be \$1.3 billion, made up of an \$8.7 billion surplus from the trust funds and a \$10 billion deficit in the general Federal funds.

These surplus and deficit projections are dependent upon various factors of an uncertain nature, such as:

1. Experience shows that actual outlays are likely to increase over earlier projections—thus increasing the deficit. Since submission of the fiscal 1971 budget in February the President has revised his official outlay estimates upward by about \$4.6 billion and Congressional enactments to September 10 have added approximately an additional \$1,776 million to estimated outlays for fiscal 1971.

2. The economic slowdown may decrease actual revenues from the amounts projected—thus increasing the deficit. The staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation estimated last May that revenue collections for fiscal 1971 will be about \$3.2 billion less than the administration was then projecting.

3. The revised budget contained about \$2,414 million in estimated outlay reductions for legislative proposals to the Congress such as postal rate increases, sales of surplus stockpile commodities, revisions in various Veterans benefits, Medicaid reform, sale of Alaska Railroad, etc. The effective date of the proposed \$1,568 million postal rate increases has been delayed by at least six months reducing that saving by at least \$784 million (which is reflected as a Congressional increase in spending above); and only \$180 million of the \$250 proposed surplus sales have been approved. No other actions have been completed. Thus \$666 million of these proposed outlay reductions have not yet been acted upon by the Congress.

4. The budget as revised to May 19, 1970 contains receipt estimates from various revenue producing proposals in the amount of

\$4.8 billion (including \$503 million for trust funds of which \$194 million was not requested by the President) which, if not enacted by Congress, will automatically reduce receipts of the Treasury by the amounts estimated—thus increasing the deficit. Congress has enacted, to date, \$322 million of the President's new revenue requests plus \$194 million in new revenue not requested by the President. This leaves a balance of about \$4.3 billion of the revenue requests of the President yet to be enacted or because of the enactment of \$194 million not requested by the President a balance of \$4.1 billion yet to be enacted toward meeting the President's estimated revenue requirement.

Taking into account Congressional actions to date on the uncertain budget estimates outlined above, and unless pending budget proposals for outlay reductions and additional revenues are enacted, the unified budget deficit for fiscal 1971 estimated by the President on May 19, 1970 to be about \$1.3 billion would be increased to about \$7.8 billion. Adding the loss of \$3.2 billion revenue collections as estimated by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation the total unified

budget deficit could be as much as \$11 billion, made up of a \$7.9 billion surplus in trust funds and a \$18.9 billion deficit in general Federal funds.

These deficit figures are not projections. They are simply arithmetic computations. Additional and pending actions by the Congress enacting revenue measures or increasing or decreasing expenditures will have a direct effect on any deficit computations. In addition, any increase in uncontrollable expenditures, like interest, or any additional savings made by the Executive will also have a direct impact on the projected deficit.

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS AFFECTING 1971

Mr. Speaker, I include a tabulation summarizing congressional actions and inactions to September 10 on various spending and revenue measures affecting the President's budget estimates. This summary has been compiled from tables 1 and 3 of the comprehensive "budget scorekeeping" report.

The tabulation reflects the effects of congressional actions and congressional

inactions in terms of both budget authority and budget outlays. The budget outlay side of the picture has been combined with the actions remaining to be taken on various revenue-producing proposals to reflect the current status of the President's May 19, 1970, fiscal 1971 deficit estimate as that deficit estimate has been affected by congressional actions or the lack of congressional actions to September 10.

It should again be pointed out that the arithmetical deficit figures shown in this summary tabulation are *not* projections; the many remaining actions of the Congress on various spending and revenue proposals which are pending disposition will necessarily adjust these figures up or down as those actions are taken. Furthermore, these deficit figures do not reflect consideration of any shortfall in revenues below those projected in the budget estimates.

The tabulation follows:

FISCAL YEAR 1971 BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT—AT A GLANCE AS OF SEPT. 10, 1970

(In thousands)

Spending authorizations	Changes from the Budget					
	Budget authority			Budget outlays		
	House	Senate	Enacted	House	Senate	Enacted
1. Appropriation bills.....	-\$745,549	+\$1,368,844	+\$440,310	+\$226,150	+\$1,044,500	+\$352,550
2. Legislative bills with "backdoor" spending authorization.....	+6,892,851	+224,851	+974,851			
3. Mandatory-type spending authorizations in legislative bills (pay, pensions, etc.).....	+418,433	+882,629	+560,011	+2,061,933	+926,129	+639,811
4. Legislation affecting proposals to reduce budget authority and outlays—on which final action has been taken.....	+939,000	+784,000	+784,000	+934,000	+784,000	+784,000
5. Total changes from the budget as of September 10, for spending authority (the sum of items 1, 2, 3 and 4).....	+7,504,735	+3,260,324	+2,759,172	+3,222,083	+2,754,629	+1,776,361
OTHER ADJUSTMENTS AFFECTING THE BUDGET AND THE DEFICIT						
6. Legislative proposals to reduce budget authority and outlays—on which no congressional action has been taken.....				+\$450,564	+\$665,564	+\$665,564
7. Balance of \$4,622,000,000 in revenue requests still pending enactment.....				+4,074,000	+3,611,000	+4,106,000
8. Impact of spending changes and remaining unmet revenue requests on the deficit (the sum of items 5, 6, and 7).....				+7,746,647	+7,031,193	+6,547,925
9. Presidential deficit estimate May 19, 1970, excluding congressional actions.....				1,234,000	1,234,000	1,234,000
10. Total deficit—potential without further congressional changes in revenues or spending (the sum of items 8 and 9).....				8,980,647	8,265,193	7,781,925

MR. H. I. ROMNES: A MAN OF COURAGE AND DISTINCTION

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1970

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, among the many hundreds of college and university commencement exercises across the Nation last June is one to which I would like to pay special attention. St. Louis University was singularly unique, to my knowledge, in choosing as its commencement speaker a businessman—a man of courage and distinction in the business community, the chairman of the board and president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Mr. H. I. Romnes.

While I will not consume the pages of the RECORD to recite the full text of Mr. Romnes' address, I do want to emphasize and single out several of the very pertinent and poignant passages of his address which he imparts with the force of his convictions.

As to the times in which we live:

If there is virtue in times of stress like these, it is that they force us to examine previously unexamined assumptions and test

the reasonableness of what we have all too comfortably taken for granted.

Mr. Romnes' address, while recognizing problems in society, refuses to yield to words of despair:

"Crisis" is a word that I am most reluctant to use, even to describe so perilous a passage in our history as the present one—first of all because we have had so many "crises" in recent years that turned out to be simply problems and, second, because, however much the word might satisfy our own yearning for a unique place in history, it implies that somehow events have gone beyond our capacity to manage them. This I don't believe has happened and—what is more—I don't believe we are going to let it happen.

The challenge is implicit. He said:

What I do understand . . . is what every American must understand by now—and that is that we are a deeply troubled and divided country and that we had better begin to ask ourselves what is happening to our country before it is too late.

The remedies he suggests are simple, yet vitally important:

We need to restore confidence in our ability to solve our own problems.

We need . . . to restore some measure of rationality to the processes by which Americans make up their minds on great issues and on small.

And we need to communicate.

Confidence:

For me, confidence that we can and conviction that we shall surmount our present difficulties comes from the reminder that this is not the first time in our history that we have been a deeply divided country.

Mr. Romnes cautions as to the limits of the passions of youth who want to change things:

What I would like to suggest is that there are limits to passion, however noble the cause that inspires it. Sooner or later, when the last demonstration is done and the shouting is over, someone is going to have to apply himself to the hard tasks of building the new and better world you want.

He warns that the ideals of today's college-age generation will not be realized merely by taking them for granted:

The achievement of your generation's aims, much as they depend on the conviction with which you pursue them, will depend even more on the plain down-to-earth competence you bring to the job . . . The quality of our society will increasingly depend on the quality of its individual components—the skills and energy that each of us brings to his chosen field of endeavor, the sense of responsibility that each of us brings to the tasks of citizenship.

Understandably, the role of business which Mr. Romnes envisions lies at the

heart of our way of life and our ability to meet the challenges faced by our society:

Business will in fact provide opportunities to shape the future as great or greater than some other pursuits that currently appear to offer more of the satisfactions of self-dramatization. . . . And it is business, I believe, that will provide the central testing ground of our ability—the ability of all Americans—to work together in dignity and mutual aspect.

He suggests that there is more to communication than merely perfecting the technical means:

There is no more disturbing aspect of our times than that we appear to have lost the capacity to listen to each other with a decent respect for one another's opinions.

There is no doubt, as Mr. Romnes observes, that communications involves risks. He said:

There is the risk that in the process we might discover that the world is a little more complicated than it seemed. There is the risk that we might discover frailties in our most firmly held convictions. And, finally, there is the risk that in seeking to change others, we may be changed ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, we certainly need more men of Mr. Romnes' kind who will apply themselves to the pressing matters of the day without fear or favor.

METHADONE AN ANSWER TO DRUG ABUSE

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1970

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, for the longest time, heroin addiction was almost a terminal affliction. Although heroin of very poor quality, or in excessive amounts, sometimes kills a user directly, more often than not, the heroin addict dies a hundred deaths trying to feed his habit, which never stabilizes but always grows.

The drug addict is responsible for much of today's street crime, the muggings, the petty robberies, and others which he must engage in, in order to get the money to pay for his daily craving for drugs.

The costs to the community, his family, and himself that the addict creates are incalculable. Suffice it to say that full-blown heroin addiction is debilitating to both the individual, those around him, and the place where he plys his habit.

Recently, there has been success in treating addicts using the substitute drug, methadone. This inexpensive, synthetic narcotic, when taken properly allows the addict to be weaned from heroin and eventually offers the hope of an addiction-free life.

The August 21 edition of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette contains an excellent article on the work being done in my city with addict rehabilitation.

Much of the effort in Pittsburgh is be-

ing carried out under the guiding hand of Dr. Charles Burks, the man responsible for Black Action Inc.

Black Action Inc. is a community organization which has been working directly with addicts in their own neighborhoods.

It has been a lifesaver, in more ways than one, for many Pittsburghers who were chained to a drug habit.

Burks and Black Action Inc. have been using methadone in their rehabilitation program.

Although there is a glimmer of hope in this treatment, it is being hampered by too little hospital space and money and too few trained personnel, all of which are needed for a successful drug rehabilitation.

I include this article in the RECORD for the edification of my colleagues:

METHADONE AN ANSWER TO DRUG ABUSE

(By Eleanor Adamets)

Thanks to a recently legalized drug called methadone, and to the pioneer spirit of the city's two Methadone Maintenance Programs, nearly 300 hard-core heroin addicts in Allegheny County have been able to "kick" their habits.

Dr. John Ekstrand, director of the program at Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic in Oakland, describes the success of the system as "approaching the miraculous."

"In two to three weeks, we see dramatic changes take place in the addicts," he said. "They talk about football, complain if they miss breakfast, and want to see their families."

In less than a year after starting to take methadone, many of the addicts in the two programs are now holding steady jobs. Most are reunited with their families, and some have even been able to return to school.

"The meth is a beautiful thing—I'm starting to dream again about owning my own business and sending my son to college someday," said one middle-aged former addict from the Hill District.

Addicted to heroin for more than 20 years, he now holds a full-time job and has been spreading the word to his addict friends on the Hill about the methadone program at Western Psych.

Another addict, a 25-year-old father of three children who started using heroin nine years ago while stationed in Germany with the U.S. Army, is planning to enter college this fall.

"For me, it's like being born again," he said. "Since I started taking methadone, 'chasing the bag' is all over. Now life means a lot more to me and my family."

"We believe heroin addicts should be rehabilitated, not incarcerated," said Annette Green, administrative assistant at Manchester's Black Action, Inc., the largest methadone treatment clinic in the state.

"Immediate 'cold turkey' withdrawal isn't the answer," she added. "What addicts need is medical help and a long period of intensive counseling."

Both Black Action's program and one at Western Psych base their treatment of addicts on the concept that heroin addiction is a disease that can be medically treated with success like many other physical disorders.

Dr. Charles Burks, the "guiding spirit" of Black Action's program for the past two years, began treating addicts with methadone out on the streets of the Northside more than a year before funds, facilities or staff were available.

"We just can't pray heroin addiction away—if we could, we'd all be praying," he said. "Methadone is the best answer we've come up with yet, and it does work."

The Manchester program treats about 250 out-patients a day at their clinic. But, in Dr. Burks' words, "We're not even scratching the surface of the problem."

"We've got another 250 addicts on our waiting list now, and they'll have to wait 10-12 months before we can treat them—we just don't have the space or staff to handle them all."

Dr. Burks speculates there are as many as 10,000 hard-core users of heroin (those physically dependent on the drug for two years or more) in the country. He estimates the number of "occasional users" to be as high as 25,000.

Partial explanation of Black Action, Inc.'s problems lies in the nature of the methadone treatment.

Methadone, a synthetic narcotic legalized by the State Legislature only last January, blocks the euphoric effects and the physical craving for heroin if an addict receives his daily "stabilized" dosage in liquid form mixed with orange juice.

But, before an addict can come to the out-patient clinic for methadone, a 4-6 week period of hospitalization is necessary to "detoxify" him from heroin and to "stabilize" him at his individual methadone dosage level.

Only nine hospital beds (seven at St. John's Hospital and two at Allegheny General) are available at any one time to admit new patients into Black Action, Inc.'s program.

The shortage of hospital beds, plus a shortage of funds (their annual budget is about \$160,000), staff, and space accounts for the long list of untreated addicts trying to be admitted into the program.

The Western Psych program treats 43 out-patients daily, but has only four beds at the hospital available to admit new patients. Forty-eight addicts are already on their waiting list.

Unlike the Black Action program, however, the program at Western Psych has an annual budget that approaches \$1.7 million. In an almost unique example of "the university following the lead of the ghetto," it has patterned much of its program on the methods used at Black Action.

But, even with more money, the Oakland center faces some problems stemming from the refusal of ward nurses in May to distribute methadone to addicts because it disrupted normal ward activities.

Since then, the program has been staffed with its own nurses and tucked away into two tiny rooms on the ninth floor of the hospital. The quarters are cramped, but the addicts are free to come in for their methadone without disturbing other patients.

Within the near future, Western Psych hopes to acquire a house in the Oakland area that will also serve as a counseling center for addicts much like the Juniata Street treatment center of Black Action, Inc.'s program.

Regardless of the difficulties both programs face, the results seem encouraging to the doctors in the programs.

Dr. Ekstrand, who is also the staff psychiatrist for Black Action, Inc.'s program, said that in the seven years since methadone was first used to treat heroin addicts in New York City, no adverse effects from the drug have been reported.

According to both Dr. Ekstrand and Dr. Burks, however, there is no way to determine how long an addict must keep on taking methadone.

Much like a diabetic must depend on insulin to maintain proper metabolic balance in his body, a heroin addict may have to depend on methadone for the rest of his life to satisfy his craving for heroin.

But, as one addict says, "Compared to supporting a \$50 a day heroin habit, the 15 cents a day it costs for methadone is a real bargain!"

THE SOVIET UNION AND THE
PALESTINIAN GUERRILLAS

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1970

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, during the past summer, I was pleased to have working in my office as a congressional intern, Mr. Robert Lifson, of Huntington, N.Y. In addition to office and seminar study assignments, Mr. Lifson did considerable research in matters concerned in the Middle East. He prepared, prior to the current aircraft hijackings, a scholarly essay entitled "The Soviet Union and the Palestinian Guerrillas." In view of the worldwide concern over the aircraft hijackings by Arab guerrillas and the timeliness of his study report, I am submitting it for the interest of the Members:

THE SOVIET UNION AND THE PALESTINIAN
GUERRILLAS

(By Robert Lifson)

Of all the aspects of the current tensions in the Middle East, certainly the one that is least understood is that of the relationship of the Soviet Union to the Palestinian guerrillas. The guerrillas, due to their recent and forceful addition to the complexities of the Middle East, have captured the hopes and imaginations of the Palestinian and Arab peoples. Thus, they are a potentially powerful force, and as such, they are a factor which must be carefully considered by the policy makers in the Kremlin.

In order to understand the relationship between Moscow and the commandos, one must have some idea of what the Soviet Union hopes to accomplish in the Middle East. Only the men in the Kremlin know exactly what these goals are. We in the West can only speculate. At one extreme is the long-run maximum objective of the U.S.S.R. which would most likely be the replacement of all Western political, military, economic, and cultural ties with the Middle East by the U.S.S.R. In other words, the Soviets would desire the virtual communization or Sovietization of the whole area. Realistically, this objective does not seem possible. Perhaps a more reasonable long range goal would be to attempt to become the predominant, but not sole, influence in the region. In the short run, the Russian goal would seem to be one of settling the issues left over from the June war of 1967. More importantly, however, the Russians want the Suez Canal open to their shipping so they can continue and increase their penetration of the Middle East, the Horn of Africa, and eventually, the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean areas, where a Western presence is in decline. One consideration above all else prevents Moscow from militantly trying to achieve these goals and that factor which the policy makers in the Kremlin must consider is the possibility of a nuclear confrontation with the United States. To the Russians nuclear war must be avoided, and any scheme which could conceivably lead to a nuclear exchange with the United States is approached very cautiously.

The emergence of the Palestinian guerrillas as a vital force in the area has not necessarily facilitated the obtaining of these Russian objectives. The common goals and ideology of all the guerrilla organizations are readily evidenced in the Palestinian National Covenant which the Palestinian National Council accepted. From this document one can see that the guerrillas are not communist, although much of what they say

and do, have Marxist-Leninist (and to some extent Maoist) strains. However, many people in the West are ready to dismiss the Palestinian commandos as communist fronts; in much the same manner that Nasser's Arab socialism was criticized as being a prelude to communism. These people do not realize that the ideology of the guerrillas is composed of two parts; Arab socialism and Palestinian nationalism. Authorities on the Palestinian problem have stressed that Arab nationalism is not conducive to communism.

The Palestinian organizations have realized that they are barely united as to the means in which to achieve their common goal of liberating Palestine, let alone deciding the future of a liberated Palestine. To state openly the ideology and politics of a liberated Palestinian state, before the existence of such a state is a reality, could only serve to destroy what little unity there is now. To avoid such a possibility article nine of the Palestinian National Covenant states, "doctrine, whether political or social or economic shall not occupy the people of Palestine from their primary duty of liberating their homeland. All Palestinians constitute one national front and work with all their feelings and spiritual and material potentialities to free their homeland."¹

The position of the Palestinians is a very nationalistic one. They claim that "Palestine is an Arab homeland, bound by strong nationalistic ties to the rest of the Arab countries which together form the large Arab homeland. Its boundaries are those at the time of the British Mandate and is a regional indivisible unit."² Furthermore, article seven states that "Jews of Palestinian origin are considered Palestinians if they are willing to live peacefully and loyally in Palestine."³ As one can see, the Palestinian groups have a strong desire for unity. The Soviet Union has also expressed a desire to see the Palestinian guerrillas unified, but for entirely different motives. The Russians would like to see the united guerrillas used as an auxiliary force by the Arab states. The guerrillas see their unity as a means of using the Arab states as bases from which they hope to liberate their homeland. Although it would be impossible to say that the guerrillas are not affected by Marxist-Leninist ideology, one must be cognizant that it is on subjects such as anti-colonialism, anti-imperialism, and methods of liberation that the guerrillas take a Marxist-Leninist, and sometimes Maoist ideological approach.

Although Arab marauders have been raiding Israel since the 1949 armistice agreements, it was not until the Egyptians decided in 1955 to aid and support raiders in attacks on Israeli territory that these fedayeen caused the Israelis to become concerned. Eventually these incidents supported by the Egyptians prompted the Israeli thrust across Sinai in 1956. The presence of U.N. emergency forces in the area immobilized guerrilla activity until 1964 when the Arab League sponsored the formation of the Palestinian Liberation Organization, headed by Ahmad al-Shuqayri.⁴ The fact that Israel had planned the diversion of the waters of the Jordan River at this time makes one wonder as to the reason why the Palestine Liberation Organization's came into being. The U.S.S.R. adopted a rather cool even hostile attitude to the guerrillas and the P.L.O., at this time. The Soviets were quite disdainful of Ahmad al-Shuqayri and his pro Chinese leanings. The Soviets did not accept the idea of popular war against Israel. They tried to discredit the guerrillas by referring to them in *Izvestia* as "mythical divisionary groups" and the Russians even went so far as to imply to the Israelis that the guerrillas were a "tool of Western intelligence agencies."⁵

Footnotes at end of article.

The June war changed Moscow's attitude somewhat. The war and the failure of the Palestinian Liberation Army discredited Shuqayri, whose downfall in December of 1967 was welcomed in Moscow. However, any hopes that Al Fatah's leader Yasser Arafat might have a better understanding of the political situation were frustrated. After the war the guerrilla movement grew and splintered into many little hands. By as early as the Fall of 1967 practically every national ideological current in the Arab world had sponsored some sort of fedayeen organization.⁶ The growth of the guerrillas had been increasing gradually since the end of the war and had made some inroads in the hearts of the dispirited Arabs. Yet, it was not until Al Fatah inflicted heavy casualties on the Israelis March 21, 1968 at the battle of Karameh that Al Fatah and the guerrilla movement as a whole caught the hearts and imaginations of the Palestinian and Arab people. Israel no longer seemed invincible. Recruitment in guerrilla organizations rose dramatically. This sharp growth in the guerrilla movement and its aftermath caused policy makers in the Kremlin to drop their old policy of virtually ignoring the guerrillas. On the other hand, any formulation of a new policy would have to take into consideration the various factors which prevent Moscow from fully embracing the guerrilla movement, despite their occasional potential political usefulness.

One area where Moscow and the guerrillas have divergent views is that of tactics and strategies. Fatah regards the Russians with some suspicion because while the Soviet Union has been indirectly helpful in making available arms and in championing the cause of liberation wars, in general it has also upheld the right of Israel to exist and it has exerted pressure on the guerrillas to mute their activities.⁷ If the guerrillas feel that Moscow is meddling, then it should also be noted that Moscow does not approve of many of the tactics of the guerrilla groups. Several Palestinian organizations feel that because Israel is a virtual "armed state" that there really aren't civilians per se, but rather every component part of society serves some military purpose. Thus, blowing up airlines is justified, in that, El Al is used to bring arms to Israel and it strengthens the Israeli economy, thus increasing Israel's capability for attacking Arabs. If one extends this thinking to its most logical extremes, then there is a rationale for blowing up children in school buses. After all, the children of today are the soldiers of tomorrow, and besides Israeli planes have killed Arab school children too. The Soviet attitude is quite different. E. Primatov a writer for Pravda told an Egyptian newspaper, "We as a government and people support the struggle of the Palestinian people to free the occupied territories. (I think the guerrillas have something else in mind, R.L.) There are, however, various aspects we can not support, for example, we are against attacking civilian airplanes and other civilian objects."⁸ There is no surprise as to why Moscow adopts such an attitude.

The Soviet Union like all sovereign and responsible states realizes that to condone such acts now may prove to be dysfunctional in the future, because in the future it may be Russian civilian targets that come under attack by some extremist organization. Still, the U.S.S.R. wants to keep its options with the fedayeen open and therefore, Russia does not condemn the acts, but merely says in a friendly manner that attacks of this nature are not helping the guerrilla movement. Indeed the Soviets would like to make the Arabs and the Palestinians more presentable to the West, and attacking airlines impedes this effort.

To be fair one should note that the position of the guerrillas is not unanimous on the matter of tactics either. The more mod-

erate guerillas represented by Arafat do not indulge in such cowardly deeds, as Moscow is quick to point out. One popular Soviet periodical notes that "there is not complete unity among the Palestinian organizations themselves. They often differ as regards tactics, methods, and even the aims of their struggle".⁹ Shortly after the hijacking of a U.S. T.W.A. airliner for which George Habash's Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine claimed responsibility, Pravda on August 29, 1969 said that the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine acts "isolated from all of the other Palestinian organizations".¹⁰

An even more serious concern of Moscow is the extent of communist Chinese penetration and influence in the guerrilla movement. The possibility of Chinese involvement in the guerrilla movement poses two obvious questions which must be faced. First, is there some sort of communist Chinese involvement in the Palestinian liberation movement? Second, if such a presence does exist, to what extent does it affect Soviet thinking? That the Chinese involvement in the area, however limited in scope, does exist, can not be doubted in light of the facts. In fact, when one considers the distance of the Chinese from the area and their ability to be of assistance, perhaps the Chinese have demonstrated a greater will to aid the guerrillas than the Soviets. More importantly, many, indeed if not all the guerrillas, feel that the Chinese support them more than the U.S.S.R. One prominent Palestinian authority asserted that the "Chinese give the guerrillas one hundred percent ideological, political, and diplomatic support".¹¹ In fact, even before the '67 war, China was willing to acknowledge Shuqayri and the Palestine Liberation Organization as an Exile Government.¹² The very idea of a people's struggle is a Maoist concept. Certainly the ideas of George Habash of the Popular Front in his recent Life interview have a Maoist color to them. Even the supposedly more moderate Yasir Arafat talks of "victory through a gun's muzzle". In other words the very militancy of the guerrillas is a rejection of Moscow's thinking and an acceptance of Chinese methods. Although the guerrillas' central ideology can in no way be clearly labeled Maoist, they have adopted some of his principles and have incorporated it into their own ideas to form something unique.

Looking at the other side of the coin, one must remember that the Chinese have expressed an interest in the guerrillas. In contrast to his cool reception upon visiting the U.S.S.R., Yasir Arafat was greeted at Peking's airport by Vice President Li Hsiennien and other high officials. In his farewell telegram to Premier Chou En Lai the Al Fatah leader expressed his gratitude for "your support and assistance to our revolution."¹³ Many guerrillas claim that they were trained in China and that Chinese assistance has even included arms. Indeed, informed Israelis are only too willing to point out that Chinese arms have been found on captured and dead guerrillas. One can only speculate what the Chinese motive for its actions in the Middle East is. The point is, however, that the Russians regard this Chinese encroachment in the Middle East, despite its limited scope, very seriously, perhaps too seriously. Although the Chinese factor may seem rather minor and illusory to people in the West, it is very real to the Kremlin.

If the Russians are to deter the Chinese efforts in the guerrilla movement, then the Soviets are left with two possible approaches. They can either try to outbid the Chinese and try to prove that they are more revolutionary, or they can condemn and attack all associations with the Chinese as harmful to the movement. At first the Russians seemed to have opted for the second approach. The

Chinese had accused the U.S.S.R. of collusion with the U.S. in preparing for a "Middle East Munich." The Russians countered by saying that Chinese propaganda, calling for the redrawing of the maps of the Middle East (at Israel's expense) would only assist the Israelis in prolonging their occupation of Arab lands.¹⁴ The Chinese, in the Soviets' mind, seem to only increase the danger of conflagration in an already explosive situation.

Some Soviets feel that "the Chinese in every possible way encourage their extremist tendencies and push the Palestinians to lead a popular war against Israel and the rotten Arab regimes. They (the Chinese) lead a campaign against a political regulation of the Middle East crisis and try to introduce a split in the anti-imperialist front of the Arab states".¹⁵ The brunt of this verbal attack, on the one hand, is an accusation that the Chinese by interfering in the area are aiding imperialism. On the other hand, it is advice to the Palestinians that the best way to achieving their goals is to unite and to work with the other anti-imperialist, such as the Soviet Union and its client Arab states. China is excluded from this group because its disruptive and disintegrative policies aid the forces of imperialism. The Chinese, then, are one consideration that the Kremlin is mindful of when it deals with the guerrillas. To some extent the Chinese involvement in the area may have the effect of pushing the Russians further to the left. Any Soviet decision towards the guerrillas will be influenced to some extent, by Russia's relations with China and also by Chinese activities in the area.

Of course, the most obvious divergence between the policies of the Soviet Union and the Palestinian commandoes is over the question of Israel's existence. The Russians are eager to remind people in the West that the Soviet Union was to a great extent responsible for Israel's birth. Indeed, not only did the Russians support the U.N. partition plan, and give recognition to the Jewish state, but it was arms from communist Czechoslovakia which enabled the Israelis to successfully defend themselves shortly after the birth of their state. While many of the Arab states have reconciled themselves to this historical reality by reasoning that Israel should exist, but only if the rights of the Palestinians are restored, not all the guerrillas subscribe to such reasoning. The ever growing and popular Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine led by George Habash claims that Palestine must be liberated from the Israelis. One gets the feeling that, despite Arafat's protestations to the contrary, this goal is the one which all Palestinian organizations are fighting for. According to E Primakov of Pravda, the difference between the viewpoints of the Palestinian guerrillas and that of the Soviet Union is that the "commandoes oppose Zionist existence, we oppose Zionist aggression".¹⁶ This divergence of view is highlighted by the presence of partisan forces which are guerrilla forces of sorts, supported by the Moscow oriented illegal communist parties of Jordan and Iraq. These partisan forces greatly differ from other commando groups in that they do not call for the dismantling of Israel.¹⁷ Clearly, this line of reasoning reflects the attitude of Moscow rather than that of the majority of Palestinians.

One must remember the emphasis the Palestinian National Covenant places on the redemption of an Arab nation state of Palestine. Articles one through eighteen are all justifications for the destruction of the Jewish state of Israel and the replacement of it by an Arab state, or as the more moderate guerrillas say "a multi-racial state" of Moslems and Jews. Thus, Israel's existence and Russia's acknowledgment of Israel's right to exist is one fundamental issue obstructing better relations between the Russians and the guerrillas. It is interesting to

note that the Chinese have no such problem, as they had nothing to do with Israel's creation nor have they even given recognition to Israel.

Since the June War of 1967, the question of Israel's right to exist has become a real point of divergence between the guerrillas and the U.S.S.R. Every major peace plan presented to date has always implied if not demanded that the state of Israel be guaranteed its right to exist. The entire question of a peace settlement poses a problem to Moscow with respect to its relations with the guerrillas. While the Arabs (Palestinians included) are cognizant of the role played by the U.S.S.R. in the formation of Israel, they tend to regard the Russians as true friends who are just beginning to realize their mistakes of the past. They hope that the Russians will try to rectify their past mistakes by future actions. Whether the U.S.S.R. is following such a line remains to be seen. If the Soviets are sincere about achieving a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, then they will have earned the undying hatred of the guerrilla groups. Even Soviet talks of peace raise the suspicions of the Palestinians. However, one should note that at present the Soviets have not been able to agree with the West on any peace formula and have only presented peace plans which have proven unacceptable to Israel and Washington. This type of situation is highly beneficial to the Palestinians, as it aids their cause by keeping the tension in the area high, by giving the guerrillas and the Middle East crisis a great deal of publicity, and most importantly it gives the Palestinians a sense of national identity and purpose. These benefits are only derived as long as the guerrillas prove useful to the Arab states in their endeavor to regain the occupied territories.

The official Soviet line regarding peace between the Arabs and the Israelis usually refers back to the U.N. Security Council Resolution of November 22, 1967. The Soviet Union's proposals proceed from the premise that Israel on the one hand, and the U.A.R. and the other Arab countries which would take part in the peace settlement, on the other hand, must be ready to abide by all the provisions of the November 22 resolution. Thus, both sides must reject the possibility of gaining territories by war and they must recognize the necessity of establishing a just and reliable peace in the Middle East in conditions in which every state in the area would be able to enjoy security.¹⁸ The U.N. resolution of November 22, 1967 involves basically the following principles: Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories, termination of all claims of a state of belligerency and the recognition of the territorial integrity of all states in the area, and their right to live within secure and recognized boundaries free from the threats or acts of force. In addition the resolution affirmed the necessity for a guarantee of freedom through international waterways in the area, a just settlement of the refugee problem, and the guarantee of the independence of every state in the area through measures including the establishment of demilitarized zones.¹⁹ To the Palestinians this resolution is not acceptable. While it does recommend the necessity of resolving the refugee problem, no specific solution is suggested, and on the other hand, it does seem to be an international guarantee of Israel's existence, which although not binding on the guerrillas would nonetheless make their struggle more difficult.

Whether Russia is sincere in her support of peace in the area is a debatable point, but the fact that both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. talk about resolving the conflict worries the guerrillas. Many Palestinian guerrillas fear that the Russians really do want peace because they feel that the Soviets are afraid of a nuclear confrontation, that compromise while not acceptable to the Pales-

Footnotes at end of article.

tinians because one of the concessions is sure to be a guarantee for Israel's existence, may be most convenient for the Russians, and finally, the Palestinians fear that the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. are coming closer together on the idea that stability is necessary in the area.²⁰ Even more distressing to the guerillas is the Soviet approach to a peace formula. Despite all the talk about a "package deal", the Soviet proposals call first for a withdrawal of Israeli troops, then, state to state agreements, and finally the resolution of the refugee problem. That Moscow does not consider the refugee problem one of prime importance is evidenced by a radio Moscow broadcast on June 27, 1969 which stated that "all attempts of imperialist propaganda to maintain that the center of gravity in the Arab-Israel conflict has moved into the struggle of the Palestinian partisans are, all the same, naked demagoguery; the main side of the conflict can only be Israel and the Arab states".²¹ Although Moscow's attitude since then has changed slightly, as the guerillas have emerged as a more potent force, one can still conclude that despite the warmth found for the guerillas in the Soviet press, that for the present the Soviet Union and the guerillas are far from agreement on the priorities for peace in the Middle East.

Since the visit of Yasir Arafat of Al Fatah to the Soviet Union this winter, the Soviets have been quick to hand out praise for his organization. However, due, on the one hand, to the growing popularity of the guerillas in Arab lands, and considering, on the other hand, the positions of the Russians and the guerillas on the various issues, one could conclude that this friendship is little more than expedient propaganda, at least for the moment. Yet one must wonder how lasting this attitude may be. How long will the Russians wait for the diplomatic settlement which will assure them of their minimum goal of opening the Suez Canal? Should the U.S.S.R. grow impatient, it could possibly take the initiative by encouraging the Egyptians to try to force the Israelis from the east bank of the canal, or they might decide to adopt the guerillas' attitude and press for the eventual destruction of Israel. Approaches such as these would seem unrealistic because of Moscow's basically cautious manner in dealing with the problem so far, and also there is no substantive evidence that Moscow has abandoned the state to state approach towards resolving the conflict. Quite the contrary seems to be true for basically two reasons. Firstly, the Soviets have shown a preference to dealing with states rather than various political organizations, other than the communist parties. The Soviets have adopted this attitude because they like to deal with groups and bodies which they can hold responsible to see that their agreements will be enforced.

They also like to have some measure of control over the situation and it is far easier to make a state keep its promises than an irresponsible revolutionary organization. Secondly, all Soviet peace proposals have adopted various mutations of the same approach, but they are all virtually the same, that being, that they have placed the refugee problem to secondary role while the primary task remains the removal of Israeli troops. From a Soviet perspective, this approach is quite logical. After all, one of the urgent goals of the U.S.S.R. is to open the Suez Canal, not to create an Arab Palestine. Furthermore the Russians have no desire to run the risk of a great power confrontation. In addition any deviation from the present approach would seem unlikely unless the success of the new approach could reasonably be expected. Although any new approach may seem improbable, it is not inconceivable, and one should be cognizant of the possibilities should the Russians grow impatient.

Another possibility worth exploring is what would happen if the Russians were able to achieve a political settlement along the lines that they have previously suggested. In other words, what would happen once the Soviets had accomplished their goal of reopening the Suez Canal? What more could the Russians then offer the Arabs after the occupied lands are returned? Would the Russians then conceivably aid the Palestinians in their attempt to liberate Palestine? There is no reason to believe that the Arabs will find a peace settlement in 1970 any more to their liking than the ceasefire in 1967, the 1956 U.N. peace keeping operations, the 1948 armistice, or the 1947 Partition Plan for that matter, unless, the settlement would give the area now called Israel to the Arabs. In brief, what they have failed to obtain in the wars, they hope to achieve at the conference tables, or by other means if necessary. Logically, then, if the Russians are to continue to court the Arabs, then, they too must continue an anti-Israel campaign, regardless of any peace settlement which may have proved acceptable. At this juncture the policies of the Soviet Union, the Arab states, and the guerillas will be in virtual harmony.

What evidence can I submit to substantiate this hypothesis? First, the Soviets and more specifically the Moscow oriented Communist Party of Jordan set up "partisan forces" which are really communist guerrilla organizations. In the Partisan Forces Manifesto published in the pro communist, Beirut daily *Al Nida* it was stated that, "the partisan forces fight against Zionism and imperialism and is a partisan of the liberation battle fought by the forces of freedom, peace, and progress led by the U.S.S.R."²² At present these "partisan forces" differ from the other guerrilla organizations in that they do not call for the dismantling of Israel. Yet, nothing precludes them from adopting such a position in the future. In fact, the natural progression of events would logically require them to do so. If they are to receive any substantial support from the Palestinians, and other Arabs, then they must offer some means of satisfying Palestinian desires, which would mean the advocacy of an Arab Palestine in what is now Israel. To advocate a peace settlement is a first step, but to reject a continued struggle for the liberation of Palestine, once the Israeli troops are withdrawn from the occupied territories, is quite a different story. In short these partisan forces must adopt a more militant position or they will wither when and if a peace settlement is agreed upon. Second, the wording of the various peace proposals, especially those of the Soviet Union, is ambiguous, to say the least.

For example, part of the Soviet peace plan as presented in the March 31, 1970 edition of *New Times* calls for "return to the rightful owners of all that was seized by force." At present, this proposal is referring to the return of the occupied territories, but if this wording is taken literally, and if one adopts an Arab point of view, that Israel itself is really an occupied territory, then, this proposal can be used by the guerillas to press for the return of Palestinian lands now controlled by Israel which the Palestinians say is about 93% of present day Israel. Another part of their peace proposal states that "as soon as the Israeli troops withdraw behind the line they occupied prior to June 5, 1967, the full end of the war should be officially proclaimed. Particular attention should be paid to the words "the line they occupied" because this phraseology in no way implies that such lines are permanent boundaries. Thus, while the occupied territories will be secured for the Arabs, Israel will not necessarily have recognized and permanent borders. Finally, the Russians have included the inevitable escape clause for her Arab clients because this peace proposal further states "It stands to

reason that in case Israel violates its commitments on the withdrawal of troops, the Arab countries will have the right to abstain from carrying out their corresponding commitments." Who is going to decide whether a violation has been committed—the Arabs? If so, one could easily invent a pretext for resuming the hostilities. Even if the Russians do have the best of intentions, one can not ignore the fact that there are too many loopholes (loopholes which are very convenient for the Arab states and the guerillas) in the Russian peace plan, to realistically believe that if this proposal was adopted that a lasting peace would follow.

More alarming to my mind, however, is that many Russian periodicals have picked up the Arab and the guerrilla charge that the Israelis are really neo-Nazis. That anyone could link the survivors of Hitler's death camps to neo-Nazism is the height of ridiculousness and/or international irresponsibility, even if one attempts to quickly dismiss such charges as propaganda for Arab consumption. Yet, the Soviet Union does exactly this sort of thing. Constantly in the Soviet press the words Zionist expansion and fascist aggression are used interchangeably. For example, one Soviet publication stated that "in this case, the situation is similar to the one which existed during the Second World War when the resistance movement was active in Nazi-occupied territory."²³ Every conceivable link between Israel and the Federal Republic of Germany is analyzed. The usual Soviet conclusion is that the result of any connections between these two states can only lead to the most sinister of schemes. The Soviets maintain that it is West Germany which supports Israel's armed forces.²⁴ When one considers the deep hatred the Soviet leaders and indeed, the Soviet people have for Germany, one must wonder about the implications of such linkages. Certainly a peaceful atmosphere has not been created. In addition, the Soviets have shown increasing amounts of "sympathy" for the Palestinian viewpoint. As early as February 12 of 1969 Radio Moscow broadcast that "the Soviet people regard the Arab resistance with true sympathy and offer the joint Arab causes all support."²⁵ Since the visit of Yasir Arafat to the U.S.S.R. and his talks with the Asian Solidarity Committee, Soviet feeling for the guerillas has warmed in about proportion to the increase in the guerillas' popularity in the Arab world.

In discussing this question whether the Soviet Union might conceivably allow Israel to cease to exist, I have used mostly circumstantial evidence. Yet, one can not help but get the feeling that the Soviet Union is using what some people refer to as "salami tactics"; that is, they are trying to achieve their major goals slice by slice. Each slice of the salami is a small step so much so that it is hardly noticed, but when people put all the small slices together they are alarmed at the result. An example of Soviet salami tactics would be the progression of events on the Egyptian front since February of this year. First, the Soviets installed SAM-2 sites in the Nile valley, and a little later SAM-3 sites (mobile) and nothing was said in protest in the West because they accepted the Soviet line that they were purely for defense. Next Soviet pilots appeared in the area, another piece of the salami, as this was a logical extension of the defense of the Nile valley. Then Soviet missiles began to inch closer to the canal until Israel's air supremacy near the canal was threatened. Finally, there was the disclosure by Assistant Secretary of State Sisco on Sunday July 12, 1970 that the Soviets were sending the Egyptians amphibious landing craft. One can only wonder with fear when the next piece of salami will be cut or if the Israelis will take the initiative and prevent what they regard to be the further deterioration of their position on the canal. I am one who

Footnotes at end of article.

believes very strongly that the Soviet Union uses such salami tactics and therefore, I can not imagine the Soviets risking their tremendous investment in the Arab world by settling for a status quo peace after they have managed to secure the opening of the Suez Canal. For a while the Arabs may be content with the return of the occupied territories, but eventually the guerillas will put pressure on the Arab states who will then turn to their big power ally and ask for assistance in the liberation struggle.

What, then, can one conclude from this discussion of the Soviet Union's relations with the Palestinian guerillas? It is apparent that the aloofness with which the Russians used to handle the guerillas is no longer acceptable. As the guerillas continue to grow in popularity and as an important factor in the Middle East conflict, they will receive a more attentive ear at Moscow. At present, there are two major factors which prohibit the Russians from giving more support to the guerillas. One is the fact that the guerillas and the Soviet government are at loggerheads over various issues concerning the conflict, and second, Moscow has an aversion for dealing with non-state entities, other than the communist parties. The Russians prefer state to state relations as opposed to dealing with irresponsible popular movements. Should some type of settlement be agreed upon, the situation would change. I believe that the guerillas have had the effect of forcing the Russians further to the left. A peace settlement might accelerate this pushing to the left, as the Kremlin would seek to protect its very expensive Middle East investment. Perhaps, Nasser was right when he said that it is the debtor nation who controls the actions of the creditor nation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "At the Mid-East Crossroads", *New Times*, May 7, 1970.
- Ball, George W. "Suez Is the Front to Watch", *New York Times Magazine Section*, June 28, 1970.
- Bell, J. Bowyer. "Arafat's Man in the Mirror: The Myth of the Fedayeen", *New Middle East*, April 1970.
- Belyaev, I. "How the Soviet Union Visualizes a Middle East Settlement: An Authoritative View", *New Middle East*, June 1970.
- Cooley, John K. "Communists in Arab States Form Anti-Israel Guerrilla Force", *Christian Science Monitor*, June 21, 1970.
- "From the Soviet Press", *New Middle East*, August 1969-May 1970.
- Hudson, Michael. "The Palestinian Resistance Movement: Its Significance in the Middle East Crisis", *Middle-East Journal*, Summer 1969, pp. 291-307.
- Jaber, Kamel S. Abu. *The Ba'ath Socialist Party*. Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, New York, 1966.
- Lenezowski, George. "Soviet Policy in the Middle East", *Current History*, November 1969.
- Mansfield, Peter. *Nasser's Egypt*. Penguin Books, Baltimore, Maryland, 1965.
- Mark, Clyde. "The Palestine Resistance Movement", *LRS*, June 15, 1970.
- Maximov, Yevgeny. "Middle East: Road to a Just Peace", *News and Views From the U.S.S.R.*, January 30, 1970.
- "Position of the Palestinians in the Israeli-Arab Conflict", *N.Y.U. Journal of International Law and Politics*, Spring 1970.
- Riolot, Jean. "The Soviet Attitude Toward the Palestinian Organizations", *Radio Liberty Dispatch*, February 13, 1970.
- U.N. Security Council Resolution #242 of November 22, 1967.
- Wohl, Paul. "New Soviet Revolutionary Stance in the Middle East", *Radio Liberty Dispatch*, May 25, 1970.
- Yodfat, A. Y. "Moscow Reconsiders Al Fatah", *New Middle East*, December 1969.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ "The Palestinian National Covenant", *N.Y.U. Journal of International Law and Politics*, Spring 1970 p. 199.
- ² *Ibid.*
- ³ *Ibid.*
- ⁴ Jean Riolot, "The Soviet Attitude Toward the Palestinian Organizations", *Radio Liberty Dispatch* February 13, 1970.
- ⁵ Jean Riolot, "The Soviet Attitude Toward the Palestinian Organizations", *Radio Liberty Dispatch*, February 13, 1970.
- ⁶ J. Bowyer Bell "Arafats Man in the Mirror: The Myth of the Fedayeen", *The New Middle East* April 1970, p. 19.
- ⁷ Michael Hudson, "The Palestinian Resistance Movement: Its Significance in the Middle East Crisis", *The Middle East Journal*, Summer 1969, p. 302.
- ⁸ A. Y. Yodfat, "Moscow Reconsiders Al Fatah", *The New Middle East*, December 1969, p. 17.
- ⁹ "The Middle East Crossroads", *New Times* May 7, 1970, p. 24.
- ¹⁰ "At the Mid-East Crossroads", *New Times* May 7, 1970, p. 24.
- ¹¹ Interview with Dr. Sharabi at Georgetown University.
- ¹² A. Y. Yodfat, "Moscow Reconsiders Al Fatah", *New Middle East*, April 1970, p. 16.
- ¹³ Paul Wohl, "New Soviet Revolutionary Stance in Middle East", *Radio Liberty Dispatch*, May 25, 1970 p. 4.
- ¹⁴ "From the Soviet Press", *New Middle East*, July 1970, p. 44.
- ¹⁵ A. Y. Yodfat, "Moscow Reconsiders Al Fatah", *New Middle East*, December 1969, p. 16.
- ¹⁶ A. Y. Yodfat, "Moscow Reconsiders Al Fatah", *New Middle East*, December 1969, p. 16.
- ¹⁷ John K. Cooley, "Communists in Arab States Form Anti-Israel Guerrilla Force", *Christian Science Monitor*, March 19, 1970 p. 4.
- ¹⁸ Yevgeny Maximov, "Middle East: Road to a Just Peace", *News and Views From the U.S.S.R.* January 30, 1970 p. 3.
- ¹⁹ *United Nations Security Council Resolution #242 of November 22, 1967.*
- ²⁰ Interview with Dr. Sharabi of Georgetown University.
- ²¹ A. Y. Yodfat, "Moscow Reconsiders Al Fatah", *New Middle East*, December 1969, p. 15.
- ²² John K. Cooley, "Communists in Arab States Form Anti-Israel Guerrilla Force", *Christian Science Monitor*, March 19, 1970 p. 4.
- ²³ Jean Riolot, "The Soviet Attitude Toward the Palestinian Organizations", *Radio Liberty Dispatch*, February 13, 1970 p. 4.
- ²⁴ "Mid-East: Western Propaganda Myth", *New Times* March 10, 1970 p. 44.
- ²⁵ A. Y. Yodfat, "Moscow Reconsiders Al Fatah", *New Middle East*, December 1969, p. 17.

A SHORT COURSE IN HUMAN RELATIONS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD for the Members' consideration "A Short Course in Human Relations" that appeared in the official publication of the 2d Marine Division Association. Surely there is much in this that could give us all reason for thought.

A SHORT COURSE IN HUMAN RELATIONS

- The six most important words: "I admit I made a mistake."
- The five most important words: "You did a good job."
- The four most important words: "What is your opinion."
- The three most important words: "If you please."
- The two most important words: "Thank you."
- The one most important word: "We."
- The least important word: "I."

THE CHELSEA CLINTON NEWS SPOTLIGHTS THE PROBLEM OF LEAD POISONING

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1970

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee held 2 days of hearings on July 22 and 23 on legislation which deals with the problem of childhood lead poisoning. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. BARRETT, is to be commended for focusing congressional attention on this serious health menace which needlessly kills too many children each year.

As the sponsor of a package of three bills aimed at alleviating this disease, I am delighted that there are 19 cosponsors of my bills and that similar legislation has been introduced by other Members. In the Senate bills have been introduced by Senators KENNEDY, SCHWEIKER, and SCOTT which also deal with this disease.

The Housing Subcommittee had before it two of my bills—H.R. 9192 and H.R. 11699.

H.R. 9192 authorizes the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to local governments to develop programs designed to detect the presence of lead paint and to require that owners and landlords remove it from interior walls and surfaces.

H.R. 11699 requires that a local government submit to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development an effective plan for eliminating the causes of lead-based paint poisoning as a condition of receiving any Federal funds for housing code enforcement or rehabilitation. It also requires that these plans be enforced.

My third bill, H.R. 9191, is pending in the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and I am hopeful that hearings on this legislation will be held in the near future.

This bill establishes a fund in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare from which the Secretary can make grants to local governments to develop programs to identify and treat individuals afflicted with lead poisoning.

The problem of lead poisoning is a serious one. In the past, local governments have been either unable or unwilling to deal effectively with the disease.

In the meantime, more than 225,000 of the Nation's children between the ages of 1 and 6 are suffering from lead poisoning. For this reason, Federal legislation is critically needed.

I am inserting in the RECORD articles which appeared in a leading New York City community newspaper, the Chelsea Clinton News on July 9 and July 16. Written by Bruce Buckley, "Focus on 'Silent Epidemic'" tells about the attempts to detect lead poisoning on the lower West Side of Manhattan.

I urge my colleagues to read these articles, for they once again point out that, as time passes by, more and more children are afflicted with lead poisoning. The time to pass legislation is now, so that lead poisoning can be eliminated as a threat to the lives and health of our children.

The articles follow:

FOCUS ON "SILENT EPIDEMIC"

(By Bruce Buckley)

One night several months ago Avelino Perez was watching his infant daughter Gloria playing in the kitchen of their apartment on West 26th Street.

As he looked on, the chubby 20-month-old girl picked some flecks of paint from the wall and popped them in her mouth.

Mr. Perez called to his wife in another room (her name is also Gloria) to tell her what the toddler had done.

Mrs. Perez rushed into the kitchen, grabbed Florida and quickly washed her mouth out with soap and water. She knew about the danger of eating paint from the walls of old apartments.

Several months later, Gloria developed convulsions. She was taken to St. Vincent's Hospital on May 19 and admitted. The Hospital, noting the age and the address, suspected lead poisoning, as did her mother. A series of tests were taken, including X-rays of the long bones and blood analysis, but nothing in these tests indicated any danger. The X-rays showed no evidence of lead in the marrow of the long bones; the blood test came back showing a level of 60 micrograms, which is considered the upper level of normal; and finally there was no evidence of anemia.

Since 60 micrograms is the upper limit of a normal reading, a second blood test was ordered, according to Dr. Vincent Fontana, head of the hospital's Pediatric Department. By this time, the little girl had recovered from the effects of her convulsive seizure, and she was released. Mrs. Perez was told to bring the child back to the hospital in two weeks. When she returned, she was examined and pronounced well. But the hospital still had not received the results of the second blood test from the Health Department, where lead analysis is undertaken. Even up to this week, the result of that second test is still a mystery.

Dr. Fontana suspects that the Health Department discovered an abnormal amount of lead in the second analysis, since right after the child was released from the hospital, a public health nurse showed up at the Perez apartment and one of the questions she asked was, had Gloria eaten any paint?

An inspector from the Health Department turned up three weeks later and took samples of the paint from the walls of the Perez apartment. These reportedly turned out positive for lead, according to Dalia Fontanez, a tenant organizer who has been working for a year and a half with the residents of several deteriorated tenements on that block. Miss Fontanez talked to the inspector for Mrs. Perez, who speaks little English.

Questioned about the Perez case, the

Health Department refused to divulge any information.

But on the basis of a reported case of lead poisoning, the Department did send a mobile unit to 26th Street last Wednesday to test children from four blocks around.

In the hot afternoon sun about a dozen parents with more than 20 toddlers in tow waited for the mobile unit to arrive. It came late, a Red Cross truck with several volunteers and a doctor.

Dr. Jacob Glaubach, the Lower West Side Health Officer, arrived too, along with Rose Whitman, the public health education consultant for this area.

It was the first time the mobile unit had been used in the Lower West Side. Before this, the unit has been sent exclusively to "high risk" areas.

A table was set up in the shade and parent lined up to sign a Health Department form requesting lead analysis. Several children had come with neighbors and could not be tested. Parents are required to sign consents. One woman who could not write signed the consent slip with a large X. For a moment it created a stir. Was that an acceptable signature?

A flash of annoyance from Dalia Fontanez: Let's not get bogged down in bureaucracy now! Miss Fontanez is a college student who lives on the block and has been fighting the landlord of the bad houses for a long time.

Finally a volunteer walked over and signed her signature beneath the X and it was all right.

One by one the children climbed into the back of the Red Cross truck, which is normally used for disaster relief work. Con Edison also contributes the use of a truck. Some of the youngsters grimaced as the syringe was jabbed into their veins; other wailed. Not all of them could be tested. The doctor drawing the blood found difficulty finding tiny veins on some of the chubbier ones and they were given an appointment to come to the Health Center at 303 Ninth Avenue. Gloria Perez was one of them.

The parents were told they would receive the results in about a week.

Children who show evidence of lead in their systems—.06 milligram is considered the danger level—will have a public health nurse sent to their homes immediately. The nurse will determine whether hospitalization is required. Later an inspector arrives to test the paint on the walls for lead. Apartments in which lead is uncovered are ordered scraped or covered with wall boards. If the owner fails to comply, the city does the work and bills him for the cost.

Sometimes described as the silent epidemic, lead poisoning affects thousands of children in the New York City area. It is a disease of the environment and a disease of the poor. It is also insidious. Initial symptoms—nausea, lethargy, clumsiness, constipation—are the same as symptoms of many other diseases and uneducated parents often don't suspect the real cause. In its later stages the disease causes irreversible damage to the brain and central nervous system. Death often ensues, but many afflicted children live a kind of living death from the ravages of the disease.

Caught early enough, the disease can be treated and the deadly process reversed. A drug known as Calcium EDTA is used to leech the poison from the system. The lead clings tenaciously to the bones, but eventually it can be expelled.

The principal victims of lead poisoning are children up to the age of five. In this age bracket, they often have a craving for foreign substances called "pica" and will eat crayons, cigarettes, clay, matches—and flakes of wall paint. This would not be harmful, except for the fact that in deteriorated apartments, the older layers of lead-based paint, outlawed since 1947, become exposed.

Estimates on the number of undetected cases in the city vary greatly. Dr. Vincent Guinee, director of the Bureau of Lead Poisoning, estimated last week that there are 6000 to 8000 cases. Others have calculated that there are perhaps four or five times that number. Since January the city has seriously begun an effort to uncover undetected cases.

The budget has mushroomed from \$150,000 to \$2.4 million a year. Naturally the number of cases has grown too. Dr. Guinee reported that 720 children with lead poisoning have been found between January 1 and the week of June 26.

In the Lower West Side there have only been four cases in that period.

"It must be hidden," said Rose Whitman. "We're trying to ferret it out."

LEAD POISONING FOUND HERE IN SECOND CHILD

A second case of lead poisoning was uncovered in Chelsea last week as a result of increased attention to the problem here in the Health Department.

Two-year-old Ricardo Salgado was hospitalized at Bellevue after analysis of his blood revealed an excessive amount of lead in his system.

The little boy, who lives with his mother and older sister in a cramped four-room apartment at 229 West 26th Street, was one of 12 children tested by a mobile unit on Wednesday, July 1. His was the only positive finding.

Ricardo will be in Bellevue for some time, his mother was told by a doctor at the hospital. The level of lead in his test—.07 milligrams—is considered "very serious," according to Mrs. Rose Whitman, public health education consultant on the Lower West Side.

Left untreated, lead poisoning can lead to irreversible brain damage and death. It has been estimated that thousands of children in deteriorated buildings throughout the city are affected by the disease. Its insidious danger is that parents often confuse the initial symptoms with those of other, less deadly ailments.

The usual source of the lead is old flaking wall paint, which some children pick off and eat. Although lead-based interior paint has been outlawed in New York City since 1947, old layers of it often become exposed in rundown houses.

As part of the stepped-up drive to uncover undiagnosed cases, the Health Department's mobile testing unit will be operating Wednesday and Thursday afternoons at various spots throughout the Lower West Side Health District (Battery to West 72nd Street) from the end of July through the month of August.

Children can also be tested at the Lower West Side Health Center, Ninth Avenue at 28th Street, every morning and all day Wednesday.

Mrs. Whitman said the Health Department continues to "keep tabs" on children with positive, but less than critical, test results.

The campaign began in earnest here after a case was diagnosed on 26th Street.

When a critical case of lead poisoning is discovered—a level of .06 milligrams in the blood is considered critical—the Health Department rushes a nurse to the home of the child. She and the family physician, if any, determine whether the child requires hospitalization. Later a Health Department inspector arrives to examine the apartment. He then orders the landlord to scrape the walls or to cover them with wallboard. If the landlord fails to comply, the work is done by the city and the owner is billed.

The mother of two-year-old Ricardo, Mrs. Otilia Santiago, said she had seen the child on several occasions eating chips of paint from holes in the walls. Each time she caught him, the boy was punished, she said, but he continued doing it.

Mrs. Santiago speaks little English. Dalia Fontanez, a neighbor who has been active in the campaign against lead poisoning as a staff member of the Chelsea Action Center, translated for her.

The mother said she had noticed a loss of appetite in the child about three months ago and became very concerned. Fearing that he might have worms, she took him to a private physician who gave him some medicine without testing him, she said. A month ago Ricardo developed cold symptoms. She brought him to Bellevue Hospital, where he was given a bottle of liquid she took to be cough medicine.

Mrs. Santiago shares her neat apartment with a sister, who looks after the two children. Pregnant now with her third child, she will soon give up her \$70-a-week job as an operator in the garment center. She receives no welfare assistance.

KOSCIUSZKO HOME NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1970

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the history of the Poles with respect to the growth of the United States is well known to every American and especially to people of Polish descent.

In writing the history of the Revolutionary War, the two outstanding Polish names are those of Kosciuszko and Pulaski. They gave so much of their time and energy to the American battle for freedom during the days of that war.

While many American cities have statues to one or both of these heroes, no effort was ever made by the American Government to honor these two men who voluntarily came to these shores and risked their lives in behalf of the American colonists who fought for freedom from their mother country.

An effort is now being made to honor General Kosciuszko through the creation of the Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site. Mr. Edward Piszek, a Polish-American businessman in Philadelphia has purchased a historic and old building on Pine Street in Philadelphia which, nearly 200 years ago, was the residence of Kosciuszko. The idea is to preserve this home and rehabilitate it as a museum honoring Kosciuszko.

The building is in an area which is scheduled for urban renewal and proposals have been made to the city authorities to save this edifice from the bulldozers and to maintain it as a historic site. Unfortunately the proposal did not meet with the approval of the city authorities which declared the necessity of the destruction of the building. Under these circumstances, the matter was brought to the attention of the Congress to have legislation passed which would establish this residence as the Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site.

To achieve this result, I have introduced H.R. 18249, which is presently pending before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, as of September 9, there have been nine similar bills introduced in the House. In the

Senate a similar bill has been cosponsored by Senators HARTKE, SCOTT, HART, and SCHWEIKER.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the 225th anniversary of Kosciuszko's birth, February 12, 1971, will be celebrated as the year when the American Government fully realizes the impact of Kosciuszko's effort in its fight for freedom through the establishment of the Kosciuszko home as a national historic site.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate Mr. Piszek for his untiring efforts in trying to achieve this objective and for his generosity in purchasing this home to perpetuate the memory of Kosciuszko through a physical expression of our thanks to a man of great military knowledge who was instrumental in America's fight for liberty and freedom.

NIXON DOCTRINE FOR KOREA

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1970

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon doctrine, which was formulated a little over a year ago, is now being implemented in South Korea where certain U.S. troop withdrawals have been scheduled.

In an August 30 editorial, the Detroit Sunday News notes that the doctrine was tested during Vice President AGNEW's recent visit to South Korea by the demand of that Government that we provide \$3 billion for modernization of their Army. Not only were the South Koreans told we would not give them that amount of money, but also what we would make available would be over a period of time, at the end of which we would expect to have all our GI's out upon the completion of the modernization of the South Korean Army.

I believe my colleagues will find the Sunday News' appraisal of the Nixon doctrine as it relates to South Korea to be interesting, and I therefore include it in the RECORD:

NIXON DOCTRINE FOR KOREA—KEY IS SELF-DEFENSE

It's going to be tough sledding reducing our armed manpower in Asia and the Pacific and persuading our Asian partners that the Nixon Doctrine means what it says: Self-defense is the new watchword if they genuinely value their independence and freedom.

The first crunch has come in Korea. There will be others. There will have to be some hard reappraisals by our allies and a dismantling of the comfortable habit of mind that, rain or sunshine, Uncle Sam would always be there, militarily and economically, fighting each partner's battles.

Uncle Sam will still be there, his defense pledges intact, his nuclear umbrella deterring the biggest bullies. But no longer will he fight other people's battles unless it is demonstrably proven his partner will carry the principal combat burden and face up to the sacrifices.

The hard nut to crack on Vice President Agnew's tour was Korea, where 17 years after the armistice 63,000 American troops are on station to bolster the efficient South Korean army and, politically, to serve as a

tripwire should North Korea strike again. As soon as we said we'd reduce that American component to 43,000 by next June, South Korea began hollering, threatening the whole cabinet would resign if we persisted with implementing the Nixon Doctrine in Korea.

We ignored that first bluff and Agnew arrived. He made it clear we meant business and then South Korea declared it wouldn't even discuss troop reduction until we guaranteed about \$3 billion to modernize its army. The administration didn't fool around. "Not feasible, unrealistic," retorted Agnew's backstop in Washington, Defense Secretary Laird, refraining, however, from categorizing the demand for what it was—impudent blackmail.

Blackmail won't work if you've got no bargaining line of retreat and South Korea has no place else to go for aid. So Agnew made it clear the GI's would be withdrawn, that maybe \$1 billion over five years for modernizing the Korean army might be authorized by Congress, and, for a clincher, that we expected to have all the GI's out when that army modernization was complete.

When you've got a new master plan—and the Nixon Doctrine promises to be a sound strategic objective—stick to it and don't permit reluctant allies to nibble it to death. We've made a good start.

THE RECORDER WILL COMMEMORATE 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1970

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to acknowledge a milestone in the life of one of the many fine community newspapers that serve the 13th Congressional District of Montgomery County, Pa.

The Recorder, originally the Conshohocken Recorder, began publishing weekly 100 years ago this year at 64 Fayette Street in Conshohocken, the third oldest borough in the county.

In saluting the Recorder, I want to pay tribute to the role of the printed media in serving the varied areas—suburban and rural—that comprise the county.

Community newspapers such as the Recorder, supplementing and complementing the three competent daily newspapers in the county, are finding new roles of service. As the suburban areas spread further out into the county, the community newspapers are expending both their coverage and services.

Although the past quarter century has seen the untimely demise of many reputable daily newspapers, the community newspaper field has been growing. I think that my district is particularly fortunate in having many newspapers serving the various communities.

The Recorder, as the oldest community newspaper in the county, merits special praise for a century-old publishing record through major wars and attendant shortages of materials and labor. It is a doughty old veteran that holds an especial esteem in the hearts of its readers.

My warmest congratulations go to the Recorder and its staff on this 100th anniversary. I wish the newspaper and staff unending years of service to the community.

THE CAMBODIAN INCURSION FROM A MILITARY POINT OF VIEW

HON. JOHN ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1970

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, when President Nixon announced that he was sending allied forces into Cambodia, he promised that the action would save American lives. Each week since we have received fresh evidence that the Cambodian operation has had just the effect that the President predicted.

The sharp decline in American casualties since Cambodia is gratifying to those of us who have supported the President's plan for ending the war. There can no longer be any doubt that the Cambodian operation was a tactical victory.

However, the results of that operation may be even more meaningful in a strategic sense. The declining casualty rate means that the enemy's capability to wage war has been seriously hampered and that bodes well for the President's Vietnamization program and the further withdrawal of more American troops.

For a penetrating discussion of these facts, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to a recent editorial in the *Houston Post* which analyzes the Cambodian incursion from a military point of view:

PLUSES OF CAMBODIA

As time goes by, President Nixon's decision to send American troops into Cambodia seems to be paying off, both tactically and strategically.

The most important result to date is that the President's prediction that destruction of the Communist sanctuaries would save American lives is being borne out.

It has been about four months since the Americans and South Vietnamese moved into Cambodia, and two months since the Americans pulled out. Not enough time has passed for a conclusive appraisal of the over-all strategic success of the operation, but sufficient time has elapsed to reveal some tactical pluses and minuses that have accrued.

Writing in *U.S. News & World Report*, Col. William C. Moore, an Air Force officer who has served as planner at Allied headquarters in Europe and with the Strategic Plans Group of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, assesses the results to date and finds that the pluses have far exceeded the minuses.

He points out that the Communists have been slow in re-establishing new base areas from which to conduct operations against South Vietnam, and that such bases, or sanctuaries, are extremely important to combat operations. They permit combat troops to rest, regroup and plan new attacks, and most importantly, to assemble in strength before commitment to battle.

The newest strongholds apparently will be in Northeast Cambodia and Southern Laos, approximately 275 miles from Saigon. Enemy troops will no longer have a short night jaunt to their targets, as they did when their bases were in the Fishhook and the Parrot's Beak. Getting troops to vital targets will be a long-drawn-out, complicated and hazardous undertaking.

"Under these conditions," Col. Moore writes, "it is doubtful whether the enemy will ever again be able to mount a large-scale operation in the Mekong Delta, or for that matter, in the southern half of South Vietnam."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Even more heartening is the decline in casualties, ambush attacks, terror and sabotage attacks, and other combat operations by the enemy since the Cambodian bases were cleaned out. In the two months before the Cambodian operation, the weekly average of Americans killed in action was 108. During the May and June fighting in Cambodia, the average rose to 141. But in July and August, the two months following the withdrawal, the weekly average dropped to 70, a 35 per cent decline since pre-Cambodia.

True, there has been a 39 per cent decrease in Communist troops killed in action in the past two months, also, but Col. Moore considers this a plus rather than a minus because it indicates an unwillingness by the enemy to engage in battle.

These and other tactical gains point toward significant progress in the strategic sense, as well. Vietnamization is moving ahead. U.S. troops are being withdrawn on schedule, and draft quotas at home are the lowest since 1954.

Col. Moore admits readily that the U.S. forces in South Vietnam or Cambodia are not out of the woods yet, and that the end of the monsoons may see an acceleration of enemy activity, accompanied by mounting casualties. Hanoi, having suffered a crippling blow to its ability to attack South Vietnam, may try to redress the setback by stepped-up offensives in Laos and Cambodia. The odds at present, however, do not favor early success in such a venture, the colonel maintains, and we can hope that he is right.

THE CONVERSION RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACT OF 1970

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, we, in this country, are blessed with a highly skilled technical and scientific community. They have contributed greatly to our success as a nation. They have turned seemingly impossible tasks into reality.

Over \$17 billion of America's \$26 billion research and development industry is funded by the Federal Government. In the past, we have geared Government-sponsored research and development toward reaching the moon and providing the best arms and equipment for our military. Eighty-three percent of Federal expenditures for research and development is spent by the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In addition, one of every four technical personnel in industry is engaged in defense-related work and one-half of the Federal Government's scientists and engineers and technicians are employed by DOD, NASA, or AEC.

Today, we are concentrating on improving our habitat on earth, and we are disengaging from Southeast Asia. We have redirected our priorities to the resolution of our social ills and the urgent needs of our people. We have cut back on defense and aerospace spending and have increased spending on pollution control, housing, and transportation.

Because of cutbacks in Government orders for missiles, planes, and space

September 15, 1970

vehicles, profits and employment in aerospace are way down. From a high of more than 1.4 million employees in 1968, aerospace employment is down by more than 200,000 workers, mostly skilled technicians and engineers.

California, a center of the aerospace industry, has been especially hard hit. In May 1968, California's unemployment rate was 4.3 percent. In July 1970, California recorded a 6.2-percent unemployment rate. Orange County alone has laid off 10,700 aerospace workers in the last 12 months.

Mr. Speaker, we must take great care to cushion the impact of our economy and ease the transition of men and resources to civilian-oriented activities.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased to coauthor the "Conversion Research and Education Act of 1970." The purpose of the act is to help the Nation convert its resources and talent from defense-related activities to socially productive civilian-oriented activities. This bill provides an innovative approach to a coordinated program of conversion research and education for defense-oriented scientists, technicians, and management personnel.

The bill authorizes a total of \$450 million for specific programs of education, research, and assistance to small business firms, in order to aid in the conversion of defense research and development to civilian, socially oriented research and development.

It provides that the National Science Foundation sponsor research on conversion and that it develop and administer retraining programs for management personnel in defense-related research and development.

In addition, the bill directs the Small Business Administration by providing technical grants, loan guarantees and interest assistance payments.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this measure is a valuable first step toward insuring the future prosperity of our Nation by directing our technical and scientific talent toward the solution of our domestic ills. We must channel the experience and knowledge of this vast resource into the fields which will improve the quality of life for all our citizens.

HEALTH AND SAFETY STUDY SHOULD BE AVAILABLE TO CONGRESS

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1970

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the grim facts of hazardous and toxic conditions in America's workplaces unfolded before the Select Subcommittee on Labor during 15 days of public hearings in the 91st Congress on occupational safety and health. We learned of lethal substances in the chemical industry, or airborne dust particles in asbestos and cotton manufacturing sites, and of dangerous pesticides used in modern agricultural practices.

All the testimony revealed that the lives of America's workers are jeopardized daily by health and safety hazards both seen and unseen. Since the conclusion of testimony, a report by Mr. Jerome B. Gordon of Delphic Systems and Research Corp. has been made available to the Department of Labor. On August 4, I asked the Secretary of Labor to make one copy of this study available forthwith to every member of this subcommittee. In his reply to me Secretary Hodgson indicated that the copy he was forwarding to me as chairman was only preliminary and had not been accepted by the Department nor available for distribution.

This report indicates that statistics concerning job safety do not reflect the true nature of accidents and injuries, and that the real count may run as much as 10 times higher than those presented to this subcommittee.

The house occupational safety and health bill, H.R. 16785, is now pending before the Rules Committee. A similar bill in the Senate is before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. In order for Members of both Houses of Congress to judge accurately the need for such legislation, all relevant material should be available to them, including the Gordon study even if such study is considered by the Labor Department to be incomplete.

Preliminary findings are often released to Congress by Government agencies, and when we are speaking about voting on legislation of major importance to the lives of 80 million American workers, such documents should be supplied to every Member of Congress. I therefore urge the Labor Department to make the report available immediately to each Member of Congress in order to afford him the opportunity to study it before the legislation reaches the floor.

I am including in this regard a recent article by Mr. Jack Anderson concerning the findings of the Gordon study:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 11, 1970]

ROCKS OF JOB SAFETY COULD TRIP NIXON

(By Jack Anderson)

President Nixon's election-eve flirtation with the labor movement could break upon the rocks of job safety.

Government statistics show that 55 Americans lose their lives and another 27,200 are injured every day on the job—an alarming total higher than the U.S. casualty rate in Vietnam.

Indeed, a suppressed study claims that the true accident toll is even higher, that the government has been undercounting the casualties by as many as 200,000 a year.

This explosive study was prepared for the Labor Department by Jerome Gordon, Alan Akman and Michael Brooks at a cost to the taxpayers of \$58,000. The big employers, however, don't want the taxpayers to learn what their \$58,000 study has uncovered.

For the suppressed facts might convince Congress to pass tough federal legislation to supplant the jumble of state laws that now regulate occupational injuries and illnesses.

The labor unions favor a strong federal law, which Sen. Harrison Williams (D-N.J.) and Rep. Dominick Daniels (D-N.J.) are now trying to push through Congress. The Chamber of Commerce would like a weaker bill, introduced by Rep. William Steiger (R-Wis.) which would merely establish better coopera-

tion between labor, management and the government.

NIXON'S DANCE

At a secret White House strategy session on Aug. 11, the President's new management czar, George Schultz, asked GOP congressional leaders to "push the occupational safety bill."

"The Steiger bill is far better, but the unions favor the committee (Williams-Daniels) bill," he said sadly. He urged the GOP leaders to seek a compromise, perhaps the Williams-Daniels bill stripped of the "penalties and harassment."

Meanwhile, the Nixon administration, under pressure from the Chamber of Commerce, has kept the \$58,000 study under wraps. This column, however, has obtained a bootleg copy.

It states that the Labor Department's annual survey of work injuries "is the only major national source of information," yet contends that "the representativeness and validity of the survey is seriously restricted and impaired."

INJURIES NOT REPORTED

Comparing what employers reported to the federal government with actual findings in California, the study charges:

"Over 36 percent of the firms examined actually had 'injuries' while reporting 'no injuries' to the Bureau of Labor Statistics... On a national basis this means that approximately 200,000 disabling work injuries... are missed."

"Information compiled from these firms in California revealed a ratio of 10 serious injuries for every disabling injury reported. Extrapolated to the national level, this means that the current annual level of 2.5 million disabling injuries reported could rise to over 25 million 'serious injuries.'" The report classifies as a "serious injury" one that keeps a worker home for a day or more.

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW'S ASIAN MISSION

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the very effective service rendered the Nation by Vice President SPIRO T. AGNEW abroad as well as at home is duly noted by the Chicago Sun-Times in a very objective editorial Friday, September 4, which I direct to the attention of the Members:

AGNEW'S ASIAN MISSION

Vice President Agnew displayed a gift for diplomacy and negotiation on his trip to the Far East. His mission was to tell Asian leaders that President Nixon is firm in his intention to reduce the U.S. combat presence in Asia and to give assurance that under the Nixon Guam Doctrine of 1969 U.S. help would be provided where needed.

Asian leaders do not like the Guam Doctrine. Under its terms the United States will give economic aid and military equipment to an Asian nation—but only after that nation has shown it is helping itself. This is a departure from past U.S. policy under which U.S. aid was likely to be freely given to any nation raising a cry of the threat of a Communist takeover.

Agnew's first test was South Korea, where President Chung Hee Park demanded \$3 billion in economic aid and military equipment as "recompense" for U.S. withdrawal of 20,000 of its 64,000 troops stationed in South Korea. Agnew parried Park's lobbying with skill and

promised nothing—except that the troops would be withdrawn.

Cambodia was an even sterner test. Its Chief of state wanted blanket assurance of U.S. military help against the Communists even to the point of sending U.S. troops back into Cambodia. Here, too, Agnew managed to leave his host with a feeling of warm friendship and hope—but without making any commitments.

Agnew's trip has won him added credentials for his next job, that of campaigning for Republican candidates in the November elections. It can be hoped, however, that he will continue to show the same gifts for diplomacy and tact in that job that he displayed in his delicate mission to the Asian nations.

GEORGE J. BURGER, NATIONAL
SMALL BUSINESS CHAMPION,
HONORED BY HOUSE SMALL
BUSINESS COMMITTEE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the House Small Business Committee, which I have the honor to serve as chairman, recently paid tribute to Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business. In this connection, I place in the RECORD a letter to Mr. Burger, signed by all members of the committee, and an article from Mr. Burger's hometown newspaper, the Standard-Star of New Rochelle, N.Y.

The letter and article follow:

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,

Washington, D.C., August 13, 1970.

Mr. GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GEORGE: The Members of the House Select Committee on Small Business take this means of commending and congratulating you for a half-century of outstanding service to the small businessmen of America.

Certainly your devoted and dedicated work with the National Federation of Independent Business and with other small business organizations has greatly strengthened small business and our competitive free enterprise system.

You have stood tall as a great champion of small business. Assisted by your vast experience and knowledge of small business, your determination, your wisdom and your enthusiasm, great progress has been made in assuring small businessmen throughout the Nation of a "fair break" in many areas of our competitive free enterprise system.

From the time that you assisted in organizing the New York Tire Dealers Association in 1920, you have fought the battle for small business—year in and year out—day in and day out—never relaxing your vigilance or diminishing your efforts.

Certainly one of the highlights of your career was the creation of the Small Business Administration as an independent agency in 1953 and as a permanent agency in 1958. The hand of George Burger—your advice and counsel—were much in evidence in the events that led to the achievement of these significant milestones in small business history in America.

You have battled for a "fair break" in taxes for small business—and you played important roles in the passage of such legis-

lation as the first step tax revision of 1958, the seven percent investment credit in 1962, and the equalization of taxes on tires in 1968, among others.

You have lived a full and useful life of service to this Nation, to Congress, and to small business throughout our country.

Certainly we wish for you many years of good health and happiness—and again, we want to thank you for your great service to this Committee and to the Congress.

With kindest regards and best wishes, we are

Sincerely your friends,

Joe L. Evins, Chairman; Wright Patman, Tom Steed, John C. Kluczynski, John D. Dingell, Neal Smith, James C. Corman, Joseph P. Addabbo, William L. Hungate, Silvio O. Conte, James T. Broyhill, Frank Horton, Laurence J. Burton, J. William Stanton, Daniel E. Button.

[From the New Rochelle (N.Y.) Standard-Star, Aug. 24, 1970]

GEORGE BURGER CITED FOR WORK IN BEHALF OF SMALL BUSINESS

George J. Burger, 30 Clinton Place, New Rochelle, has received the commendations and congratulations of the Select Committee

on Small Business of the House of Representatives "for a half-century of outstanding service to the small businessmen of America".

Mr. Burger, who commutes between his home here and his Washington office, is vice president in charge of the legislative office of the National Federation of Independent Business.

He said the citation, signed by Rep. Joe L. Evins, chairman of the select committee, came as "quite a surprise" as he found it on his desk. It was signed also by members of the committee, Reps. Wright Patman, Tom Steed, John Kluczynski, John D. Dingell, Neal Smith, James C. Corman, Joseph P. Addabbo, William L. Hungate, Silvio O. Conte, James T. Broyhill, Frank Horton, Lawrence J. Burton, J. William Stanton and Daniel E. Button.

The citation lauded Mr. Burger's "devoted and dedicated work" with NFIS and with other small business organizations which "has greatly strengthened small business and our competitive free enterprise system".

"You have stood tall as a great champion of small business", the citation continued. "Assisted by your vast experience and knowledge of small business, your determination, your wisdom and your enthusiasm, great progress has been made in assuring small

businessmen throughout the nation of a 'fair break' in many areas.

"From the time that you assisted in organizing the New York Tire Dealers Association in 1920, you have fought the battle for small business—year in and year out—day in and day out—never relaxing your vigilance or diminishing your efforts.

"Certainly one of the highlights of your career was the creation of the Small Business Administration as an independent agency in 1953 and as a permanent agency in 1958. The hand of George Burger—your advice and counsel—were much in evidence in the events that led to the achievement of these significant milestones in small business history in America.

"You have battled for a 'fair break' in taxes for small business—and you played important roles in the passage of such legislation as the first step tax revision in 1958, the seven percent investment credit in 1962, and the equalization of taxes on tires in 1968, among others.

"You have lived a full and useful life of service to this Nation and to Congress, and to small business throughout our country.

"Certainly we wish for you many years of good health and happiness—and again, we want to thank you for your great service to this Committee and to the Congress."